
NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everybody, and welcome to the At-Large ALS Criteria and Expectations Task Force Call on the 21st of August 2015. On the call today we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Maureen Hillyard, Yrjö Länsipuro, Wolf Ludwig, Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Alan Greenberg. We have on the Spanish channel Juan Manuel Rojas and Alberto Soto. We've received apologies from Vanda Scartezini, Siranush Vardanyan and Heidi Ullrich from staff. From staff today on the call we have Silvia Vivanco and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. Our Spanish interpreter is Sabrina.

I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes, and also to speak clearly and loudly so the interpreter can do their job. Thank you ever so much, and over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Nathalie. This will probably be a shorter call than normal, because we're just trying to get started. We've had very little participation, or very few comments or people saying they're willing to join the Design Teams, on the list. So I think we're going to have to beat the bushes a little bit and try to make sure people are really willing to work on this. We had a large number of volunteers for the overall group, but when it comes down to saying exactly what people are going to work on, we've had very little people putting their hands up.

So I think we have some work to do there. Or simply decide that ten or six of us, whatever the number is, are going to make all the decisions,

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.

and then hope no one else complains afterwards. The first Item is the approval of the Agenda. Is there anything else we need to add on this? Seeing nothing, the Agenda is approved as submitted.

The first Item on the Agenda proper is a short one, and it's agreement on the Design Team structure and the leaders. The four Design Teams that we came up with last time, or I suggested, and I think we agreed to in general, are listed on the Agenda in a little bit more detail. There was a fifth one on the application form, and I think we'll roll that one into Design Team A on the application process, with the understanding that much of that work can't really be done until a criteria group is finished.

Then we had a couple of other groups that could kick in once this process was close to being completed, and we'll activate those at that time. The only question is... I proposed Nathalie lead Design Team A on the application process, although we normally have a volunteer taking these roles, I think in this case, she's the expert on it and the person who's going to have to live with the results, and I think she has a vested interest in making sure the Design Team comes out with recommendations that are both implementable and can address the needs, obviously, not only of the application process but of the staff, and moreover, the RALOs who have to pass judgment on the applications also.

Unless there are any objections - I see a number of tick marks - then Nathalie, you are confirmed. So you can't get out of it now. Thank you very much for agreeing to do that. The next Item is to spend a bit of time on the actual Design Team work. We've done very little on the mailing list and have very few volunteers. So my inclination is to spend a

bit of time on the one I'm leading, because I may be more prepared than others, just knowing this was going to be happening, and then open the floor to anyone else who wants to make any overall comments. Nathalie may be in a position to do that, since she's new at this. Then we'll close early if necessary.

For those of you who got up early to be on the meeting - and I may be the only one, I apologize -, for those of you who want to go to sleep, I don't think anyone will be upset about that. On Design Team C, one of the discussions we had at the last meeting was size, and I want to go back to that a little bit, because there were a number of things being said in the chat in parallel, which I don't think were being talked about in person, and I think we need to bring them all to the table. I'm not trying to make any decisions today, but I want to make sure we're all on a level playing ground. Alberto's hand is up. Alberto, over to you.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you. Good morning Alan. I volunteered to help. As you know, my English is not very good, but I am willing to work and to cooperate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Alberto. I didn't say nobody had volunteered. But we are populating the list of who's working on which Design Teams and we've had relatively few volunteers for that. We'll make sure staff goes over the emails that were received, and that we start populating the lists. Thank you Alberto. The item I want to talk about is size, and I had put that on because we've had a recurrent issue over the years that there are

some ALSes where it's become apparent that they effectively do not exist, other than for the leaders, or perhaps the leader, who's identified as the representative of the ALS.

In at least one case we know, the ALS was actually created with a few people getting together to be the leaders, just so they could fill in the forms. In that case, three of the four people effectively disappeared as soon as the forms were filled in. That bothers me. That says we are claiming to have organizations on the ground where, for all intents and purposes, they're on a piece of paper only. Certainly it bothers me. Maybe it doesn't bother anybody else, but I think we need to make it clear how we differentiate between one person or two people who are perhaps eager workers, but really fit the mold of an individual Member.

That's as opposed to an ALS, which for all intents and purposes doesn't exist other than to satisfy the paper requirements that we have. In the chat last time, I think Glenn said he knows of special interest groups where six or seven people are very active. I think six and seven is a fine number. It's the one and two that I have a problem with, especially since the issue of travel does come up on a semi-regular basis, and has been used in some cases as explicit reasons why, "I don't want to be an individual Member. I want to be an ALS because of the travel opportunities."

