
YESIM NAZLAR:

Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the ALS Mobilization Working Party report cross-RALO single issue call, taking place on Thursday, the 12th of November, 2020, at 13:00 UTC.

We will not be doing a roll call, as it's a webinar, but attendance will be noted on the wiki page.

If I could please remind all participants on the phone bridge, as well as computers, to please mute your lines when not speaking to prevent any background noise, and also to please state your name when taking the floor, not only for transcription purposes but also to allow accurate interpretation. We have Spanish and French interpretation for today's call, and our interpreters are Claudia and Marina, and Aurelie and Jacques on the French channel.

Now I would like to leave the floor back over to you, Alan. Thanks so much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, and welcome to this presentation. This is the second of two presentations on the report of the ALS Mobilization Working Party. The purpose of the webinar is largely to present the report and certain aspects of the report and make sure we're all on the same page as we go through the discussion within the ALAC and the RALOs. Certainly there'll be an opportunity at the end of people to disagree or ask questions. This is not a formal attempt to get input from

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.

the community. That will be done specifically through the RALOs. So, although comments are welcome, anything you expect to be acted on will have to be done through the RALO. The ALAC will of course be considering input from the RALOs in addition to things that are issues that come up within the ALAC itself.

Next slide, please. All right. How do we get here? The At-Large review, which took place starting in 2016—so this has been going on for almost half a decade at this point—ended up with a report from the independent examiner, which effectively said, “Get rid of ALSes.” It didn’t say that in just those words. It said, “Treat an ALS as an individual person. Treat it as the representative and no more,” for a number of reasons. The reasons varied. There was significant pushback on that. Ultimately, that is not what was put into the final recommendations that went to the Board and not what the Board accepted. That’s a rather radical happening, given that, normally, independent examiners’ reports are taken pretty much as is.

What we did is, among other things, we went back to the bylaws and to our own rules and tried to understand why is it we had ALSes, what was the perceived benefit from them, and was that something that was still there?

Next slide, please. Well, what we found was, in both the ICANN bylaws and within our own rules, there was a common thread. The common thread was one of the main *raison d’etre*—one of the main reasons for existence—of ALSes and creation of the ALS structure or framework that we have was ALSes literally have members. The value of an ALS to

ICANN and At-Large is the ability to potentially motivate those members to mobilize them to get them to do things.

That requires communication with them, and that was something that, in general—next slide, please—was not being done. So, to a very large extent, RALOs’ interactions with ALSes was almost exclusively—there were a few exceptions—with their representatives, and it was not clear, in many cases, whether the other members of the ALS even knew that there was an involvement in ICANN. As you see, it was more serious in that in some cases. We’ll go through some of that.

So the mobilization plan that we’re talking about essentially says, “Let’s establish communication paths with the actual members of the ALS and hope that some of them come back to us.” Clearly, not everyone is going to be interested in ICANN, but we don’t need everyone. We have 250 ALSes. If we get 50 new people in the next couple of years, that’s significantly increasing the number of people who are actively involved in policy issues within At-Large. If we get more, so much the better.

Next slide, please. The ALAC chartered the ALS Mobilization Working Party. The term “working party” is not one we use a lot within At-Large. The message was that this was a group that was going to come into existence, do some work and, once the work is finished, which isn’t quite done yet, the group will disband. So it’s not an ongoing working group, which will be around for years and years. We asked for volunteers, and anyone who volunteered was put on. There was no selection done. The RALO Chairs were given an opportunity to review the membership and make sure that their RALO was well-represented. We ended up with seven people from AFRALO, six from Asia-Pacific,

from Europe, three Latin America/Caribbean, and three North American. That included six current and ex-ALAC members, and eight current and ex-RALO leadership people. So there was a good representation from both long-term people who understood the history and understood the dynamic within At-Large and a lot of new people—relatively new people. I was Chair, and we had ex-officio Maureen as ALAC Chair, and Cheryl, who has led the At-Large review implementation process.

I'll take questions at the end, by the way.

Next slide. The working methods. We met pretty much weekly from sometime in January to September. We missed a few meetings during ICANN meetings and one or two other occasions but not many. All decisions were made by consensus. There was no voting. There were a couple of straw polls taken. But ultimately all decisions were taken by consensus—most of them unanimous, although there are occasional cases where individuals dissented, but virtually everything that we put into the report was discussed. That didn't mean we were all thinking the same way. There were often significant differences along the way, and certainly, at the beginning of many discussions, we had very different opinions. But ultimately what we decided what we believed was best for At-Large going forward but always in line with what we had specifically recommended to the Board that we do. There was significant reporting back to the community through a number of different paths.

