
NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everybody. And welcome to the At-Large ALS Criteria and Expectations Taskforce call on the 7th of August 2015.

On the call today we have on the English channel, Chaitanya Ramachandran, Wolf Ludwig, Alan Greenberg, Beran Gillen, Glenn McKnight, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Tijani Ben Jemma, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Vanda Scartezini.

On the Spanish channel we have Juan Manuel Rojas and Alberto Soto.

We've received apologies from Siranush Vardanyan, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Maureen Hilyard.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Ozan Sahin, and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

Our interpreters today are David and Veronica.

I would like you all to speak slowly and clearly for the interpreters, and also to remember to state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you every so much and over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. First of all, we have an agenda, and if anyone has any changes or additions they would like to add.

Seeing no hands, hearing no voices, we will say that the agenda is approved as presented. The first thing I would like to do is very, very

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.

briefly, talk about why we're doing this, and I'll go into in more detail as we go through the presentation.

Essentially we are looking to revise all of the rules associated with ALSs and implicitly going along with that, that changes some of the terms of reference for RALOs, because the ALSs are the vehicle by which RALOs can do their work.

We are looking to set, potentially set criteria for admission of ALSs, then therefore also continued service as an ALS, within At-Large. We are looking to set the expectations of what we expect from ALSs. And lastly, we are looking to identify, in some detail, sorry. The third part is, the processes that go along with admitting ALSs have to be looked at.

Now we'll talk about where we are today as we go through, and you'll see that we're not necessarily in the best of shape. We know that we have a lot of ALSs that have not been particularly active, but I think it's important to recognize, this is not an attempt to kick ALSs out. This is an attempt to get a good At-Large going, that we can say is really satisfying the need of ICANN to present the needs and issues related to users within ICANN's forms.

So with that, if we can have the presentation up please. And that's pointed to, if you want your own copy of, by the link on item number four.

And if you can fix that so I can scroll it.

Can we synch that so we can see a slide at a time and not...?

And not scroll between them?

Anybody there?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Yes. Alan, you have now scrolling abilities.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Can we set it so we can see one slide at a time, not scroll between the images?

Perhaps we can't.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Alan, this is Heidi. I'm only seeing one slide at a time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Because I have continuous scrolling on mine.

Okay, let's assume it's correct then. Okay the first question is, why are we doing this? And as I said, this is not a punishment exercise. So let's get out of the mode of looking at it as some people have, as a method to get rid of ALSs and to punish people. Our intention is not punishment, our intention is to have a functional At-Large.

Sorry, I'm having trouble with the scrolling here, but let's keep on going.

All right. We're on slide three if the synching is not going along with what I'm seeing. Now, a couple of ground rules for both criteria and expectations. And these are essentially legal issues. Number one, we have to set rules that are not discriminatory. Now, there is a narrow

line between selecting the people that we believe meet our overall qualifications, and discriminating against some people.

So we are allowed to say we want organizations that are largely run by individuals and not by companies or governments. We can't say, we only want people who speak a certain language, or only lawyers, or you can pick any of the infinite other forms of discrimination. So essentially the criteria has to be designed to meet the purposes of the organization, and cannot be arbitrary past that.

We must document what these things are. To the extent that we can identify criteria and expectations that are quantitative, that are objective, that is good. We will not always be able to do that. There will be judgment calls involved, and that's part of the game we're in. Not everything is going to come down to numbers and yeses or nos. Number four is, whatever rules we have to be fairly applied.

You cannot selectively apply rules to one group and ignore them for others. To the extent possible, evaluation should be documented. Now on occasion, we're going to take secret ballots, and we cannot document the exact reason why people reject it or not, but to the extent possible, we must document processes, so if someone questions it after the fact, we can explain why something happened.

And everything is a balancing act. If we set criteria expectations too high, we won't have a large enough community to be credible. If we set them too low, then we have poor engagement. And although we have numbers, we don't necessarily have productivity. And in ICANN, we talk a lot about accountability and transparency.