That logic bothers me, when combined with an ALS, which is only the individual Members. From that context, I'd like anyone else's thoughts. Glenn? For those listening afterwards, it's a lot easier if people actually talk, because on the chat, you can't tell the context of when it happened during the conversations. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you Alan. I agree with you. It also bothers me, that kind of participation, so to speak. We have had, and from time to time we do have, individual Members that have worked in our Working Group, and were very well received. Our rules allow for individual Members, or volunteers. They are not allowed to vote, but they can actively engage and participate. However, we also had some ALSes that did not participate, and as you said, the person in charge of the ALS vanished into thin air.

This is what we have to do in the RALO. We ourselves have to take care of checking why this is happening. We reach out to that ALS, and that person had left the ALS. We worked so as to reactivate the ALS, so to speak. They were about to be decertified, but now they're actively engaged again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Alberto. To be clear, I'm not worried about the fact that the person disappears, but there should be other people who are already engaged. Certainly if there's only one person, and that person disappears and the ALS is no longer interested, that's the kind of situation where I believe it was not a real, active organizations as part of ICANN anymore, to begin with, but was simply a name to allow the participation. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I think we can possibly afford to take, from an ALS point of view, a somewhat pragmatic approach, now that we do have - and are closer to having - all of the ALSes allowing for individual Members, which of course is an important part and a [corroly 11:23] to some extent, to some of the motivation why, as you suggested in your intro, some ultra-small quasi-organizations may have been formed, where very few, perhaps as low as one or two, people were actually interested in the work of ICANN.

We certainly know of one or two organizations that were literally formed for no other reason than to engage in the At-Large movement, which is fine, but we now have more options than we did before. My pragmatic approach however - most jurisdictions have, and all of our organizations, are housed in a jurisdiction, at least from a legal perspective, if not from a mere mailing perspective. Most jurisdictions where organizations, or associations, or whatever we want to limit this to, are in some way identified by a minimal number.

I doubt there would be anywhere where it would be less than two, and possibly - I'm not suggesting we do the legal search - but I doubt there would be many places where there's less than three. But wherever the jurisdiction is for the organization or association that's applying, there would be a definition of what makes you an organization and association and not-for-profit, or whatever you are claiming to be. I think that minimum number could be taken from a pragmatic approach.

It would that we'd never, probably, have a less than three, or perhaps less than five. Because you can have perfectly valid and quite vibrant engagement with numbers as low as that. But we do need to recognize

that for those ALSes, which in a number of cases - and it may be more in the future - of organizations with Member outreach exceeding several thousand now, but quite likely we have one that goes into hundreds of thousands of people.

There is a perceived disparity where the voting rights and equity between an organization that has an outreach to hundreds of thousands of individuals, versus three, have the same status. That also needs to be balanced. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I'll go to Olivier in a moment. I just wanted to introduce a couple of things that as we're going forward we need to consider. We know, because of another part of our lives, that in California one Member makes an organization, and an unincorporated association only requires two. We know the numbers are small in some jurisdictions. I think one of the other variations we have to think about how we want to treat is how do we consider an organization that has 45 Members? They're giving us the number. But if we were then to ask them a question of how many of these Members know how to spell ICANN, the answer would be one.

That is only the front person has any interest whatsoever in doing it, and by the way, for the record, one of the organizations that was created to be an ALS so they could join was in North America, where we've had individual Members from the beginning - just to add, for the fun of it. Olivier, you're on.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. You mentioned two things I thought were interesting on the differentiation between an ALS and an individual. What does an ALS get that an individual doesn't get? Obviously that's the vote on the one hand, and the possibility of travel, whether it's for a GA or for something else?

The ultimate thing is, if we actually made less of an emphasis on the ALS, as far as the travel is concerned - not the vote, because that's a political thing, and I think we need to keep that vote within ALSes, because that's part of our structure - but as far as the travel is concerned, have travel incentives that are more geared towards Chairs of Working Groups, key individuals, key people that get things moving, we might have less of an emphasis on single-person ALSes getting created and coming forward in order to be able to be part of that travel and go to an ICANN Meeting in person. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. The challenge of course is how to do that. Cheryl raised an important question; on both travel and the voting, do we feel comfortable equating someone who's leading an organization of 1,000 people and may be consulting with the group in some way before making decisions on behalf of the organization, with someone who has nobody to consult with, even if the organization has 1,000 people, because nobody else is actively involved?