Next slide, please. Our mandate was to review the rules, processes, and documents associated with ALSes. We were to focus on adjustments to

address ALS mobilization to do a general cleanup. The last time that these rules and processes were looked at was about 2007. So, over the years, there were a lot of things that we noticed either weren't quite working well or needed changes. So this was an opportunity to do a lot of that. It was very explicitly not a redesign of At-Large. We weren't looking at everything associated with At-Large and saying, "Well, we can make it a little bit better." We very clearly focused on the things that were within our scope as part of the review implementation or fixing problems, essentially. We very carefully and explicitly tried to avoid areas where we believed the issue was not very important and there might be significant controversy.

We didn't want a lot of confrontations within At-Large which would delay implementation. We were trying to make sure that what we were recommending was implementable and could be done quickly. We reported back to the ALAC for the consideration of the ALAC, the RALOs, and the ICANN Board. The ICANN bylaws explicitly say that rules associated with ALS accreditation must involve discussions with the RALO, and the Board has ultimate, essentially veto over it, but the Board must tacitly to anything associated with ALS accreditation.

Next slide. So what is changing? Well, we're changing some of the criteria for accreditation. We're changing expectations/what we expect of an ALS once they're accredited, and we're changing the accreditation processes. That looks like we're changing everything.

Next slide, please. This is not nearly as dramatic as if you were flipping slides. *echo* And we have a problem. All right. So, although we're changing bits and pieces all over the place, there's nothing earth-

shattering and nothing that's really going to change the nature of At-Large. At least that's certainly the belief of the working party or the individuals on the working party. We hope it's going to make it more effective but not change its overall nature.

Next slide. And now we go into the substance. We looked carefully at the criteria for accreditation, and we've added a number of things. Again, none of them are particularly earth-shattering. The first one is that the application must actually have the support of the ALS leadership. Although this was often the case, we found cases where an organization applied for membership as an ALS and did so essentially without anyone else in the ALS knowing. One of the more blatant cases was in a situation where we lost contact with an ALS representative, went to the leadership of the ALS, and they said, "Who are you? We've never heard of ICANN." So this is an attempt to make sure it doesn't happen.

ALSes must have a sufficient number of members. Again, in edge cases, we have found situations where an ALS really only consisted of its representative. Remember, before we had individual members, there was a push that, if someone wanted to become involved, they felt they had to form an ALS. Now, that never was true. You always could have become active as a person, whether you were recognized as a member by your ALS or not. But, nevertheless, there was a belief in some circles that you had to form an ALS. So we had people going out and forming an ALS with either just them or them and one or two friends. If the domain rationale for having an ALS is to get to its members, then, if you don't have members, it becomes somewhat moot.

There must be an intersection between the ALS interests and ICANN. Although ALSes are organizations that exist prior to involvement in ICANN in many cases, we want to know why they're interested. Just interest in the Internet alone does not necessarily mean you have much interest in ICANN.

There is no prohibition about an ALS being active in other parts of ICANN—NCSG, for instance—but it must be declared.

Lastly, we are recommending that we had a provision for membership of an ALS that doesn't quite fit the definition that we have used. That is, you must be predominantly managed and impacted by individual users in a single region. There are some ALSes—one of the best examples is a group looking at disabilities—that span regions. We have a few applications over the years for groups like that and struggled with how they fit the model. We're proposing a very minor change to how the rules are interpreted to allow them. Now, this has been referred to as someone people as a global ALS or a cross-region ALS. None of that is true. Ultimately, this will be an ALS that will be part of one region, period. But how we decide what that region is essentially the only question that we're addressing.

Next slide, please. And that's it for criteria. So we're not making great changes that will affect most ALSes or change whether they can become an ALS or not. We're just trying document what we're looking for and make it clear that we're all on the same page.

All right. Expectations. The first expectation is the crux of the whole issue. If ALSes exist so that we can get access to their members, then we

actually have to communicate with them. Now, that's a non-trivial issue because we don't know who the members of an ALS are. We have no right to demand their membership list. There has to be a separation, but if we can't contact their members, then the whole purpose for why we have ALSes can't be met. So what we will be doing is periodically sending out messages. A requirement is that the ALS either distribute it for us by e-mail, social media—whatever their preferred method—or give us a way of just getting to their members. They may give us a mailing list address, for instance, which goes to their members. These messages are not going to be the normal messages on our mailing list. These are going to be targeted things aimed largely at people who aren't familiar with ICANN, hopefully not full of ICANN buzzwords and understandable and presented in a way that we may get people who don't already know about ICANN to express some interest.