Well, they're not just for the Board and staff, they're for At-Large as well. So what we do has to be auditable to the extent possible, it has to be done in an open and transparent manner within certain reason. And as you know, in much of At-Large we, for instance, do secret ballots regarding people. But we're going to have to look at all of those things carefully and make sure, to the extent possible, we are transparent.

I will take questions as we go along, so if anyone has anything, then please put up your hand.

All right. The certification criteria. The first bullet is a quotation from the bylaws. The criteria standards for certification of At-Large, structured within geographic regions, shall be established by the Board, notice by the Board, on recommendations from the ALAC. So, as we'll be talking about later on when we look at some of these documents, these are not necessarily things that we unilaterally can decide on our own, although if we do it rationally, the Board is not likely to second guess us and refuse.

The ALAC is responsible for certification and decertification in consultation with the RALOs. Now that puts us in an interesting situation. We trust the RALOs to make recommendations, but the ALAC does have discretion, and that's important, which is part of the reason that we need to be able to document things, so that even though the RALOs may do the in-depth diving to look at details, they've got be able to rationalize it to the ALAC.

And the criteria that we're looking at, whatever the certification criteria are, must be maintained once certified. So in other words, you can't say

you're run by users when you start, but three months later change into a government organization and still maintain your certification. And of course, as you know, we have not done a really good job of watching this and making sure that those kind of rules are being adhered to.

Now, in terms of ALS expectations. It's up to the ALAC to set a reasonable set of expectations. Our current rules set some, and again, we haven't been really good at monitoring them. That's going to have to be fixed. Over and above that, RALOs can set other expectations that they want of their ALSs.

We, of course, have the caveat that I had earlier, that you don't want to set them too high, because then you don't have many people at all. Or if you set them too low, you have quantities but not quality. And that goes along with the need to be realistic.

No questions.

Okay, we talk a lot about metrics. Metrics, to a large extent, are once we have criteria and expectations, metrics are the measuring of them and potentially take action where certain thresholds are not met or are exceeded, whatever the metric is reference to. We won't be talking a lot about metrics in this group, and we're not talking a lot about enforcement, other than with the clear statement that if someone clearly doesn't meet anything at all, then there are repercussions of it.

But most of what we have been talking about in metrics, we're not going to be focusing on here. And one of the reasons the metrics group have had such a hard time, is the lack of detail in what both we, and in some cases, the RALOs have said we expect from people. And

hopefully, by setting our expectations properly, the metrics groups can then, globally within At-Large and ALAC, and those within RALOs, will have an easier job fulfilling their need.

Okay. What do RALOs do? Well, they have a number of responsibilities. And again, these are, what you have here is essentially out of the memorandums of understanding that ICANN signed with the RALOs, the wording varied from RALO to RALO, but essentially they all contain something akin, or similar, to what you have here.

The first is helping to inform individual Internet users in the region about ICANN news, meetings, policy development. So it's a push of getting information out. Help to promote outreach activities in the community. To advance understanding of the issues. So it's not only a matter of pushing the information out blindly, it's taking actions as necessary to try to make sure that what we're doing is effective.

And offering mechanisms, often mailing lists, but not exclusively, or Wikis, to allow feedback and input to come in up from the community. ALSs have been the prime focus that we've looked at. We now have individual users within four of the five RALOs. We have a mandate from our last At-Large review to have individual users in all RALOs. But even where there are individual users, it's not been particularly successful, partly because we have varying rules for them.

And in many cases, we say we want users but then when we get them, we don't know what to do with them, because in much of our communication and discussion, we only focus on ALSs. So that's going to be a focus that will have to change.

We're going to be looking at ALS criteria and application process. The current requirements are not likely to change. We certainly can review them, but I think their core requirements within the overall structure, they were essentially built into the fabric when At-Large was created in 2003.

Size of an ALS is something we've talked a lot about. From my perspective, there is no magic size, but there are sizes that are clearly too small. And if we only have an ALS where we only have a representative, and the representative actually is the only person in the ALS, I think that's a problem. We have some lack of credibility if we call that an At-Large structure.