So that person is essentially acting unilaterally on their own in any involvement - be it for deciding who's going to travel, or deciding how to

vote on something. I think that's really what we need to be asking ourselves. Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you. First, we have one ALS that has more than 7,000 Members. We know for sure, because the representative is telling us, that we know that apart from her, and maybe one other person, the Members cannot spell ICANN, and they don't know the meaning of the acronym ICANN. The only positive thing I can see is that when it comes down to outreach, we can quickly reach out to a very important number of people - that is more than 7,000 Members. In terms of travelling, we're working on some metrics in order to measure the activity of every ALS.

We always work on the basis of a criteria of inclusiveness. Some ALSes will lose certain rights if they don't participate within a year's time frame. I'm not going to mention the specific metrics right now. That ALS will not be able to vote, to travel, to apply to the CROPP, until within the following one-year term, that ALS regains active status. If, within that second year, the ALS doesn't regain active status, then it will be decertified, or we'll apply for the decertification. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you Alan. I just wanted to raise for example that in some small countries, such as my own, the number of Members on the ground in our organization is probably smaller than a lot of other organizations. I

originally was representing [unclear 20:07], which has over 600 Members, but the representation is now elsewhere, and I would now represent my own local [AT 20:20] organization, and of course [ARIN].

When you have about ten people in our group who may be pretty actively involved on the ground on our country, we actually only have two Members of the group who are involved in ICANN, and [smaller 20:44]. [unclear] GAC. Yes, so just [unclear] parts of ICANN. I know that more people would become involved, except that we do have a problem to do with Internet connection, and less than half of the people on our island have Internet connection at home.

So joining meetings at all the strange hours of the day that we do is not possible. Even if they tried to connect, say, at work, some of their employers aren't very keen for their Internet to be used for anything other than their business. So there are reasons why people from within an ALS may not be engaged. I think that we've also got to take that into account. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Maureen. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Alan. On the issue of the size of an ALS, it's interesting, because LACRALO has a system where the votes are weighed by country. As an outside observer for the number of years that I was ALAC Chair, I did find that having the vote divided among the number of ALSes within a country was actually quite an interesting and worthwhile way to move

forward, although I do admit it was introducing all sorts of difficult calculations. But then, looking at it further, it still had the next level of a problem, which was that a large country, like Brazil, would have the same number of votes as a much smaller country.

So that again introduced some pressures and some perceived imbalances. Frankly, if you try to fix this number of votes and so on, unless you go into trying to find out exactly how many Members each ALS has, and weigh the votes in and so on - and then of course ALSes will try and cheat and get as many Members on paper as possible - I don't think we've got any chance of resolving this, short of keeping the system we have at the moment, or to do it by country.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. Yrjö? Dev says he can hear you. I can't.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Neither can I.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll keep Yrjö in the background and hopefully get him working some time soon. I put my own hand up. I have a question. Alberto mentioned they may have an ALS with 1,000 Members, only one or two know how to spell ICANN, but it's a group available for outreach. I have no problem if information is being disseminated and others in the ALS have a chance of participating, should they choose to. But simply being in the background in case they're ever invoked, but they're not right now, I find a little problematic.

At the other end of the extreme, to look at what Maureen was talking about, from ICANN and At-Large's point of view, what is the difference between two very active Members in a group, being individual Members and being equally active, and two people out of 20 being the only ones who know how to spell ICANN? I guess I'm trying to understand what benefit we have by having an ALS where indeed there is no real organization that is involved other than the one or two people? It's fine to say, "Let's de-emphasize travel," but as long as we have travel, we know it is a factor in people's minds.

I guess I'm not sure how to resolve those discrepancies. As Olivier pointed out, there are many. We're not going to be able to resolve them all, but essentially, what's the added value we have? That's the question I'm trying to understand. Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thank you. To some extent, I'm nowhere near as concerned as you seem to be on this matter, but there you go. That often happens between you and I. I think there is an optics advantage to organizational sub-structures of ICANN - the At-Large being the current example we're dealing with - to be able to show not just the depth of its coverage but the diversity, penetration, and that still desirable - I trust - one ALS per country goal. I think it's still a valid one, because of that.

I really don't care if, in my utopic near future plan, with our having at least one ALS per country in existence, whether some of those ALSes are extraordinarily disproportionate in numbers of Members, and numbers of Members specifically active in the incoming policy development

activities - for example, to take one major issue at ICANN - as long as there is activity in that. The outreach and dissemination of information should not be undervalued.

