**AFRALO Operating Principles Review Working Group**

Recommendations

**Individual membership**

**Presentation**

In the ICANN bylaws, it is mentioned that unaffiliated individuals may become member of the RALO if it is stipulated in the MoU signed between the RALO and ICANN.

The AFRALO MoU with ICANN says in its article 2-C:

We declare that every interested citizen or resident in our region is welcome to join at least one of our At-Large Structures. We will also allow individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within our Geographic Region to become Members of the RALO.

So, we committed to allow for unaffiliated individuals to become member of AFRALO

Today, 3 of the 5 RALOs allow for unaffiliated members (NARALO, APRALO and EURALO)

The first At-Large review recommended to promote the individual membership, and the report of reviewers of the second review recommends to transform At-Large in an individual members only through their EMM model.

The working group discussed the individual membership, taking advantage of the experience of the 3 RALOs that adopted this concept. There was a strong push back from the majority of the WG members for the following reasons:

* The main mission of a RALO is to:
  + Bring the opinions and views of the regional end users’ community to ICANN
  + Inform the regional end users’ community about ICANN mission, policy and activities.
* The individuals will have very limited ability to assume this responsibility compared to the ALSes that can better assume it through their members
* An individual member isn’t accountable to anyone but himself, while an ALS representative is accountable to his ALS
* An individual doesn’t represent anyone but himself. An ALS representative represents dozens, Hundreds, or thousands of end users.
* As individual member, anyone can come and ask to be AFRALO member. How to proof that he/she is not sent by an entity who has political interests (Government), financial interests (DNS industry), etc.

After a long debate, the WG ended up with accepting the individual members, but rejected to give them any ability for decision making. This was accepted to be tried for an year, and then reconsider the issue according to the result of the one year experience.

**Recommendation**

1. Non Affiliated persons may become AFRALO members (unaffiliated members)
2. The unaffiliated members must submit an affirmation to At-Large Staff indicating that they meet the following criteria:

* being a permanent resident of one of the African countries/territories
* Being not a member of a certified ALS.
* Accepting the AFRALO Operating Principles and the ALAC RoP
* being subscribed to the AFRI-Discuss list,
* Being active in the local Internet end users community

1. Ceasing to meet any of the above criteria terminates unaffiliated membership.
2. The Unaffiliated members are encouraged to join one of the certified ALSes of their country or create their own association and go through the regular process of ALS certification.
3. The Unaffiliated members are encouraged to collaborate closely with AFRALO ALSes in their country of residence.
4. The Unaffiliated members participate in all the AFRALO activities including but not limited to:
   * Attending the AFRALO face to face and virtual meetings,
   * Participating in and/or initiating debates
   * Proposing views, activities or projects
   * Etc.

Nevertheless, they don’t participate in any kind of decision making in AFRALO

1. The individual membership issue will be reviewed in 2019 to reconsider their rights and duties of unaffiliated members in light of the 2018 experience.

**Weighted Vote**

**Presentation**

At-Large represents and defends the Interests of Internet End Users. End users have only one interest: the global public interest in opposition to political or financial interests.

To prevent any country having the largest number of ALSes from pursuing an agenda beneficial to its own interest as opposed to the benefit of the region, and avoid that it influences decisions to its own advantage, the vote of each ALS in a country will be weighted according to the total number of certified ALSes in that country.

This is particularly important in our region since our governments have greater influence on the civil society organizations, especially because their main financial resources come from governments. The RALO decision may become closely linked to the interests of the government of the country with the largest number of ALSes while the RALO decision should be for the interest of Internet end users of the region.

The proposed system of the weighted vote shall be so that the sum of the weights of all ALSes in a country is equal to 1

Considering Country A where there are “n” ALSes; the Vote weight for each ALS in that country is equal to 1/n

For the record, LACRALO applies the weighted vote since very long because Argentina has 8 ALSes while most of the Caribbean countries have only one ALS per country.

**Recommendations**

* For any voting operation, the vote count will consider the following weighting system
  + The weight of each ALS vote shall be 1 divided by the number of accredited ALSes in its country

This will give each country a total weight for all ALSes equal to 1

**Note:** Recommendations for weighted vote were finalized in 2014, before the working group stopped the work because of the availability of its members, busy by the cross-community working groups on transition and accountability. New members joined the group when it resumed its work in 2016, and some of them disagree with the recommendations and wished to review them. But given the time constraint, the issue was not reopened and the recommendations remained unchanged.

