

---

TERRI AGNEW: Welcome to the At-Large ALS criteria and expectations taskforce, taking place on the 14<sup>th</sup> of August 2015.

On the call today, on the English channel, we have Alan Greenberg, Glenn McKnight, Yrjo Lansipuro, Jacqueline Morris, Ron Sherwood, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Chaitanya Ramachandran, Mwendwa Kivuva, Maureen Hilyard, and Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

At this time we have no participants on the Spanish channel.

I show no list of apologies for today's meeting.

From staff we have Silvia Vivanco, Nathalie Peregrine, and myself Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreter today is Veronica.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes.

I also see that Siranush Vardanyan has joined us as well.

I'll now turn it back over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. The agenda is posted on the Wiki and in the center pod. Are there any comments, questions, or suggestions for change to the agenda?

---

*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.*

---

Seeing nothing, hearing nothing, we'll deem it to be accepted as displayed. What I'd like to do today is to go over all of the substantive issues, and just have a brief discussion, and we have an hour for the meeting. There are essentially six issues of substance to discuss, plus a few other things.

So we can't afford more than, you know, perhaps seven, eight minutes on each item, just to give you a perspective. We're not trying to solve all the world's problems today, but I would like to try to introduce things that other people feel should be on the table for discussion by the groups that will be looking at each item.

The first one is something we haven't explicitly talked about until now. It could conceivably be on the table when the external reviewers start looking at us. And the question is, do we want to put on the table for our review, the overall concept of RALOs and ALSs, plus the, what currently are the ancillary individual users, which are currently allowed for the five regions.

And I guess I would like to open the table, or open the discussion. If we were to do something like make a change that is a very significant change, it's going to require a lot of work, it puts into question perhaps our credibility for having pursued it for the N years that we've already have, on the other hand, if we think it's something that will never work, then perhaps now is as good as time as any, and a better time than a few years from now.

Anyone have any thoughts?

---

And the thoughts can be, let's run away from it as quickly as possible and not even consider it, or do something more in-depth. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much Alan. I would say that I think that we don't have to, I don't see any need to change the overall structure of At-Large. If there is an improvement, we can perhaps do improvement in the functional, how to say, functional [inaudible] etc. but the end structure itself, I don't think we have to change it. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Anybody else? So Tijani suggests we run away from it and don't consider it. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Carlton is not on the call, which is a shame because he and I served on the geographic regional review working group for many years, and in fact, we are still chair that particular entity until we finally get it put to bed and through the final process of the ICANN Board in Dublin, or perhaps even before Dublin. One thing that didn't make the cut for a number of reasons in that report, but was fairly well discussed at least two of our public meetings, again, many years ago.

That we did talk about some particular benefits of sub regions, and while that is not a full discussion in terms of ICANN wide regional development, I wondered if administratively, and to aid engagement and outreach, that if we don't run away, even if we put a pin in it and

---

come back later, we might see that would be a big benefit for some form of sub regional behavioral or modeling, within some of our RALOs, Asia Pacific, for example, would lend itself very well to be broken up into at least five sub regions.

So that's the sort of thing I wondered if we might think about, perhaps not put it at the highest priority. But just wanted to bring it to the table. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I have a question Cheryl. In your imaging of this, if you look at the GNSO right now, every time we have discussion of GNSO representation on some committee, working groups, whatever, or the new community empowerment, we get into the problem that there are too many groups within GNSO, it's just a number of people we're typically willing to give them.

And that seems to, would, we'd have the same sort of thing if we had sub regions, are we talking about significantly expanding the size of the ALAC? And also potentially changing the number, the balance between the regions because there are sub regions? Or would you imagine some other level of addressing it?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. Alan, for the short end, near term future, so there I'm look at least, you know, five to 10 year plan, I would see no more than an useful exercise for local area networking for the better term, to working as just a natural part of the existing RALO

---

structure. it would not necessarily, in fact I can't imagine that it would need to change ALAC structure at all.