So we're going to have to try to assign some numbers and some methodology for addressing that. I think, to a large extent as we have created the At-Large organization, we have simply said, does anyone want to belong? We have something to do with the Internet, and we never really do much further than that. And I think we're going to have to try to the extent possible of understanding why ALSs want to belong, and give them motivation for why they want to belong.

But, you know, the first onerous is to try to make sure that when we get an ALS, they have a chance of succeeding. If there is no intersection at all between the things that we're likely to be talking about and what they do, then I'm not quite sure why we want to join up essentially.

And then we have to look at the history we've had in accepting ALSs over the last several years, and where we've had a number of problems, we have to look at trying to fix them. For instance, we have on a semi-

routine basis, found that somewhere along in the application process, we have to put things on hold, waiting for information on the ALS, waiting for information, in many cases, from the Internet Society, waiting for something to happen because they apply it a little bit prematurely.

And currently we have no process to do that. So we have sort of invented it along the way and hopes no one noticed. And I think we want to fix all of those kinds of problems. Still looking for hands, I'm not reading the chat so if someone wants to catch my attention, please just don't put a note in the chat, raise your hand, or call out if you're not in Adobe Connect.

Then we have a list of possible ALS responsibilities. I say possible because they are ones that I came up with, as I was drafting the discussion document. But they're not necessarily magic answers, they may be things that other people agree with, they may not be. I believe we need to have periodic reports. Now when I say reports, I'm not talking about a 20 page document, I'm talking about something, hopefully, that can be filled in as a web form, the frequency we can decide on.

Maybe it's annually, maybe it's once every two years, but on some regular basis that we want to make sure that the ALS is still alive, and they still meet our criteria. We need to do more work in pushing information out to ALSs. Right now, the only information we have often is in a form that a typical ALS cannot digest, and that we're going to have to work on.

There is a lot of documents within ICANN that have been created over the last couple of years, that are simplified forms of things, and we're going to have to get organized and use them, that's going to involve translation in some cases. But we have to make sure that we push things out, and the RALOs push things out. And I believe we want to have an obligation of ALSs to distribute among their members.

To a large extent right now, we treat an ALS as the representative. If you look back earlier, in the last little while, we did surveys of ALSs, but in fact, all we did was survey, in most cases, of the ALS representative. And hopefully, the ALS has more substance to it than just that one person.

So, we're going to expect ALSs to, in fact, admit their members. We had a recent case where somebody applied to be an individual member, signed a... This was in NARALO. Signed a statement saying they're not a member of an ALS. Well it turns out they were a member of a very large ALS, but they didn't even know that ALS, that that organization was an ALS.

And that kind of problem clearly is an issue. The current requirements already say they must make reference to ICANN on their website, but we don't enforce it and very few of them actually do that. We have a question from Alberto. Go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Hello. This is Alberto Soto for the record. Thank you very much, Alan. When it comes to the engagement or participation of more than one member, in LACRALO, we are requesting information about a second

representative, at least, who might be able to participate in the working groups, not only voting members, but this second member, or any other member, might be able to participate just by identifying himself as a member of the ALS.

We have created a trivia, not long ago, for a trip to Buenos Aries. And there, we said everybody can participate. And we had participants that were members, that we didn't know that belongs to an ALS. There were not the main representative nor the second representative of the ALS. So what I mean is that, when they want to participate, they can do it. They don't necessarily have to be the first or the second representative that we know for each RALO. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Alberto. And that's exactly what we're looking for. We're not going to try to maintain lists for each ALS, that's not our job. But the activities that we're talking about, and hopefully the participation we're looking for, definitely should be coming from not just the representative, or even an alternate representative, but should be coming from the ALS proper.

And if we're successful, then indeed we're going to have multiple people within an ALS, participating in our activities. Clearly not from every ALS, but there should be an ability to do that when they choose, and we have to make sure that they get the information to allow them to do that. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I agree completely with what you've been mentioning here, including what is currently on the slide on the possible ALS responsibilities. There are several aspects to this. And I think that, I mean, if you look at them, there is a lack of understanding about participation from the ALSs themselves. It's not really explained to them as to what we want from them, and you know, there is a lack of communication there.