[**Performance Metrics**](https://community.icann.org/display/AFRALO/Performance+Metrics+-+AFRALO+ROP+Review)

**Criteria of involvement and participation**

* **Meeting:**attend AFRALO conference calls and any other virtual or face to face meeting

Non attendance or lake of participation in face to face and/or virtual meetings

won't be counted if they are justified and documented, and if the concerned

member apologized in the appropriate time

* **Contribution:**Contribute to the AFRALO discussions and/or to the ICANN policy

development through mailing lists or wiki pages, as well as participation in the Working Groups

* **Vote:**Vote at the elections of AFRALO officers and representatives within and on

various ICANN constituencies and/or any other kind of vote (ratification of statement, survey, etc.)

* **Local Activity:**Have a real presence on the ground (Local Activity, communicate with

the individual end-users of the country and the region, etc.).

**ALS status**

* Active
* Less active
* Standby

**Threshold Parameters**

1. Active:
   1. Participation in at least **2** meetings every **3** months
   2. Making at least**3** Contributions every **6** months
   3. Voting in at least **2** of the last **4** consecutive polls
   4. Submission of at least **2** local activity Reports or more every **year**
2. Less active:
   1. Participation in at least **1** meeting every **3** months
   2. Making at least**2** Contributions every **6** months
   3. Voting in at least **1** of the last **4** consecutive polls
   4. Submission of at least**1** local activity Report every **year**
3. Standby:
   1. **No** participation in meetings within **3** months
   2. Less than **2** Contributions every **6** months
   3. **No**Vote in the last **4** consecutive polls
   4. **No**local activity Report in the last **year**

**ALS Status:**

(a**or** b)**and (**c**or** d)

**Example:**

To be active, an ALS must

* Participate in at least **2** meetings every **3** months **or** Make at least**3** Contributions every **6** months  
  **and**
* Vote in at least **2** of the last **4** consecutive polls or provide at least **2** local activity reports every year

[**Decertification**](https://community.icann.org/display/AFRALO/Decertification+-+AFRALO+ROP+Review)

**Presentation**

The ALAC is in charge of the certification of the ALSes under the recommendation of the RALOs. It is also in charge of the decertification of the ALSes that don’t comply with the membership requirements also under the RALOs recommendation.

Since AFRALO is supposed to give its recommendation for the decertification if any, we must set up the guidelines regarding the decertification of ALSes

What are the possible reasons of decertification?

* ALS didn’t show-up since a while.
* ALS in hibernation mode or don’t exist any more
* ALS not interested anymore in AFRALO

For the record, 3 other RALOs have already recommended the decertification of some ALSes

**Recommendation**

AFRALO can recommend to ALAC the decertification of an ALS following the below process if it doesn’t fulfill the performance criteria detailed in the operating principles,:

* An ALS entering the "Standby" status is contacted by the RALO Chair to understand why it is not active
* An ALS that has been in a "Standby" status for one entire year, and didn't give valid reasons for that situation should be considered for decertification
  + All over this year, the interaction with the ALS representatives shall continue to bring them back to the RALO activities
  + If after the interaction year, and despite all those efforts, the ALS didn't give any sign of improvement, the RALO Chair officially contacts the ALS representatives for a last trial to bring them back to the RALO activities before proceeding in the decertification process.
  + If, 6 months after the last trial, the ALS didn’t improve and didn't give convincing reasons for their silence, The RALO should proceed and propose to ALAC the decertification of the ALS.
  + All the above is applicable to individual members.

[**Quorum**](https://community.icann.org/display/AFRALO/Quorum+-+AFRALO+ROP+Review)

**Presentation**

The current Operating Principles set the Quorum as follow:

* A quorum at any AFRALO Meeting shall be one third (1/3) of the Members, or seven (7) members, whichever shall be greater.
* The quorum for any vote of the members, whether held during a Meeting or at any other time, shall be a simple majority of the whole Membership.
* At any meeting where at least one half (1/2) of members are present, a motion to amend, change, or repeal the Operating Principles may be initiated. Two-thirds of the whole membership must consent for the motion to carry.

It is not acceptable that a meeting can be quorate with only 7 members attending over the 53 (today) total number of AFRALO accredited ALSes. It is proposed that we stick to 1/3 (which is today 18 members).

For the record, this quorum is for the meeting to deliberate. The decisions will be taken by simple majority of the whole membership (today 27 over 53) .