We will be translating them into local languages. The rate will not be high. We're typically talking about one per month. It might be often or it might be less. But it's not a high rate. But it's something that periodically shows up and may catch someone's attention. And there's a minor exception for a group, for instance, that looks mainly at cybercrime or spam or something else that is of interest to At-Large. If they commit to supporting us when we're looking at their particular topic, then they're not expected to send the messages out because their members have a very, very targeted focus, and, if we send them general ICANN information, that's effectively spam. And yet we want the cooperation of these groups because they may be able to help us.

Next slide. We expect an ALS to, every two years, report back. It'll be via a webform. It will be done in such a way that the amount of effort that

will have to be done is minimal. But we want to hear from you periodically. If you can't fill out a form once every two years, then we have to question whether indeed you want to be an active ALS or not. It's basically just going to confirm the things that were already on the application and give us updates on current status on a number of issues.

The ALS must mention their ALS status on their Internet presence. In other words, if a group wants to join At-Large and join ICANN as an ALS, they have to be prepared to tell their members about it and tell perspective members about it.

Next slide. We expect representatives to do that. That is, they must interact with us. We don't make huge demands of representatives, but if you're just missing an action forever, that's a problem. If you look at our website, we tell people, "Hey, if you want to get involved in ICANN and At-Large, one of the ways is to find a local ALS (if there is one) and join it." In order for us to do that, they must provide some sort of link—an e-mail address, a web link, or something—which allows prospective ALS members to join because, again, if members are the reason we have ALSes, then it's to our benefit if we can get them to have more members. Now, ALSes make their own rules about who becomes a member and who's eligible. We're not changing that. We just want to say, "Make it a little more public." And they must designate representatives. Currently, we require a single representative. Some RALOs ask for more. In many cases, there's at least two. Now we're formalizing at two to four. Again, no prohibition of an ALS representative being active in other parts of ICANN, but it must be declared.

Next slide. The question that comes up regularly is, is this applicable to existing ALSEs or just new ones? The answer is it's applicable to all ALSes. There is nothing that we are proposing which is not already within the guidelines and scope of what we have said before that an ALS is for and what expect of them. We're just being a little bit more insistent that they actually do what it is they committed to do in earlier versions.

Next slide. There's a couple of things that some people who have been around for a while will notice are not in the list of expectations. There was no mention of voting in RALO election/selections/whatever. That was very carefully decided. Again, there's virtually nothing in this report which was not debated by the group. And we looked at voting, and some RALOS in the past have made voting essential. We couldn't really find the rationale for why that is important if the ALS is fulfilling the other obligations that we're asking of them. Now, it's conceivable a RALO may have such a rule, but it's a rule within the RALO and not necessarily At-Large-wide. In fact, we're advocating that they not have such a rule, but that's a RALO issue.

We're not trying to track participation of ALS representatives in policy meetings or other meetings. The representative is the administrative contact, and we need an administrative contact just for day-to-day business. But they're not necessarily the person who has an interest in ICANN in terms of policy issues and the other things that we're here for, and we're not tracking that. We will, however, be tracking individuals and their participation. And, of course, since we usually know what ALS an individual is a member of, if they're an ALS member, we can attach measures to ALS participation, but we're not tracking it as such.

Next slide. The accreditation process is largely unchanged. It won't look particularly different to those who have participated in it before, if you're part of RALO leadership or, in some cases, ALSes. But it's cleaned up and clearly presented. So there's a lot less ambiguity and there's a lot more clarity in what people are expected to do when. We are still targeting an overall 90-day period from receipt of application to a decision, although there is now some flexibility for timing, for instance. The application can be put on hold for a while for a number of different reasons, and we recognize that, during ICANN meetings, we're not likely to do a lot of administrative work. So there's an allocation for that. We were well aware of the fact that each RALO does their application processing differently. Some RALOs go all the way to ALSes for discussion. Others do it purely within the leadership of the ALS. The rules give the RALO the flexibility to decide exactly how they're processing it. There is, however, a requirement that the RALO document what their process is and then follow that process. We will inform ALS applicants exactly what the process is for each RALO.