They're primarily subscribed to the RALO lists, and then get immediately flooded with irrelevant discussions. They're not sure whether only the ALS rep or anyone in the ALS are allowed to participate in At-Large discussions, or in working groups. They're not asked enough about what their ALS does. You know, everyone...

We're talking at them rather than talking with them. And I remind you of the At-Large 2 summit, the ATLAS 2 recommendation 28 which says, the ALAC should work with all RALOs and ALSs to map the current expectants and interests in their membership, to identify subject matter experts and facilitate policy communication. The moment we have this mapping, and this again is going to be a dynamic mapping, we're going to be able to talk with our ALSs, rather than talking at them. And that's, I think, one of the concerns I have.

And I just mentioned that they're dynamic, yes, their membership changes, but our relationship with ALSs at the moment appears to be entirely static. We get them in there, we sign them up, and viola, we think that they remain the same forever, and in fact, that's probably not the case.

Some ALSs might have differing topics and so on that change with time. And then finally, I think that we base too much of our incentives and travels on general assemblies and on summits, none of which recognize the ALSs that are actually usefully involved, and those are just there for the occasional holiday. So there is no incentive based capacity building program that has a leadership training, that would be useful to the professional lives of our ALS representatives or the people within the ALSs.

And I think that's my comment for the time being. But there is currently enough work for us to do, and for our relationship with the At-Large structures, to evolve and to improve. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. I take it you're volunteering for this part of the task then. Since you are clearly enthused.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Of course not. Did I say yes? Oh well.

ALAN GREENBERG: No, but you're exactly right. We have routinely treated the ALS as just the rep. And we've gotten what we deserve. We've gotten only the reps is the only people we can talk to. And yet the free travel part is an issue. One of the reasons that some RALOs have talked about not really having individual users is, but people only want to join for the free travel.

Well, if an ALS of 100 people are joining because of the free travel that one person gets every two years, we have a real problem, if that's the best rationale we can give. And if we can't get some level of involvement from people who are really interested, without promising free trips, then we should just shut it off, I think.

We do our best to fund as much travel as we can, but we're never going to be able to fund enough to satisfy the overall kind of participation that we're looking for.

All right, I want belabor the issue. Essentially, we're going to have to put together reasonable criteria of what are ALS responsibilities, and going hand in hand with that is, what is ICANN's responsibility, and is that ICANN staff, the ALAC, the RALOs, in providing parts of that communication. Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. Have you finished your presentation?

ALAN GREENBERG: No I haven't.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay. So please go ahead, and at the end I will make all my comments. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. Individual users, individual members. We talked a little bit about them. We need to learn how we can create positions for people to participate without being part of an ALS. Right now we are in the horrible position, I think horrible, maybe others don't agree, where, on occasion, we recruit individuals to start participating, and tell them they have to go out and find, you know, find 100 friends and create an ALS, or pick an ALS, pick some organization they belong to which can join, just so that one person can be a participant.

And that's one of the reasons we have so many ALSs with single participants, is indeed because it wasn't the ALS that really was interested, it was the person that was interested. And I think we need a vehicle that works across all of the RALOs, they don't have to be identical, but so that we can develop a pool of people who are interested in ICANN and want to work.

And I don't think we want to necessarily have to have them fabricate an ALS to do that. The ALS application process. Now we originally talked about doing this in a separate process, but it makes more sense, I think, to integrated together, and we're going to have to look at what the steps are in terms of the current application process, the deadlines, the how much time do we have to do things.

The ways we can put it on hold if necessary as we go along. And confidentiality is one of the issues. Currently we have some rules about what can be distributed and what cannot be distributed, specifically regarding due diligence, and in some cases, the application itself. We pretty well flagrantly violated in some cases. That is, we say they're not allowed to be distributed, then we post them on Wikis where everyone

in the RALO can take a look at it, or send them out on open mailing lists which are archived.

So I think we need to look at the rules, make sure we put rules in place that are indeed practical, tell people ahead of time what the rules are, and then follow them. You know, if we need to be able to say we will post all applications, except your home addresses, then we need to tell people that.

That may mean that some ALS doesn't apply, that's life. But I think we need to again, set up rules, document them, and then actually follow them.