The ability for ICANN, the entity, to benefit by having that demonstrable breach into regions, sub-regions, countries and parts of countries, and later on different diversity tools within countries. It should not be underestimated. But none of those should simply be, if they are given active and voting type status, just sitting there, doing nothing. To pick up on some of the work we saw come out of the AFRALO area on ALS criteria - and it's something I'm quite comfortable with - we can actually have a sliding scale of classification of activity of ALSes. I don't really mind if only two or three people - to be honest I barely mind if only one of them - is the one carrying the lion's share of that work. Because that's sometimes the nature of things.

Asia Pacific, for example, has insisted for many years now that no less than three alternates - and they need to be actually able to be contacted and respond to email when checked on - are listed per ALS. That means already that at least within our region, where we've got three hot, live bodies that we know can be contacted and can be interacted with, but we can have up to five on our records. So there are ways to gentle some of this in, rather than mandate it in. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. I'll just highlight - you said a couple of things that are really interesting. One is to increase from one the number of mandatory representatives that are identified, and three, I think, is a substantially

different number than one. The second thing you said is that it's okay if that small number are the really active people, as long as - and I'm paraphrasing - there is a communication channel to the others. If we had those, then a lot of my concerns disappear. It's the absence of those that raise the worries in my mind. Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you Alan, and Cheryl - because Cheryl's basically said what I was going to say. At the moment, ALSes are asked to promote ICANN on their website, so that even if there are only a few Members who are actually active in ICANN, this participation is notified for other Members in some way. I know that, for example, in Cooks, we are gaining more interest in ICANN through the articles we've got on our website, and that we pass onto our local media about the meetings we participate in. I'm not sure our other ALS websites are updated. As Cheryl said, there's a real communication channel for us. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Juan Manuel?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS:

Thank you. I see that certain issues crop up. For example, the goal has always been to have one ALS per country. In our region, we have countries with more than one ALS, but as Alan was saying, we have ALSes that seem to have only one representative. Going back to what Cheryl was saying, maybe we can have three, four, five participants, and we can also try to have active participation of these representatives

within ALAC groups, so that we don't always have the same person participating in all the groups.

If an ALS has several Members or representatives, they can distribute those Members or representatives into different Working Groups so that they have more outreach, and we don't end up with only one person always engaging in all the Working Groups and having all the workload, as we see sometimes - for instance, Cheryl and Olivier always everywhere, with all the workload.

As was mentioned before, we can have some metrics on a regional level, so as to determine whether an ALS has a certain number of Members and a certain number of active participants, so that we can engage new people, and sometimes newcomers, or potential newcomers, do not engage because they say they cannot participate or they don't have enough information. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Juan Manuel. Nathalie?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

I just wanted to add to what you said regarding the channels of communications within the ALSes. Recently, in some occasions, we've realized the primary and secondary contacts have not been Members of the leadership. In some occasions, when for due diligence questions, I've tried to get hold of the primary and secondary contacts and not managed, I've managed to contact a Member of the leadership team there, and they've expressed surprise at the application.

They weren't aware of it at all. We can presume if they weren't aware of the application then they were not aware of the accreditation, if it happened, and therefore not in a position to communicate, really, anything regarding At-Large. Regardless of how many people we end up with regarding compulsory contacts within the ALS, I think it would be a good point to insist that there is a Member of the leadership at all times as primary, secondary or third contact for the ALS.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Nathalie. That's interesting, and certainly we know of cases like that. In my prior life, I've probably applied for Membership of something on behalf of my university, and certainly the leaders of the university didn't know anything about it. That's not necessarily uncommon, the question is, is it bad? I think if the person has no ability to interact with the Membership, then yes, it probably is. On the other hand, if the leadership knows about it but wants to identify someone else to be the rep, that's just fine. I think that's an interesting issue, and perhaps one of the things we need to look at. Jrjö, we'll try you again.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

I think there are many ISOC Chapters who have the status of ALS, and at least in cases, we know, not the entire Membership is necessarily interested in the specific things ALSes are doing, because there are other things in the Internet that ISOC is interested in. But there are one, two or three who actually take care of this segment of the work. I think that is pretty good. I think this, in other types of organizations that have the ALS status, I think this diversity is actually an asset. The problem is how

to use it. I hope I'll come to that when we talk about Design Team E.
Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Yrjö. I think you've alluded to something that should be obvious, but just to make it really explicit, these various things are going to interact. We have been talking about communication channels, for instance. That's one of the things that's going to come up in spades in expectations - that we are going to be expecting people to use those channels on a regular basis to disseminate the information. That's information that probably today doesn't exist, because centrally we're not necessarily doing a good job. But these things are going to be linked together. It's not as if these are completely separate activities.