It may, for example, again using Asia Pacific as an example here, and Maureen and I actually toyed a visual of this when we did the review of our rules, but it's something I would want to seriously look at again next time we review our Asia Pacific rules. Should we have, for example, up to five sub regions in Asia Pacific, I would suggest that we would look at having a chair, and sub-regional vice-chairs, which would be five sub-regional vice-chairs, and the chair would have to be an independent and demonstrably non-regionally, or they could be associated, obviously, they have to come from a region, but they would be the chair.

And such things as travel for a vice-chair would have to rotate between five of the two. That's the sort of thing without the modeling actually issue within the regional administration, I think, would work. And maybe, somewhere in the next decade, we might find that all sorts of different things are happening within engagement. But I also think, as you probably should know by now, that this concept of having to have more than, in our case, for example, in the GAC's regional input into many of these committees, is ridiculous.

And that, you know, we should be able to send one or two people to represent, you know, large numbers and parts of the organization. I hope that's a good enough answer for you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I've got a couple of comments, but I'll put myself in the queue. Tijani.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA;

Thank you Alan. I heard you Cheryl, that it is [inaudible] especially for the Caribbean region. But I am trying to think about what you are proposing for [Africa] for example, and I would see five vice-chairs from the five sub regions of Africa, or four sub regions of Africa plus [inaudible], so there is five or so.

And this may be useful, but this is also a way to make more, how do you say, division inside the same community, more how to say... You remember very well what the, how [inaudible] something in Africa had done in the past [inaudible], noise, because he wants to be, wants to have a position while he don't do anything. And he's using this kind of element, the sub regions, we don't, we need more, for example, [inaudible] or more people from this sub region, and this is his argument.

And this will be a little not very comfortable. Perhaps we need to make it optional for where we need it, but I don't think we need to make it a rule for all the regions. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

If I may Alan. Cheryl for the record. I couldn't agree with you more Tijani. The mass and complexity of Asia Pacific is an ideal example where a sub-regional model for internal workings will work very well indeed. But I would fight tooth and nail if you then tried to cleave Asia Pacific into actual sub sections.

---

Our strength is in our diversity, but there are real benefits, and in fact, I should let you know, although I'm sure that our chair and, who is on the call, and of course Maureen would let you know as well, that we have for several years, being very careful, to try and balance the leadership of Asia Pacific across the whole region. So if we had people from the southeast, then we make sure we've got people from the northwest in that leadership team, and hopefully a few from the middle.

So, it would simply make, in my mind, some of the balancing appropriate for some regions. Why on earth, for example, North America would need to even need to contemplate having such a thing, I can't imagine.

ALAN GREENBERG:

See there, Cheryl, I'm going to try to wrest control back of the meeting. You clearly don't understand the divide between Canada and the US if you can even say that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

I wasn't going to be so presumptive Alan. And in fact, Alan you might have to have your Anglophone and your francophone as well, but I'll leave that up to you all too.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I did say I'm going to try to wrest control back of the meeting. I guess what I'm hearing is this may be a useful, although potentially inflammatory way of addressing regional problems, but we're not

---

talking about something on an ALAC wide basis, and I think therefore it is probably off the table for this discussion.

What I'm hearing is, it would make for a very good way to get cohesive discussions, I haven't heard how then one melds those into a regional perspective. And that I would find a little bit, potentially problematic, but I don't think it is on our table, and unless someone strenuously fights for it, I think this has been an interesting discussion, but it's the last one we'll have on it in this particular group.

So thank you. The next part is, I'd like to go into the items that we have decided that we are going to look at. And that is particularly the criteria for joining as an ALS, and implicitly the criteria which you have to then continue to satisfy. The application process itself, rather... Hold on one second.

Not the process, but the application form, which may or may not be the same subset. Clearly, whatever criteria we establish we have to ask questions about, but I also wondered to what extent should we look at it, as perhaps a process that we have to do later in our overall flow, but it's not necessarily the same people who are going to get involved in that, as the people determining what the criteria should be.

