NATHALIE PEREGRINE:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody, and welcome to the At-Large ALS Criteria and Expectations Taskforce meeting on the 18th of September, 2015. On the call today, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Yrjö Länsipuro, Maureen Hilyard, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Siranush Vardanyan, Alan Greenberg. That was on the English channel.

On the Spanish channel, we have Harold Arcos. And we received apologies from Chaitanya Ramachandran, Juan Manuel Rojas, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Vanda Scartezini, Leon Sanchez, Wolf Ludwig, Glenn McKnight, and Tijani Ben Jemaa.

From staff, we have Heidi Ullrich and myself, Nathalie Peregrine. Our interpreters today are Veronica and David. I would like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes, and also to please remember to speak slowly and clearly so the interpreters can do their jobs. Thank you ever so much, and over to you, Alan. |
| ALAN GREENBERG: | Thank you very much, Nathalie. The agenda today is relatively simple. It is a review from the four design teams, a discussion – a brief discussion, or perhaps announcement, because I'm not sure we talked about it before – that we do have staff allocated to do specific detail work, and then a brief discussion of what we think we can get done for Dublin and how much time we need to handle this in Dublin, and then any other business. |

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.

Are there any questions, comments about the agenda, or can we accept it as shown? Hearing no voices, seeing no hands, we'll accept the agenda and go on to the first item. The first design team is the one on the application process with Nathalie leading it. Nathalie, you have a bullet under it on a report but no documents, so I presume it's going to be a verbal report or you're going to show it to us now.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Yes, apologies for that. Both Terri and I have tried desperately to start uploading to the wiki in the last hour and we've had [inaudible]. The minute we get that solved, I'll update it to the agenda page. However, it is posted in the Adobe Connect room for now, so if you like, I can give you a brief update on the work we've done up to now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please. Go ahead.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Drafting Team A has Juan Manuel Rojas, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Alan Greenberg, and myself, Nathalie Peregrine [inaudible]. We had the first meeting on Monday last week, and we started a broad discussion on a few precise points, and came to a few conclusions, which I found interesting at least, so we'll be really interested to know what you think.

The question raised was [inaudible] on the mailing list, on the taskforce mailing list, just before and during the week. We went over those – I'll go to slide nine quickly now. We went over those quickly, then introductions to the call. Most of the detail of these questions can be

found on the Drafting Team A wiki page, which is created from the main taskforce.

What we covered were the following questions. Really I'm noticing that there was a big difference in the quality of the information received from the applicants. This could [hinge] on their size, on if they were part of another organization or not. Is there something that could be done to input the information that we ask from them in order to get more equal input from the applicant?

We then asked equally, is there anything that you could find out from the RALOs? Maybe RALOs with their cultural differences have different themes, angles they would be interested in. Is this something we could work with? We also asked the question whether due diligence should be a staff-community collaboration. More than that, and you'll see later on, we really try to work on when staff-community collaboration is relevant during the application process and when it should be discarded.

Noted again are the discrepancies of the regional advice, not necessarily the regional advice received, but more how it's processed within the individual RALOs, and then raised a point that [inaudible] on the mailing list. Is it a good idea to give ALAC members a week prior to the voting period start? So basically, upon receiving the voting [inaudible] information package, rather than starting the vote on that very same day, should they be given a week to look at the documentation and ask further questions, and then start the voting afterwards?

Discussing that, we realized that we were aiming – we agreed more or less on these first possible outcomes. There may be more to come.

Obviously, we're looking for clearer and more reliable information from the potential organizations. We needed to better define when the communities would give information, feedback, and also ask questions about the application if this is before regional advice is asked, during regional advice, and then, as I mentioned earlier, during the voting period of the ALAC members.

One new idea that came up during the meeting was the idea that I think was very smart and didn't come from me so I can say that, was to use the application period to stop on engagements. As we all know, we've been receiving applications, accrediting applications, and getting them involved in At-Large theoretically, and then they disappear into the jungle.

So what if we started giving these ALSes, future ALSes, a bit more information the minute they apply? So going into more detail of these changes quickly, in order to get more reliable information, we had a few shots at this one. Updating content on the application for [inaudible] starting point may be giving fewer options to just not answer a question, and making answers compulsory, and also making their qualifications, examples, or maybe anecdotes, whatever, making those compulsory, too, so we get a better picture of the applicants.

Another point raised was also giving the applicant the opportunity to stop and start application. We haven't done that with the web-based forms recently and that might encourage applicants to give more time to the application forms.

Also, we'd need to make the content of the application form a bit more sensitive to different types of applicants. For the moment, we've left it so generic that we might be excluding people rather than [obviously] asking more precise questions about their website's possibilities, about the [state] of their web access, for instance. These might be things that could make applicants feel more understood, more engaged within At-Large right from the start.

Another idea, as you mentioned, there was an issue with maybe only the primary and secondary contacts of an organization really having any links to At-Large upon accreditation. If we could make this form printable so it could be circulated by the primary and secondary contacts within their organization, that could already be another kick start to having the whole organization engaged, and not just a few individuals. Right now, the form is printable but the results are mediocre, so we would really need to work on that.

Community input, we didn't necessarily come to an agreement, and I think there will be a lot more discussion about it, about when is community input good, necessary, and especially what do you mean by community input? We discussed community input during due diligence. We discussed, again, the discrepancies in the RALOs.