Another issue that has been a recurrent problem is, during the application process, there is often interaction between staff and the ALS, and occasionally RALO, in the past, and the ALS. But that information never found its way into the documentation. So, if we got new information along the way to augment the application, that will now be incorporated into the history of it.

Lastly, the application process starts off with the receipt of the application by staff, and staff performing a due diligence, reviewing the application, and just making sure that it meets the requirements, identifying any issues that have to be considered by the RALO and the

ALAC. There will be an opportunity for RALO leadership input at the very beginning of this. That means, if the RALO is family with an issue, plus or minus, staff are aware of it and can consider it as they're going through the due diligence process. So that's increased involvement for the RALO very early in the process, which we hope will be useful.

Next slide. As I said, there's a provision for suspending applications. The timeline allows for ICANN meetings and, of course, in this modern world, we're now looking at privacy issues and making sure that we are compliant with things like GDPR and other privacy legislation.

Next slide. Withdrawal of accreditation. What happens if a group ceases to be an ALS or we want them to cease to be an ALS? The first change is a change in terminology. The bylaws refer to disaccrediting. At-Large has never used that term. We have used the term "de-accredit." On careful investigation, we found out that "de-accredit" is not really a word. Although it is used within ICANN and a few other places, it's not a dictionary word and not an advocated one, so we're changing the terminology or recommending we change the terminology to "withdrawal of accreditation." Not a particularly big thing, but it does clean some things up. And we've described the process clearly. The withdrawal of accreditation was always very vaguely described and didn't acknowledge the fact that different reasons for withdrawal of accreditation perhaps should follow different paths. For instance, if we are taking action to withdraw accreditation from a group that, at some level, still wants to be an ALS but we feel they're not fulfilling their obligations, that's now a different path than if the group simply either requests that they no longer be an ALS or, for that matter, disappears—the group itself disappears—and therefore

clearly can't be an ALS, but we didn't have a clean path to removing them from our list.

Next slide. Well, it's not clear how long this process within the ALAC and RALOs will take and how long the Board will take to respond, but once we get formal approval and we announce these changes, we're expecting about six months for staff and volunteers to actually implement the things to get to the point where we can start following the new rules. We have an expectation of compliance at that point, not necessarily an audit. The biannual reports will be one of the ways that we try to make sure that everyone is addressing these issues. In theory, because we'll be doing the biannual report cycling—we can't do them all at the same time because that would be too hard a load on staff—it may take up to two years before we cycle through all ALSes. Hopefully, we'll find a way to make sure everyone is adhering to the rules a lot quicker than that. But that's part of the implementation process.

Next slide. As part of what we did, we found a small number of places where we felt that some bylaw changes were necessary, either because of what we were doing or, in most cases, because we simply found that we had to do a cleanup because of problems associated with them.

The first one is, as a result of the first At-Large review, we made a change to the bylaws, and it led off with the sentence saying, "The At-Large Advisory Committee"—remember, the bylaws are a description of the At-Large Advisory Committee, not as At-Large as such; they include At-Large, but the topic is the advisory committee—"is the primary organizational home within ICANN for individual users." Well, that sounded nice at the time, but it turns out it's wrong. It was never true.

The At-Large Advisory Committee is a 15-person committee appointed partly by RALOs, partly by the Nominating Committee. But individual people who want to start working at ICANN don't join the At-Large Advisory Committee. So we needed to find a way to ... On the concept, we thought was important to say "At-Large is the home for individual users," but we didn't want to do a massive rewrite, and we found a way that we believed could address the issue with a very small wording change.

Next slide, please. Now, it turns out that one of the words we picked people have objected to. In this version, you'll see I put that word in square brackets. Some people have felt that the word "oversees" is not quite the right word, so chances are that will change. But the concept is that the At-Large Advisory Committee is involved with the At-Large community, which is the primary organizational home.

So that was the first change. Again, it's a cosmetic one, but it was an issue that was important because there has always been confusion among users, among ICANN staff, among the Board, and among the CEO of what's the difference between the At-Large and the ALAC. So we felt the words had to be accurate. Otherwise, we're just encouraging more confusion.

Next slide. This one again is purely the terminology that we talked about before. We're replacing the use of the word "disaccredit" with "withdraw accreditation from." No other change other than a terminology change.