So my item B, I have a bit of a question mark on. The operational expectations, I think is a significant part of what we have to do. And that is, how do we make sure that we have engagement? What do we do to both to ensure that we have engagement and make it practical to have engagement? There is no point in setting expectations that are completely unreasonable.



---

The application process, that is what steps do we have to go through in the process from the time someone submits an application, through to approval or rejection of it, and we have had a number of problems over the years with what we're doing right now. And lastly, individual members. We have, right now we have individual members in four out of the five RALOs. They have rather different status in each of the cases.

There are issues of onsite participation, that is travel to meetings on occasion. And although we said we don't want to focus on that, we've been told a number of times that one of the reasons people for an ALS is because of that situation. So I think we have to face up to it. And the voting issue similarly. In some cases, we have a quasi-ALS, the group acts as an ALS, in other cases they explicitly do not.

And I think we need to again, decide whether we want to have any common ground or whether this is something that's purely up to a RALO. My recollection, Cheryl correct me if I'm wrong, is that the first At-Large review did make a statement about individual members across the At-Large, did they not?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: It was in fact a recommendation, and now a requirement, that individual members must be able to be joining each of the RALOs.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. So currently satisfied in four out of the five, but with different sets of rules governing them. And the [CROSSTALK] that we want to do.

---

So I'd like to open the table now on these five items, with an understanding that perhaps B is not an item in which we want to work on in the very immediate future. For ALS criteria... Okay. I have some hands up. Are these hands up to discuss the categories or to start discussing the actual substance? First, I'd like to only address issues of our work plan, not the actual issues. So Tijani, is it to start discussing criteria, or one of the other items, or is it the overall plan?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It is about the members, and the requirements you are speaking about. Didn't give a level of membership of those individuals, as we have a big problem in Africa, people are refusing this kind of membership...

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, let's defer that discussion until we get to that item.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Alberto is, if this is about the list of categories that we're going to discuss, fine, if it's to talk about one of the issues, then let's wait until we get to that issue.

Alberto, if it's about the categories, but not the details of the substance, please go ahead.

---

All right. I'm assuming we don't have Alberto or he's not speaking right now. Okay, we're going to go on to the first item of ALS criteria. Now, what you see on the list there are basically the ones that I had put in my original discussion paper. Or they're ones that are currently on the books. The current ones on the books are self-funding, mission... It implies that you have a mission related to Internet and end users.

You must be largely individually led, that is perhaps the main criteria. You should have a website or other means of disseminating information. We have not talked about, we have not had a criteria of size, but this comes up continually every time we mention whether ALSs are viable or not. And I believe we need a question of, why they fit in ICANN, or why they believe they will fit in ICANN, as opposed to simply the Internet Society or something focusing more on the Internet in general, as opposed to within ICANN's remit.

So, I would like the floor up to people, is this the right list? What we're doing is providing some input into the group that's going to refine this. So we don't need to go into huge rationales, but are there items that are missing from here, that we want to be, this small group that's going to be looking at it, to consider and think about?

Anyone have any thoughts?

Nobody? Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. I think that the main criteria should be having the Internet users, part of their activity. If it is not, we don't

---

have any reason to be in At-Large. This is the first [inaudible]... If we think about five, we are trying to have an easier number, now you're speaking about the size.

You [inaudible] we may have the small association [inaudible], but which is very active and very knowledgeable, and you may have huge organizations that don't do anything and don't have any knowledge or any, how to say, activity. So this is, I don't think we need to emphasize the kind of [inaudible], but we have to ensure that we have to make it rigorous, the activity of the organization, of the ALS should be clear.

If there is no activity on the ground, there is no ALAC. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. We have Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks. Cheryl for the record again. [Inaudible] Tijani, I can't say your name tonight. It's, the size would be the one that I would be least concerned about. I probably would want to see some variable waiting for the group to look at as well, and I too think it is the mission is what is important.

My point on size can be balanced by saying what is a constituent a bona fide organizational structure within the country, or domicile. If it is in, we'll do. And if that varies country by country, then fine. But most countries and areas have some form of definition, and in many cases it's quite a formal one of what is an association, versus an organization, versus a not for profit, versus whatever.