Okay. What's our target? Well, we use expressions like, perfection is the enemy of the good. I have two of my favorite examples here. That expression actually came from a statement that Voltaire wrote, talking about an Italian, who said that the best is the enemy of the good. I particularly like a statement that was made by the developers of, one of the developers of early warning radar in World War II, give me the third best, because the second best is going to be late and the best actually never comes.

Don't target the best. Let's target something that is workable, reasonable, and meets a reasonable number of our targets. If we're looking for perfection, we're going to spend too much time doing this, and not necessarily getting value for our time out of it.

My target is, I would like to have a substantial draft ready for review, discussion, and hopefully approval in Dublin. We may or may not make that, but I'd like to target that. We have an extra full day of discussions.

We're now meeting on the Saturday where we would not have previously met on the Saturday in Dublin. That gives us a full extra day. We will have plenty of time [inaudible] substantive things to discuss.

And I'm hoping [CROSSTALK] one of the sources. Hello?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Can people still here me?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Not now please. I'm busy.

ALAN GREENBERG: Whoever is talking, please mute your line.

Wolf, do you want to get in right now?

WOLF LUDWIG: Well, all I can also wait like Tijani until after the end of your presentation.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. We're very close to the end at this point. Okay, work methods. The CWG and CCWG, and if you go back to the effort that ALAC did to

rewrite the rules of procedure, were very successful in dividing the work up into small chunks, having some number of people volunteer to work on it, come up with something they think is workable, bring it back to the group.

We have an overall discussion, and then we continue to go back in a loop until we get something that works for the whole group, and I think we're going to do something akin to that. And that's the end of the presentation. And we have Tijani and then Wolf. Tijani, it's all yours.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Yes, thank you very much Alan for this presentation. It's much appreciated. I would prefer to read it perhaps before this call. It would be more helpful, and perhaps we would be prepared better to participate in this [inaudible].

Let me speak about some points. First you said, Alan, that we have to focus now on individuals rather on ALSs. I don't agree with you. I do think that we still need folks on ALSs. And individuals would be, how do you say, a part of the RALO, but it will not going toward having more individuals than ALSs.

I don't hope so. And I don't think we will go in this way. The ALSs will be the main backbone of the RALO, and I hope it will remain like this. For other reasons, we have to think about the kind of application we have to prepare for them, because it will be different from the application of the ALSs.

Now, Olivier spoke about the free travel, and I understood from him it is a compensation, or not a compensation, but the price of being active. I strongly disagree with this concept. We start with this, we will not do anything. We will still be always having people who are only interested. I think that the travel support is the consequence, and the consequence is not something that we start with.

You start with work, if you are interested, and I agree with that we have to [inaudible] of reflection of work. Because perhaps if we only speak about representatives of the ALSs or members of RALO, that will not reach a very good team of working. But if we focus on pools of interested people, interested people are very important. People who are interested in working, who are interested in the subject, and who are interested in evolving the work of At-Large, I think this is a good way to go forward.

Last point. You spoke about Dublin. I am afraid we'll not manage, because we have a lot of things that are tied to Dublin. And we have a lot, a lot of work still in the CCWG, and now the groups because also for other groups, we have [inaudible] in Dublin. So perhaps this work is something that is for the future.

So we don't have to hurry. We have to do it perhaps with more time, but with more depth. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay thank you Tijani. Wolf, if you go ahead and then I'll address what both of you are saying. But just try to keep this in focus. We're not

trying to do the work here and decide what the answers are, this is just laying out the groundwork to start that discussion. Go ahead Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay. Thanks. It's Wolf Ludwig for the record. My first point is I entirely agree with Tijani who said, there is no urgency or real time pressure to get this done until Dublin. I think we, on such an important [inaudible], should concentrate a little bit more time and energy, and particularly good thought, to have something reasonably done.

This brings me to my second point. What is a general remark on some doubts about this coach. To my memory, [inaudible] was created almost 10 years ago, in 2006, 2007, there was a common understanding that this should be a new bottom up element and approach. Before the RALOs existed, it was more a selection of people who had the privilege to travel to ICANN meetings, was more or less incidental.