Next slide. This one is also at terminology change in the bylaws. If you read the bylaws, you'll find that the terms "certify" and "accredit" are used seemingly interchangeably in the bylaws, and you'll find two consecutive paragraphs, for instance, with the exact same sentence structure, saying, "Decisions related to certification," and the next one says, "Decisions related to accreditation." It's not at all clear. Are they talking about the same thing? Are they talking about different things?

Now, the answer is they're talking about the same thing. The reason the terminology change crept in is that the term "certified" was used in the original bylaws when the ALAC wrote the detailed rules of how ALS applications are processed. In the 2007 timeframe, a bylaw change was made to factor those in and refer to them. At that point, we used the term "accredit." So the words appear sort of interchangeably in different bylaws, and it wasn't clear that they meant the same thing. So this is just a very small change which clarifies that they are the same thing. We didn't want to try to rewrite the whole section of the bylaws and use the terminology uniformly. That would have been too large an effort and didn't seem to have enough merit.

Next slide, please. The fourth change and last change also refers back to the first At-Large review. One of the recommendations at that point is that all RALOs have the concept of individual members. At that point, only the North American RALO had that concept. That has now been done. However, the bylaws still say that, if you have individual members, your memorandum of accreditation—that's a memorandum of understanding; that's an agreement signed between ALSes and ICANN in the 2006-2208 timeframe ... Only the North American one made reference to it. So we really had a problem. Either the bylaws

shouldn't refer to the memorandum of understanding, or each of the other four MOUs had to be changed. The concept of changing the MOUs for just this reason was daunting. As I said, the MOUs were initially signed by every ALS in existence. If we were to try to do that today, the bureaucratic administration of doing it would be daunting. And it's not clear we could avoid doing that. So we're proposing a small bylaw change, which basically eliminates the reference to the MOUs in terms of individual members.

There is another minor change which ... There's two references in the bylaws to communication with ALS members because that's what we started off saying. That's a crucial issue related to ALSes. We're simply expanding that to say it applies to individual members of the RALO as well.

Next slide. The bylaws were reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel. Typically in ICANN, the bylaws are drafted by legal counsel, so they implicitly have the support of ICANN's legal support. That makes sure that there are no conflicts, that there are no surprises. We didn't want the RALOs and the ALAC to be debating bylaws and then be told by ICANN Legal "Oops, there's a conflict. They don't work," or, "You did something wrong." So, because we drafted them without the benefit of the lawyers being involved at that stage, which normally is not the way it happens in ICANN, we made sure that there were no surprises. That doesn't commit us to using the wording that was passed by the lawyers. It just says there are no things that we need to worry about and no gotchas that we need to worry about. Of course, if we change the wording during this review process and approval process, they'll have to go back to ICANN Legal to look at it before it goes to the Board. We

would be foolish to try to send something to the Board which was not reviewed by legal counsel.

Next slide. At this point, the purpose of this webinar is to make sure we're all on the same page. There will be discussions going on within the RALOs, and RALOs will presumably, through their ALAC members, feed information back to the ALAC. The ALAC will at some point have to vote. It's conceivable that the ALAC, if it finds problems or if they find there are problems identified by the RALOs that need adjustment, may send this report back to the working party for a modification. The working party is on hold right now but is no dissolved. We're prepared to do follow-on work if that is requested by the ALAC, but it's up to the ALAC.

ALS-related processes—specifically the accreditation process and the ALS expectations—have to be approved by the Board before they are final. That's one of the current bylaws. If we go ahead with any bylaw changes, there's a very specific process involved in doing that that's documented within the bylaws themselves. There's a public comment. It requires a super majority vote of the Board. Then the Empowered Community has the ability to reject it. The Empowered Community, for those who aren't familiar, is the group of five ICANN organizations—the ALAC, the GAC, the GNSO, the ccNSO, and the ASO—which have the ability, if enough of them say, "This shouldn't happen," to reject the bylaw. Lastly, if all of that goes through, then we have the implementation, which we talked about, which will be a significant effort, both among staff and volunteers.

Next slide. This presentation, I believe, is linked or should be linked to the agenda, so you can all find it easily. There are a number of documents which you may want to look at. There's the At-Large Structure framework, which is the current set of rules, the mobilization wiki, which has all of the documents going back to the first meetings/records of all the meetings—you can look at the literally hundreds of versions of the documents as we work through them, if you are diligent enough—and, of course, the report that we're talking about.

And that's it for the presentation. I was targeting 45 minutes, and it looks like we're pretty close-on. I will open the floor for any comments or questions.