---

So whatever description they declare they are, an association, not for profit, or whatever, as long as that fits with where they're coming from, I think we can look at. And just to answer one of the questions in terms of the individual led, largely individually led, in many, particularly merging and developing economies, people and organizations have a number of roles that they are involved with. And it may be that a perspective At-Large structure might not just be purely consumer or end user focused.

It may also have some leadership, or activities, or interests, which may take either local government or policy making within country, or whatever. So that largely individual led means it's not just an organization of organizations, but it's an organization of predominately individuals. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you Cheryl. And I put myself in the queue. That last item was something that was hashed over in great detail, and for a lot more time than perhaps it should have needed at the time we came up with the original ones.

And the current words I think we have are plenty clear, and they're also largely in the bylaws. So I don't think we're likely to change that, and individual led does not mean that these people don't wear other hats, or that there aren't parts of the group, which maybe government or business or something like that, but they're not the controlling parties. So I think that's well written, and I would be very, very hesitant to change that particular part of the criteria.

---

On the size issue, my concern is that we have had cases where an ALS is created, an organization is created to be an ALS, and it never has more than three people or four people in it, and with attrition it comes down to one person. And I question whether we could, not legally, we can legitimately call it an ALS if there really is only one person who is at the end of the communication channel.

Yrjo.

YRJO LANSIPURO:

Yes. Thank you. It's Yrjo Lansipuro for the transcript record. Well, for example, we have ISOC chapters that are ALSs, and ISOC chapters that are not. And here, I think it's basically those chapters who want to influence things from the inside, within ICANN. From any user perspective. That's, of course, why they want to be ALSs, but at the same time, they also should have a change to do that, to actually to participate in the process of giving advice.

But then this is more, relates more, of course, to the operational expectations. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I think that was... I was trying to address that in my last bit of why ICANN. What's the intersection between what they are interested in and what ICANN does. Anyone want to get in on this, or do we remand it eventually to the group?

I think the, just to belabor the point a little bit, I think the issue of size is, you know, I'm not quite sure what the number is. In my mind, I

---

absolutely no that one and two is too small to be called an ALS. From my perspective. On the other hand, I would not want to differentiate between 15 and 500.

So just make it clear to what I'm talking about when I refer to it. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto. Thank you very much. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. Sorry, but I was muted before. When it comes to ALS criteria, well in LACRALO, we believe that we should include non-governmental ALSs, and this is what we say when we express ourselves and when we present things. Perhaps that is the mission criteria.

I heard that there are people that different hats within an organization. And they might be in a non-governmental organization, but at the same time, they might be working for the governmental organization. But when they're working within an ALS, there are working for a non-governmental organization. So for us, it should be a non-governmental organization.

---

But this does not imply that, for example, someone working for the government might work for an ALS. When it comes to the number, or the size, well it's quite difficult to determine this. For example, in Haiti we have an ALS with only seven members. And this is the only people they have because they have great problems, and this is the same for Latin America and the Caribbean, we have that problem because we have many emerging economies, most of the countries are emerging economies. So it's quite difficult to have many members participating in one ALS. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Alberto spoke about points, there are [inaudible] how to say, we don't speak about it in our discussions, which is a non-governmental ALS organizations. Sorry, I am speaking, it seems that I am speaking low. I hope it is better now.

So I think that the At-Large has only one interest, which is the public interest. We have to avoid the political interest, and the commercial interest. That's why we want the ALSs to be not led by governments, and not led by commercial entities.

We have to be clear on that, because if we are not clear, we may end up with companies, commercial companies, part of the At-Large, and we may end up with some [inaudible] members of At-Large. I think the main criteria for this issue for the control of the ALS should be not



---

controlled by governments, not controlled by commercial interests.  
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I put myself in the queue. I heard two different things from Tijani and from Alberto, and maybe I misheard one of them. I heard Alberto saying no governmental involvement, as a government. You know, he's not saying an individual who happens to wear a government hat, cannot participate as an individual, but he's saying no formal participation of a government unit.