So I think we will be cross-feeding ideas between the various groups. I think we've had a good discussion right now, and it's going to take a bit of thought, but as the team leader I'll try and pull this together. I think we're coming to closure on how we address the issue of size and not disadvantage people because of it, but at the same time make sure we have the ability to actually use organizations on the ground in aid of the work we're doing.

I think something is starting to coalesce. I'm happy to call that part of the discussion to a close, and I'm also quite happy to end the meeting a few minutes early. Many of us have another meeting in about 15 minutes, and I know I for one wouldn't mind a few minutes of preparation for it. Unless there's anything else, or Any Other Business? Then, thank you for your participation.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan? I just got the sense that Yrjö was perhaps hoping to make a couple of points with his Design Team E? I also do.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, then while you're on the phone right now, why don't you talk about Design Team I for a few minutes, and then...

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Happy to do so. Just to let you know, I'm looking forward to working with each of the regional reps in the individual Member Design Team. We will have to reach out, because it is something that is mandated across all of our RALOs. My prediction, if I look in my crystal ball - and before you ask, yes, I do actually have a crystal ball, it's very heavy, I don't travel with it, and it's volcanic glass - should I polish it up and look into it, I would suspect that what we may end up with is a couple of high-level principles, which can be harmonized, or seen as uniformity across RALOs, but necessarily a degree of diversity entwined within the specific for each RALO, and probably subject over time to change within the RALOs.

We will obviously look at the [on-site 40:54] participation aspects, but I'm a great believer in the metrics and role-based basis for much of the participation in meetings, wherever they are, and however they're happening. I think Olivier alluded to that quite successfully earlier on in today's call. Asia Pacific, which could very well have one of the most potentially exciting quasi-ALS model options, looking at what's currently

working in other regions, one of the things our region is likely to find attractive is to use the quasi-ALS voting.

In other words, that's where one piles your individual Members into a pseudo-ALS, and that [unclear 41:56] in itself with whatever [core eight] responsibilities it decides upon, puts forward a primary contact person and various [jobs 42:04] and things like that. It's worked in other regions, and there's no reason it wouldn't work across all of the regions.

However, it would be unreasonable, for example, should the extraordinary large number - because we have billions - of people we could perhaps look to as individual Members, unaffiliated, individual, independent Members across our regions - it would be extraordinary to have extremely high numbers all in a single ALS. It comes back to my earlier challenge question about how one balances what a three-person operation does, to a 33,000-person operation. So we need to look at opportunities and the need for local needs to be met.

Maureen and I are putting together a white paper on what we think our region may be able to utilize, and I think part of what Design Team I would like to do is to start sharing some thought pieces from the region, inclusive of those that already have operational structures. It may be, for example, Glenn, that things discussed in the last review of the North America Rules of Procedure, that whilst they didn't become enshrined as changes to how you manage your individual Members at this stage, they were at least discussed.

I think having access to that in a frank and fearless conversation will help us develop that end. I'm hoping Design Team I will not only use chat,

but perhaps even have meetings from time to time and do a fair amount of Wiki work. I'd very much like to ensure that we have at least one dedicated Member of this Task Force from each region to work with us on Design Team I. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Cheryl. As a small insight, I've been the formal individual Member representative for NARALO, and though we don't have a large number of individual Members, we've never been successful at getting the hundreds of thousands, or even the tens. As a quasi-ALS, it's probably one of the ones that does the most in-depth consulting on any decision. As the representative, I cannot cast a vote without consulting everyone, where as I doubt that's the case in many of our other ALSes. We may have [overtalk 45:07] on a person-by-person basis than almost any other ALS, despite our small numbers. Yrjö, you're on next.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Thank you. I think the five sub-points here under Design Team E are all fine, but I would like to add a couple of points. One relates to what I think Alan just said - the question of how the RALO and the ALAC could benefit from the grass-roots experience from all the ALSes. That's of course something the ALSes have to do; a lot of things they don't do now, but also the RALO has to do its part. The other thing is that ALSes should be part of the multistakeholder corporation in their countries, on a national level. They should network. They should be part of the local IGF organization teams and so on and so forth. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. Just to be clear, the lists of bullets there are the ones that I dreamt up when I wrote the original position paper. There's nothing magic about them, other than those are the ones that came to my mind at that point. Do not feel restricted by those. Seeing no other hands, I will now give everyone a moment, if anyone else wants in. Speak up, otherwise we'll adjourn and meet again. Thank you all very much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]