I see none so far. Is there anyone either on staff or others that have been reading the chat? Is there something there that should be brought to my attention? I have not been focusing on the chat at all.

Gopal, go ahead.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

Thank you. Thank you for a nice lecture. I have put some questions on the chat, [but that comes] later. The notion of online community is not new to the Internet. They began as special interest groups with only a professional ideology to pursue. Whereas we are telling that ALSes can have any interest, including business interests. So, how does it fit into the entire gamut of not-for-profits and the volunteer [companies]?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I guess that's not really for us to determine. Our rules make it very clear that, for a group to become an ALS, they must be largely managed by and controlled by individuals within the region. After that, there really is no overall rules. Each ALS is different. Typically, they're not-for-profit. I guess conceivably they could be for-profit, but I'm not sure how relevant that is. We have ALSes in some areas that are tightly linked to industry. We have ALSes that have the involvement of government. We have ALSes for whom both of those things would be considered revolting. So there really is no uniformity in that, nor are we trying to enforce uniformity.

The standards and norms within different parts of the world are very, very different. As an example, I'll say we've had discussions saying, if you are involved in government, then you cannot be involved in an ALS. Yet, there are parts of the world where the number of IT-involved people are very small. People where multiple hats. Almost everyone has a day job and therefore is making money, often but not always involved in technology. There is a lot overlap in government in many cases. So it's a very, very mixed bag, and we don't try to govern exactly what that relationship is. We have ALSes that have existed for decades, and we have other ALSes that were just formed relatively recently. The rules and norms vary highly across the world. So there just is no uniformity in that, nor are we trying to enforce any.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

But then there's a [cross-] ALAC requirement as we are looking a the single issue here. Is there an advisory, is there any way, in which these

aspects are highlighted in some manner to make a decision whether to go [cross-] ALAC or not?

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry. I'm not quite getting what your question is. All of the rules and expectations we're talking about have always been documented, and they will be documented better now and be more accessible. But other than that, we don't try to govern exactly how an ALS does its own business.

GOPAL TADEPALLI: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Vanda, please go ahead.

YESIM NAZLAR: Vanda, if you're speaking, you're on mute.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: They put me on mute again. Thank you. The first position is just to confirm what Alan just said—that, in LACRALO, for instance, we have this problem most of the time, related to people that work in the government and work in the industry and work in other parts and have some ALSes to participate. And they are very active anyway.

What we decided inside the RALO was that they should not have a very high hierarchical position into the government because, if they do that, please join the GAC, and your country will be much more represented than in an ALS. Some of those guys just move from one part to another part, but still the ALS continues to be part of our group. So we have those kinds of things that are just for our situation.

The other question I have—because we are trying to define more in detail—is how the metrics can be to adjust the accreditation but also the way to withdraw the accreditation because we have some problems in our RALO for that. So my question is, are we going to have, or is the group just thinking about, metrics that could be applied? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The answer is we talked about that a lot. The bottom line is, when you look at why we have ALSes—why we have ALSes is largely to get access to their members ... If you are an ALS, if you have 100 members, and we are communicating with those members, is there anything else we expect you to do? The answer is not a lot. We expect you to file a report periodically. We expect your representative to be a human being who responds to messages if they're sent. But that's all. So there really are very few metrics associated with an ALS. As long as you are fulfilling your obligations, it's not clear that we need to be measuring a lot with regard to the ALS itself. So, really, the metric is, are you following your obligation? There's about half a dozen of them, and we will be checking that off. But that's about it. So we don't see a lot of metrics associated with ALSes.

Now, if you're not following them, then hopefully our processes will allow your ALS to be decertified—we'd withdraw accreditation—and so be it. But, if you are satisfying them, it's not clear we need to do that.

With regard to your first comment, you said, if you're working for the government, you should join the GAC. Well, I don't have the option of joining the GAC. My country has a government, the government select who the GAC representatives are. And they didn't come to me and say, "Do you want to be the rep?" Now, in some small countries, that may not happen. That may be a lot less formal. So joining the GAC is not an issue.

Now, if you are in a position where you cannot take a position without your government approving it, that's a showstopper. But I really have some concern with saying you can't be an employee of the government if you're in a position where there is no conflict between what you do as an individual and what you do as a government employee. So it becomes a very subjective decision at that point of whether there is a strong linkage between your employment and what you can do as an individual. That, again, is subjective. That has to be looked at manually.