And I heard Tijani say, controlled by individuals. And when we set up the original rules, the current ones we're operating on, there was a very significant discussion on that, and the statement was made that in some regions of the world, you have to have some level of government participation, not necessarily in a controlling form, but it might be very awkward in certain regimes, in certain places, to get together without having a nominal participation of a government unit, but that doesn't mean that it's controlled by that government unit.

And I think we would probably have a problem doing the same thing, of changing that rule right now. So I guess I wouldn't mind a little bit of clarity from the two speakers, just to make sure that we're talking the same thing. Alberto, you're next.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Hello. This is Alberto Soto speaking.

---

Alberto Soto speaking. What I said is this, that in LACRALO, we have a consensus that an ALS should not be a governmental organization, or a decision making organization that might create conflicts of interests with end users. But in order to avoid this, it should not be a governmental organization, because for that reason, we have the GAC.

Of course we might have one individual who is within an ALS, not a [inaudible] individual, but participating within an ALS, who might work for the government, but at the same time, that person might also be working within an ALS, which is a non-governmental ALS. We had that case in LACRALO, and we had no problem with that.

And the point of view of that ALS, it will never be the opinion of the government, because there are other members involved in that ALS. So that was my comment. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Am I muted? No I'm not muted. I can't remember what button I last pushed. Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record. I put a Wikipedia quote [inaudible] in the chat, I wanted to draw everyone's attention to it, because it does quite specifically say that a NGO, under this category, may even be funded by a government foundation, business, or private persons.

And I know that in our discussion many eons ago, Alan, those sorts of things were a concern to some of our membership. But the reality in

---

Asia Pacific in many places in our region, is that some degree of business and indeed often, local or regional government, will be part of the self-funding model for an organization which has every right or reason, to become an At-Large structure.

So again. One of those I will fight tooth and nail for [inaudible]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. All right. I think we've had a good discussion. Probably longer than we need to, but this is really one of the really critical issues, and I'd like to go on to the, I think we'll skip the ALS, the application question one for the moment, and go on to operational expectations.

The items that I had originally identified are some level of periodic reporting. And again, not large treaties, just so that we make sure that we have the information up to date, and have some idea of what they're doing, and that it still sits as an ALS, because one of the problems we've had over the years is someone, is if an ALS joins, and then we really have no idea to what extent it continues to exist, and it's continuing to do a functional unit that if they applied again, would we admit them?

So that's one of the questions. We have said, and again, it's in the current rules but not very well in the current rules, they have an obligation to disseminate information, to request information back from their users. We have talked a number of times about, to what extend

---

should they be required to participate in various activities, be it RALO meetings, working groups, whatever.

Advertised participation, again, that's implied in the current rules. They're supposed to tell their members that they're an ALS. Something that always hasn't happened in the past. And to extent can we make sure that we're not talking about just the representative as the ALS, but actually involving other parts of it?

Again, not an exhausted list. But anyone have any thoughts on any of these items? Either should they not be included, or are there things that are missing at this point? And we're not making any decisions right now, I'm just soliciting input. Do we have anyone?

No? Everyone is happy with the list, and we'll go off and work on our own? Okay. The next item is the application process. And for instance, I'll give an example, Dev is this on the process or on the operational expectations?

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: This is Dev. It was on the operational expectations. Sorry, I was connecting my audio.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Can you hear me?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay. Sorry about that. This is Dev. Regarding the operational expectations, the reporting, when you say the reporting, is it the reporting to what? To the RALOs, the At-Large, what exactly did you mean by reporting?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, the kind of thing I was talking about is, you know, the requirement to annually, biannually, something, clue us in on what your structure is, who your management, who is in your management structure, what activities are you participating in? You know, the group is going to have to come up with that list of things.