So it was always a bunch here from the European side at least, a bunch of the same suspects, who had the necessary connections and the privilege involved. And we brought it on a broader scale after EURALO was created, etc. and once we had some sort of this bottom up approach and inputs via our ALSs. And therefore we should avoid anything which is too much made in a top down manner, and which may be understood as conflicting or even as counterproductive as the bottom up scheme we have practice over the last years.

My third remark is just a small one on the role of individuals. We have three lines at EURALO, a couple of years ago, there is a lot of individuals, floating members, who are engaged partly over years, but who were

not part any of our existing ALSs. And therefore we even change in 2011, we modified our bylaws to allow individual members what was always informally common practice. Olivier is one of our best and foremost examples, to allow individuals on the sort of equal footing, equal participation at EURALO.

And I think we found a reasonable compromise at the time that we encouraged our individuals to create their own ALS, which is not based in any of the European countries, but is a cross European ALS. And it's more or less the home of our individual members. This concept was agreed, and meanwhile there are a lot of interesting people our individual, EURALO's individual ALS.

So this is not conflicting with the existing ALS structure, as Tijani pointed out. And I don't think we should understand this in a competitive way. We should try to understand it in a complimentary way. And to our experience, inputs from our individuals are very valuable, so just take Olivier, or [inaudible] who are permanently contributing to a large extent, not only to EURALO but also to the ICANN work. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Let me make a couple of very brief comments. In terms of early availability of this document, yes, it would have been nice if it was available. It wasn't written until yesterday, but this meeting is only an introductory one. It's not one to have discussion on substance and talk about the specifics of what the RALOs are doing, or solutions to some of the problems.

There is this document plus a long reading list that will be talking about before we finish, that will address how we go forward. In terms of Tijani saying we're going to focus on individuals rather than ALSs, I don't believe I said that. I said we're going to focus on individuals as well as ALSs.

Regarding travel as compensation, I agree completely. I think it's one of the issues we're going to look at because people implicitly do presume travel is the bonus that they're getting for participating, and that puts the focus on one individual per ALS, and I think that's a bad issue.

Maybe we need to come up with ways to counter that. In terms of the target for Dublin, we may or may not make it, but we are going to try. We have an external examiner coming in soon afterwards, and I think to the extent that we can have some of our plans in line in that timeframe, we're going to be in a much better position, then having other people tell us what to do from outside.

And in terms of bottom up and top down, well, we are bottom up. People here, I hope, are going to be getting the participation of their organizations in this discussion. This is an open group and we need people from all levels. Ultimately, the ALAC and the Board are responsible for presenting the rules. So I don't think we have much choice but to do it that way.

We have a speaker list. I'll ask people to number one be somewhat short. We're going to run out of time otherwise. And again, not talk about specifics, about how to solve the problem, that's not for this meeting. Next we have Vanda.

What channel is Vanda on? Is she on English or Spanish?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

...we don't believe that we cannot do something until Dublin. I believe that this is all work over at [inaudible] inside many RALOs, we could bring some first drafting in Dublin, to sit back from the other components of ALAC, would be very useful for us.

That's one point. The second point is, I also believe that individuals that really can add value, should have a chance to participate in any committee, in any group, and so on. And many times we are more discriminatory in that sense. And I believe the size of the ALS also depends upon the size of the country.

And we cannot expect to have a large one in a small place, in an island or something like that. It's a few people that can have the interest on ICANN, or have the skills. So that's my main point on that. I put some ideas on the Wiki, how to work. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Vanda. Carlton?

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Carlton is saying that, note that I endorse Vanda's comments.

ALAN GREENBERG:

But his hand is still up. Carlton do you want to speak or not?

WOLF LUDWIG: Perhaps he is muted.

ALAN GREENBERG: If you want to speak, this is your chance Carlton.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: He said yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: I thought he said yes he wants to speak.

VANDA SCARTEZINI: I believe that... [CROSSTALK]

He is speaking but nobody is hearing.

ALAN GREENBERG: Carlton, I think we now heard you. Say something again.

No?