Cheryl, you're next, please.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks, Alan. Vanda, I just wanted to respond a little bit on the metrics front. Much of what I've seen this work party develop will more clearly articulate to At-Large Structures what their expectations are, but of course, the regions themselves—the regional At-Large organizations—may also have particular "requirements" or expectations of what it

means to be an active At-Large Structure. It might be something like attending X number of meetings within an annual cycle of regional meetings. If you don't attend, then an apology. Whatever it is. It doesn't matter.

There may be, however, specific expectations and even requirements that the regional At-Large organizations and the regions themselves may agree to. But what's here is the superordinate, the absolute minimum requirements. Dare I use that term without trying to be minimalist about it. That I think is an important thing. The metrics will be articulated, will be more obvious. All of that is a good thing, but most importantly, this work party has also put together, as Alan said, much more clear pathways for a number of ways that accreditation may be withdrawn. That, of course, includes when you've got At-Large Structure themselves that no longer wish to be classified as an accredited At-Large Structure within ICANN.

So I think this is a good step forward, and we should see a lot of less of the problems that you're concerned about. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Before we go Satish, I notice in the chat there was a comment from Oksana. I'm not reading the chat carefully, but I just noticed one about, "Is there a requirement or something like that about participation in local or national IGFs and things like that?"

That was an issue that we actually talked about a fair amount, and there is an item in the report that covers that. It is not a requirement because, although we may feel there's a strong overlap between IGFs and what

we do in ICANN—they're both aspects of Internet governance—it's very ALS-specific. If your ALS's main function, as we have ALSes, is involvement in groundwork on getting people involved in their Internet, and their local Internet, of teaching them how to use the Internet, there may be very little overlap with IGF. To instruct them that they must be involved in the IGF just doesn't fit our model that each ALS is an independent organization.

We do, however, point out and will mention in the literature that, in many cases, there is benefit of that kind of overlap, and they should consider whether they want to be involved in it. It's not a decision we're making for them, but it's something they want to say.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. Just jumping in. Oksana's question was specific to ALAC leadership in those roles, not the At-Large Structures [inaudible]. That is well outside of this work party's remit.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. Okay.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But what you said is absolutely true. I certainly saw all that happening.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Sorry. This group is about ALS and mobilization, not ALAC [or] leadership.

Satish, go ahead.

SATISH BABU: Thanks, Alan. First of all, thanks very much for the very dedicated and detailed work on this, both you and the team. This is a very important part of our future. As we go ahead [some day], APRALO's perspective is that we're looking at this document—the final report—as well as Roberto's unaffiliated individual member ... the similar document form that group as well to restructure our ROPs. That's one.

Now I'll be of course taking this to the APRALO group, and we have a policy forum. They will be looking at it from an ALS-level perspective. We'll try to get input from ALSes and also the leadership.

But I have a comment which is not strictly bylaw oriented. I see that there's a focus on ALSes as a presentation for the members. So what is valuable within ALSes is its members. While that is undoubtedly true, I also think that we consider an ALS to be a very integral part of the community. It would be, like they say, the whole is more than the sum of its parts. The community is not just the membership alone. It is a larger union composite kind of a thing, which has its own values. I wonder if you're underplaying that aspect of what the ALSes and also the members together constitute. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

The answer to that is there's not a lot of focus on it here because it's not something we can influence. There is mention to it certainly in our discussions and in the report. There is mention. For instance, what I was just mentioning, which wasn't relevant as I mentioned, is involvement in IGFs and involvement of other things. That's one of the things that can increase your credibility within your local region, and your credibility within the local region is important because there are times when we want you to act as our voice within local regions and to be part of the outreach work that we do within regions and local countries. But that's almost a side benefit of when we have you as an ALS, not necessarily the reason that we have the ALS to begin with.

So you're right. Once we have this structure, it has other implications. But, if we cannot access your members, then that is one of the main areas of why we had ALSes to begin with. But, as I noted, there is exceptions—a group that is focusing on particular topics, for instance. We're not looking to greet your members to get them involved in the next SubPro PDP because that just isn't an area that they have any interest in. But you have other skills that you may bring into our environment when necessary.

So, yes, there are exceptions, and there are some very strong benefits of ALSes once we have the structure, but the *raison d'être*—the reason—we have ALSes to begin with is because of their member base. That's one of the core elements of it. That was certainly the position we took, and that seems to be the position that the bylaws and the existing processes, which were developed 13 or 14 years ago were aiming at.