I did give a number of examples in my original thing. It's basically when someone comes up and says, hey, you have an ALS in Trinidad, you know, what are they doing these days? Tell us something about them. Or for that matter, make sure we have a current email address, to be blunt.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Okay, got it. I was thinking well, it's more like reporting on the work they're doing within ICANN or At-Large, on that perspective. Now I understand what it means now. Okay. Thanks.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Well, I think that could well be part of it, and perhaps should be part of it. To what extent we're collecting information independently, and we don't need them to report, then fine. If we're collecting participation and being able to relate it back to an ALS, then that may be fine. Right now, if someone joins a working group, and they're not the representative whose name we know, we don't even know what ALS they're form.

So right now, we don't even collect enough information to relate it back to an ALS. So self-reporting would be the only way we could do that. If the ALS even knows for that matter. One of their members maybe actively participating and not even telling them. So I think that's the kind of things that we're going to look at and figure out how do we resolve?

Anyone else? I see some stuff going on in the chat. Does anyone else want to speak on this? No? Okay. Then the next item is the application process. We've had interesting problems over the years, and I'll give you a very simple one. At various times, we have an ALS apply where they're actually applying before the organization even exists.

It may be an ISOC chapter that is the process of forming, but doesn't really exist. You know, and we're told that by ISOC that yes, there is communication, but they don't exist as a chapter. We have no formal process within our current rules to suspend that application and say let's wait until something happens.

---

So I think this group is going to be, to some extent, staff driven in identifying what kind of problems have we had over the years, and what do we need to put into the process? So it's a robust process that we can manage properly, so that we can actually follow our own rules, but at the same time, ensure that we don't get bogged down. And we have several people. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Tijani speaking. I think the formal existence, or legal existence, on the ground, must be one of the criteria, one of the conditions to apply for an ALS position. Now we are asking people if they have the legal...

ALAN GREENBERG:

Have we lost Tijani?

Apparently we've lost Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Now we can.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Okay. Thank you. I was muted there, I'm sorry. So I said I think the legal existence on the ground should be one of the criteria, one of the

---

conditions to apply. Now we are asking about the existence of this legal existence, but we are not asking for the, I don't remember that we satisfied an ALS that has an existence, even if it is an [inaudible] structure.

We always, for ISOC chapter, we always ask the region of ISOC, to know if this ALS is actively working. We are not only asking about the existence, we are asking about their real activities. But you were right, Alan, perhaps we need to ask for the true of the legal existence. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. I'll introduce a clarification. We do not ask for legal existence right now. The rules very explicitly say you do not have to be a legally existing entity. The reason for that is in some parts of the world, it is exceedingly complex and exceedingly expensive to create a legal entity. And again, this is one of the issues that was discussed heavily. And requiring legal existence, that is a form of corporation is something that we are very carefully said we do not need.

If some regions are asking for legal existence, and I know that it has been raised on occasion, that is incorrect, and that is in violation of our rules, and I think that is one of the things we need to clarify. There are parts of the world where legal existence is very, very expensive and time consuming. So I don't think we can put that as a rule, certainly it's up for grabs, for discussion, but I would be very reluctant to see it go forward like that.



---

But that doesn't mean that it shouldn't have existence in terms of reality of being a group that does have process, does have rules, does have ongoing activities. And that's very different from legal existence. In any case, Alberto, you're next.

ALBERTO SOTO:

This is Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you very much Alan. In LACRALO, what we do is this, we have a plan to engage ALSs, and when they asked us we make a difference between formal existence and legal existence. So we asked them to have bylaws, and when they can, fill in the application form, they should send that bylaw.

And even if it is not legally approved, this is a formal certificate, or a formal proof for the association. In many countries in the Caribbean region, this is very expensive, and it is sometimes very difficult to obtain the legal existence. And the process is very long, perhaps it might take two years to get the legal existence. So what we asked them is to show the formal bylaw, or the formal bylaws approved by their Board of Directors, for example, or their association, and with that, we can work together. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Alberto. Again, the details, we may well want to, we will have to be fleshing out. So exactly what level of existence are we requiring. Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. Olivier speaking. And on the topic of legal [inaudible] it is worth noting, that in the ALS application, we do ask whether they are a legal [inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, can you speak up? You're very hard to hear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you hear me better now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Not really.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've got the mic about a centimeter in front of my mouth. [CROSSTALK]

ALAN GREENBERG: That's good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. My neighbors must feel it's great as well. To my neighbors, apologies. I'll have to ask for another dial out afterwards. Just to say, on the subject of legal incorporation, it is put in the application form whether they are legally incorporated, etc. And indeed, when one is looking at accepting an ALS or not, we can always make up our mind as to whether we think that's enough or not enough.