Can staff try to get Carlton unmuted somehow? And if we can go to Juan Manuel.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS:

This is Juan Manuel Rojas speaking. Thank you. I wanted to make two comments. First of all, I would like to say, as Alberto said before, that in LACRALO, in our bylaws, individual participation is not allowed. Individuals can participate actively, but at the time of making decisions, the individual in LACRALO are not taken into consideration.

So perhaps we might modify this in LACRALO, and we take this into account. Now, secondly, whether we like it or not, I believe that the RALOs and ALAC have become a forum where people who participate, are the ones having more than two positions. And this is what we were discussing before.

I mean, these are the ones that are always travelling, and the ones that are always getting the benefits. There are new people that I would like to participate, that they want to be part of the group, but the positions are still being occupied by the people having always there. So perhaps this is what we must take into account, this is what we should address. Because we may say that an ALS should have a certain amount of individuals or participants, but at least, we must try to help them, to get involved and to involve more members.

I am personally trying to involve more members for my ALS, and this is not an easy task, because when it comes to debate within ICANN, we have a great level of complexity and not everybody is able to understand that level of complexity. So this is something that we should take into account. That is to say, we have to promote the participation within ICANN, but we should also promote the participation, as Alberto said, in other groups.

And this is something that will help us a lot, a lot to improve our discussion, and to avoid, to have the same people for a long period of time. Renewal is a good option. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I tend to agree. Right now, for better or for worse, travel has become perhaps the reason that some people continue to participate. There is nothing in our rules, by the way, that says right now a RALO could not say that the same person cannot travel at repeated meetings. You know, you could say, this may be productive, this may be counter-productive. So I'm not recommending it.

But we could say that from any given RALO, there has to be a different traveler each time. And they have to rotate it. So just by being the representative, you do not get all of the travel opportunities. That is certainly something we could do, or a RALO could do, should they choose. But we have to look at it, we're never going to get to the point of funding travel for 100 people in a RALO, or even 10, on a regular basis, so somehow we have to try to make it work.

And I don't want the solution to be no travel at all for RALOs. We had fought very hard to have general assemblies and have the summits, but we have to make sure that people aren't holding on to slots just so they get those travel opportunities. That is certainly true. Carlton, do you want to try now?

WOLF LUDWIG:

Come on, Carlton.

He's speaking, but we cannot...

ALAN GREENBERG:

...speaking, but we cannot hear you.

All right. We're getting very close to the hour. Let me spend a minute or so doing the close up, and then if we can figure out how to get Carlton, we will. If we can dial out to him, that might be useful.

If you look at the agenda, you'll see at the bottom of the agenda there are a number of documents pointed to. I don't know if they are on the... Are they on the agenda that shows in the Wiki? No, they're not. Okay. There is a whole bunch of documents that are there. Some of them are historic, some of them are repetitive, some of them are subsets of others.

I've tried to find all of the relevant documents, including the original formation document from 2003. It would be really useful if people take the time to read them. They are a little bit tedious, and as I said, they are repetitive, but it's important to understand what rules we have in place, and what the thought process was for how we got here, so that we don't repeat too much of the same things again.

In addition, you will note that we are, as you read the documents, you'll find that we are out of compliance with many of them. For instance, as an example, it says that individual RALOs... Sorry. RALOs may have individual members, if their memorandum of understanding says so. Well, three ALSs, three RALOs have added individual members, and of course, we never signed a new memorandum of understanding.

So we're going to have to do some work to make sure that the bylaws and the MOUs all fit together and that we're in compliance with them. So that's going to require some work. And you'll notice on the task list, at the bottom, I do have bylaws and MOUs. We're not going to talk to them at the beginning, but as we get closer to the end of this process, we are going to have to look at what bylaws do we need to recommend to the Board to change.

Do we need new memorandums of understanding? There are a number of things in the bylaws that refer to MOUs, that would probably need more dynamic than being in a MOU. So I think we're going to have to look at that towards the end of this process, and make sure that what we have, those full set of documents that we have, including the bylaws and MOUs, match what we actually do.