When this review is adopted:

* We will have more participation because our ALSes will try not to be in the standby situation that may lead to the decertification
* Several of the current ALSes will be decertified because they never show up except when there is a travel support. Some of them even didn’t respond to our call for the General Assembly in Johannesburg.
* We have today 53 Accredited ALSes. We can have a valid meeting (or call) with 18 attendees (for a Quorum of 1/3). When we come to a critical decision, we will need to vote.

**Recommendation**

* A quorum at any AFRALO Meeting (face to face or virtual) shall be one third (1/3) of the AFRALO Members (Accredited ALSes)
* A vote shall be conducted for critical decisions
* Critical decisions may include:
  + Selection of someone for a position
  + Adoption or ratification of a statement, declaration or position
  + Certification or decertification of an ALS or individual member
  + Modification of the operating principles (with different quorum)
* Any vote will be conducted electronically to permit to all members, present at the meeting or absent, to participate in the decision-making.
* The electronic vote lasts 7 days except in the case where we need a quick decision (discretion of the Chair)
* The vote result is considered valid if 50% of the accredited ALSes participated in the vote

The members of the WG agreed that if the quorum of 50% for the vote is not reached, a second round shall be conducted. They also agreed that the interval between the 2 rounds should be decided on by the AFRALO Chair according to the urgency of the decision. But they didn’t agree on the quorum for the second round. 4 suggestions: Whatever the number of voters is, 10%, 25% and 33%.

A new proposal came at the last minute, based on ideas expressed by some members and got the agreement of 9 over 12 members of the WG and 2 opposed. The proposal says:

* A vote shall be conducted for critical decisions (or when requested by one third (1/3) of the AFRALO Members)
* Any vote will be conducted electronically to permit to all members, present at the meeting or absent, to participate in the decision-making.
* The electronic vote lasts 7 days except in the case where we need a quick decision (discretion of the Chair)
* The vote result is considered valid if 50% of the accredited ALSes participated in the vote
* If this quorum is not reached during this period, it is extended for the same period for the members who didn’t vote yet.
* The quorum for the whole period (original and extension) becomes (whatever the number of voters is, 10%, 25% or 33% of the accredited ALSes)

This means a first period with a quorum of 50%, and if this quorum is not reached at the end of this period, instead of redo the vote for all, the period is extended for those who didn’t vote yet; the votes casted during the original period are also counted. The quorum becomes (Whatever the number of voters is, 10%, 25% or 33%)

The General assembly is requested to choose between:

* 2 separate rounds or
* a prorogued period.

In both cases, the GA needs to choose the quorum for the second round or the prorogued original period. The proposals are:

* Whatever the number of voters is
* 10% of the AFRALO members
* 25% of the AFRALO members
* 33% of the AFRALO members

**Vice Chair position**

**Presentation**

The current AFRALO operating Principles includes 3 AFRALO officers: a Chair, a Vice Chair and a Secretary. The only mission of the Vice Chair is to replace the Chair in case of unavailability.

For the record, on the 5 RALOs, only AFRALO and APRALO have a Vice Chair.

It is proposed to consider the possibility of removing the AFRALO Vice Chair Position for the following reasons:

* The VC doesn't have other duties than the replacement of the chair in case of unavailability
* AFRALO has 2 travel support slots only for the ICANN meetings; It has always been embarrassing to decide on who among the Vice Chair and the Secretary should accompany the Chair
* If we mention clearly in the reviewed operating principles that the second slot goes always to the secretary, this will discourage members with ability to devote energy and time to volunteer for the Vice Chair position. You see what kind of Vice chair we will have. So far, in the current OP, nothing is said about who should accompany the Chair for the ICANN Meetings. AFRALO tried so far to balance between the VC and the Secretary, and so do APRALO.

**Recommendation**

* To remove the AFRALO Vice Chair Position
* In case of unavailability of the Chair, the Secretary would replace him/her for the short period necessary to select a new Chair with 2 unique tasks:
  + Organization of the selection of a new chair
  + Dispatching the ordinary business during this short period
* If the removal is adopted by the GA, it wouldn't be effective before the end of the term of the newly selected Vice Chair (2019 AGM)

**Note:** a few members of the group opposed to the removal of the Vice chair position arguing that a secretary can’t replace the chair in case of unavailability, and that the issue of travel shouldn’t be the cause of the removal.