---

And I think it just comes out as a package with all of the other commitments that the ALS, well somehow I wouldn't say binds itself, to but says it will proceed forward with. So I don't think we should be looking at this in a specific way or change anything to it. That's it. And I'll ask for a new dial out.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. Anyone else want to get in on this one. We are starting to approach the end of our time, so I'm quite happy if we finish this item. The last item is individual users. I don't want to get into, in this call, how the various regions treat it, but I think the group looking at this, is going to have to look at the various options, four options we have, and they're all somewhat different, and decide to what extent do we want At-Large wide rules, to what extent do we want flexibility within the regions?

And, you know, all the other questions that go along with it. It's quite clear from our original process and I suspect it's going to come out of the second review, that the requirement to create an organization to be allowed to contribute is something that we probably do not want to tie ourselves to. And I'll give myself perhaps the best example.

You know, I've been willing to put a lot of time into At-Large, if I hadn't been named by the nominating committee, I might not have ever started, because I wouldn't have likely to try to go join a club and then rise in its ranks to be the spokesman for it. I probably would have sound something else to do with my life. So I think it's something that we do need to consider carefully.

---

Anyone want to get in on this one right now? As I said, it's not an opportunity today to go into it in depth. But I do think we're going to have to look at it and clearly we have to do better than we have to date on this.

All right. In terms of the structure going forward, I would like to suggest that we use the concept that was very successfully used by the CWG stewardship, and that is design teams. Small, well, the group can be as small or large as the interest is, with one person leading it and taking responsibility for reporting back. And work going on in mailing lists, teleconferences, if necessary, and reporting back within a small amount of time.

That is initially within a week or two, to try to get some coherent, some, just something for the whole group to discuss. The only real question we need to answer in the short term is, number one, do we use the standard mailing list for everything, and flag subject lines to say which design team is this? Or do we want separate mailing lists? Anyone have any strong feelings on this?

I can live with both. I think to start with, we can use the single mailing list unless the traffic starts getting unreasonable.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Single is my preference. Cheryl.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: We have two singles. Anyone want to speak for multiple? As I said, something we can move if indeed we have to, but I wouldn't, okay. Everyone says single, that decision is made.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Multiple for Tijani.

ALAN GREENBERG: Multiple for Tijani. Your odd man out at the moment, based on about six people typing in single, maybe eight. So we'll keep it single for the moment. I'll propose a flagging way that we can look at it, and go forward on that. We're going to want to have someone to lead each of these processes, and we're looking at four of them right now.

I would suggest that if you have an interest of leading or more of them, then contact me privately, and if we have multiple people, we'll figure out a way to resolve it for any given design team, and if we don't have any, then I will identify someone to try to get to a volunteer.

Is there anything else we need to discuss today? I'm going to be moving forward on what I just described over the weekend, so if you do have an interest in leading, please let me know soon. Otherwise, I will reach out. And there is anything else anyone wants to discuss? Or we can leave a few minutes early.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I was just wondering on behalf of those of us in the more Pacific parts of Asia Pacific, if any of these calls are going to be other than between midnight and 2 AM on our Friday night? Well actually on our Saturday morning.

ALAN GREENBERG: The answer is yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: You have a good reason to wonder that, and we will be doing a Doodle... Sorry. At the last meeting, we said we'll hold the next meeting at the same time, but after that, we'll do our best to rotate. I don't think that Doodle has gone out, but it will be.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

You're welcome. Thank you for reminding me. Anyone else? The last word before we adjourn for the day.

No? Okay. Thank you all for attending. Thank you for those who are attending on their Saturday or very late Friday, and I wish you a good weekend all. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]