I am going to propose, however, that we divide into five, not divide, but that we have five subgroups. I'm going to be looking for someone to chair each of those. And to look at the issues related to, you'll see, it's item five of the agenda subtasks, ALS criteria, application questions, operational expectations, the application process, and individual members.

And we'll be looking for people to work on those, and come back to the group with a draft or talking points or whatever, wherever they're at. We will be meeting weekly, and if people find this time acceptable, then we can, if we need to rotate, however, then please let staff know, and we'll do our best to rotate, or send a message to this list. If this kind of time is really awkward for you, then we'll do our best to try to make sure we have good participation across the group.

So the homework assignment for the next meeting, a week from now, is to go through the documents, this presentation plus start looking at the documents that are pointed to at the bottom of the agenda. And next time we will have a discussion, in a little bit more substance on what direction we're going in, and we'll try to identify the leaders for the various teams, and start the substantive work.

I have nothing else to say. We have two hands up. Carlton, are you still, are you going to try to talk this time?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Yes Alan, I'm on the bridge. I hope you can hear me now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Hallelujah. Let's go.

CARLTON SAMUELS: Okay. Let me...

ALAN GREENBERG: We are out of time, but we'll go a few minutes over if necessary.

CARLTON SAMUELS: I'll try to be very quick. Two things. First of all, Vanda understands what the main issue is. We have a structural issue. The MOU with the RALO does identify At-Large structures, and individuals who want to compete, to participate. But if you read the MOU like North America,

you assume that individuals can actually be a separate group and you'll have built your procedures to accommodate that.

I think we need to ensure that people understand individuals that make contributions, not ALSs, let me tell you why. Any volunteer organization you come into, there are going to be people who will give more than others. And what you want to do is to encourage those who give, to give, continue to give, and try to bring in new ones.

Now, when you link travel as a reward for giving, that becomes a problem. And the way we thought we would handle that, and I was at the forefront of writing the rules, was to make sure that you have a turnover in the leadership. Because ICANN funds only the leaders to its meetings. So our rules of procedure, our operating principles, says that you have to go through election, you could not be reelected and so on.

That's one way to do it. That is not a foolproof way to make sure people participate. Because regardless of how we want to think about it, people will participate based on their interest first. And what is the challenge for us is to figure out how we take that into consideration. So that's a structural problem.

Then we have a political problem. The political problem is that the way the ICANN MOU is resolved, actually encourages only participation of some people. Here is why. If the RALOs believe that you have to be attached somewhere to give service, then you exclude the people who would like to give service, and don't see themselves as a part of the in group, which was what Juan Manuel was trying to say, was saying, as I interpreted it.

And the issue then becomes, how do we do it? The problem is, the longer you participate, the more ready you are to make valuable contributions. And I say valuable as a prescriptive, because contribution is one thing, it must be valuable to make an impact. And that is what we face when we have people repeating.

You could not replace somebody like Vanda with a nobody, and still think the region is adequately represented. That's a problem we have to sit down and talk about. So we have to look at the structural problems separated from the political problems, and come up with a good measure somewhere in the middle. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Carlton. I think everything you're saying is completely true. I'd like to think that I cannot be replaced by a novice who has never seen ICANN before, on the other hand, having one person to participate for 10 years is problematic if we're trying to get new blood involved. We have to balance the two, I don't know, and that's why we're here. Tijani, last word.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Alan, do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yes we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we do.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you. Alan, I do wish that we would receive the presentation soon, by email or on the Wiki, so that we can go through it and do what you asked us to do. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: The presentation is linked to on the Wiki. It's agenda item number four, I believe. That is a link and it will download the PDF.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Any other last words? If not, we're four minutes over. And I will adjourn the meeting until next week. We will be starting on time, if at all possible, so please try to be here a few minutes early so we can actually start productively. I've been requested to keep these meetings to one hour, and I will, but we really want to get the full value out of the one hour.

Thank you all for participating. As I said, if you have a severe problem with this time, let us know on the list, and we'll try to do some rotation. And Glenn has his hand up, very quick comment.

Glenn?

Glenn, we can't hear you, I'm afraid.

All right Glenn, I'm going to ask you to send your message to the list. And I'm calling this meeting at an end. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]