I see Gopal has his hand up. I thought it was an old one. Maybe it's a new one. I'm not sure.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

It's an old one, but then I just wanted to mention, since you called me. What I have observed is that ALSes typically tend to have a big launch, and then nothing happens for several of them. Then a good number of them are non-starters. [What are the chances that big panic doesn't happen due to a sudden wake-up or a realization?] The best way an online community is to stretch on. We give more time. We give a longer rope. Is there any other method? I don't know. That is the point that I wish to make. That's all. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. Look, we're certainly expecting that, when this comes in, we're likely to have a number of ALSes that have existed for a long time that, for all intents and purposes, don't really exist right now, and there may still be one person hanging around who still says they're the representative. So we're probably going to have some fall out of groups that probably shouldn't still have been ALSes but were. No doubt, when we publicize the rules, we may get some action in some ALSes because they forgot about us, and this wakes them up again. And that's fine. I'm not expecting that we're going to lose a huge number of ALSes because of this, but am expecting that the RALOs, through the natural course of things, will, with the new processes, identify some ALSes that don't quite exist. In fact, we have gotten the message from RALO leadership

that they're hoping that happens in some cases because they know they have ALSes that aren't really very active anymore.

So this is part of the overall review. We're not expecting radical changes. We are expecting some change. This is going to be a learning exercise. This is something new we're embarking on. As I started off saying, the words have been in the bylaws since the very start of At-Large and ICANN, but we haven't necessarily invoked them and used them. We're going to try to be using them now. Now doubt, it will be a learning experience, and I have no doubt our successors five or ten years now will come back and say it's time to do another review and make some revisions. Hopefully, what we do will last that long and won't have to be sooner because this was an expensive endeavor to embark on in terms of effort of people.

We still have 25 minutes. I see no hands.

GOPAL TADEPALLI:

I'm sorry, Alan. One more point. In your lecture, you were mentioning that there'll be a dormant state—something like [inaudible] terminate and still be notified in other records. What do we do with that ALS that has been under this [inaudible]? What I understood from your lecture is that it can be dormant. It could [inaudible] terminated and still be on the records. [What is the possibility of that being?]

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, if ALS accreditation is withdrawn, we don't erase them from our history. We still have records that they were an ALS at one point. But

they're no longer a member. The same thing if you joined the IEEE or ACM. Presumably they have records of past members, but if you're not a member, you're not a member. So that's just going to the normal course of events.

I'm not quite sure that you're asking, but, overall, we have not withdrawn accreditation from an awful lot of ALSes over the years, so it's not a huge volume—at least in the past—that's of major concern. Periodically, a RALO may decide to look at their ALSes. Are there ones that are not active anymore? But it hasn't been a major endeavor, and I'm not expecting it to change.

Anybody else? Or is there anything in the chat that I should be made aware of? I will be looking at the chat afterwards, but I haven't been following it along.

I'd like to give credit to the working party. As I said, it's made of 21 members. A few were not very active. Many were very active. Given that we all went into this—some of us with very different positions—and came out with consensus—that is, not everyone was happy with everything—for anything that went into the final report, there was general agreement on it. I think this is a positive thing to say about the multi-stakeholder model and about At-Large—that we can have these kinds of discussions with very different positions and hopefully come to closure. I'm certainly looking forward to see what comes out of the RALOs and the ALAC. Just as I presented this webinar, I'm happy to be involved in the process to the extent that the ALAC Chair would like to have me involved, or the RALO Chairs. That's an offer to work with the

RALOs if the RALO Chairs have an interest and with the ALAC going forward.

In the absence of any more comments—Cheryl, you have a comment.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I do. I just wanted to put on the record in this meeting a thanks to you. It was a huge amount of work. It was, I think, very well led by you. I think the success of this report doesn't reflect the thanks that we should give to you. It wasn't always an easy task, and I just wanted those of us gathered to know that, at least from my voice, I think thanks and appreciation should be recorded. Yes, the work party did a great job, but it did a great job with you guiding it very effectively and very efficiently in doing an awful lot of background work to ensure things happened. So thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Cheryl. I will share with this group that Cheryl was one of the people I would periodically go to and threaten to resign and things like that when things got rough. So Cheryl does have a little bit of insight as to what was involved. But that didn't happen and we did come to conclusion and got this report issued.

All right. In the absence of any further comments, I'll turn it back over to staff to end the meeting.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you very much, Alan. Thank you all for joining this webinar. The webinar is now adjourned. Have a great rest of your day. Bye-bye.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, all. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]