I think the main issue raised here explaining why we didn't come to the [inaudible] because there's such a clear difference between the cultural differences between the RALOs that coming up with a defined structure is going to be difficult, and if anything, a hindrance to the accreditation periods.

What we did agree on, however, was this week given to ALAC members prior to the start of the vote, and so it'd be good to see what you think.

Regarding the engagement, this is just the last point, and one I'm excited about, many ideas of ways – giving maybe engagement webinars during the accreditation process, or maybe getting them engaged within working groups. We realize that this would be maybe a bit too heavy-handed.

However, dispensing bite-sized portions of information about At-Large and At-Large Working Group could be helpful, and this would go by the ICANN e-learning platform, and sharing recordings of previous webinars, and this would be part of an ongoing process still encouraging each time this information is shared, encouraging the applicant to share this within the organization.

This would be something that could be done with staff only. However, it would be a shame, we think, that RALOs and RALO leaderships should miss out on this. So this should be maybe an approach, a pre-accreditation engagement approach that would be worth talking to RALOs and getting staff and RALOs to work together on this, because it could really make a big difference to ALSes' activity once they're accredited.

That's pretty much it for me. I know that Cheryl is on the call. I'm sure I missed out a few things, if you would like add anything else to that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I noticed Alan's hand popped up [inaudible], as well, but Nathalie [inaudible] a very extensive review. Yes, we did discuss a lot more, and particularly the mechanisms with getting our applicant ALSes and the individual members engaged via RALO interactions through a more guided process is certainly where a lot of [inaudible] is going to be. The particular parts of the web-based form [inaudible] now, I think a lot of our conversation is talking about how would the right sort of re-jigging of questions and guiding people.

If you say this, then go for that, rather than have this huge form open in front of somebody, making it a far more friendly user interface, but also helping to ensure that the type of material that is put into the application is more useful for staff because it's highly variable. A lot of great work has happened and I'm looking forward to Monday's call to find out where we're going to take [this all to] next. And I want to thank Nathalie, who really did the hero work on the basic proposals and discussion points.

It gave us an excellent jumping off and a good discussion [inaudible] to follow up, but there's an awful lot that we need to talk just from the DTA with the regional leadership at the Dublin meeting. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are you still with us, Nathalie?

[NATHALIE PEREGRINE]:   Alan, I think you had your –

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I have a number of things. In the interest of full disclosure, I am on DTA but I couldn't make the one meeting that's been held so far, so I am listening to this all brand new. A couple of questions, first of all, questions just maybe statements, one of the things that really needs to be on your list is issues of privacy.

Right now, we have certain rules about what should happen with the application and the due diligence. We don't necessarily follow those rules. For instance, some things are supposed to be confidential. They get put on wiki, on public wikis. So we need some clarity and the rules need to make sense, because if we're asking a RALO to evaluate something, then we need to make sure the RALO can evaluate it if indeed we're expecting it to be done at a level below just the leaders. That's number one.

Number two, one thing that's missing right now, and it's related to my next point, is a summary to the ALAC. That is, what were the issues that were noted in the process, and due diligence, and RALO process, that we need to wave flags on? What were the issues which might have made it questionable whether it's being recommended or the issues that were identified as reasons to not recommend them by the RALO, so that we provide to the ALAC the issues that they really need to focus on, the decision points.

And the last thing is – and it's not really the application process; it goes into a much deeper question – but what is the responsibility of the ALAC? I've always taken it that ALAC members may choose to simply say, "I don't enough time, I'll believe the RALO," but ALAC members

really should be looking at the documents themselves, not just delegating to the RALO.

I've seen something recently from this one ALAC member who said, "If the RALO recommends, I do not question it." And I think that's an abdication of responsibility that we should not be doing. But I think the DTAs should be making some statements and making recommendations on how it should be working, so that's really the sum of my thoughts. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Olivier, you have your hand up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nathalie. My question is about the person who signs the form or who files the application. Are there any rules as to who has the ability to file the application and to what extent the organization that they are filing the application for should be aware or implicated in it? I just remember some anecdotal evidence that some people have filed applications on behalf of their organization, but the organization itself, once these people have left the organization, was not even aware that they were an At-Large structure and they had been accredited.

I'm not sure if there is any rule regarding this and if there is any verification, then, that takes place afterwards or during the application process that the organization is indeed willing to join. I'm concerned that we have so much of an emphasis on the actual representatives of

the At-Large structure and not enough on the At-Large structure itself. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, I will be covering that under DTC, by the way, or at least part of that.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I hop in on that? Because one of the things we discussed in DTA regarding re-jigging the application, the web-based application, and that led to the printability issue was by changing some of the information that is requested, we could tease out some of those issues, and the suggestion of making it easy, for example, to ask, "Has your organizational management, Board, etc. leadership, read and understood the criteria listed above?" You know, that sort of stuff. Print it, distribute, and respond.

We can get them to make some statements that [give] those undertakings. The answer to the rules, Christian, there, though, Olivier has said we know there's an expectation but there's an organization in joining, then the organization should be aware of us [inaudible] outline that has not, of course, always been the case.

Some organizations are highly formalized in how they approach their applications to become an accredited At-Large structure, and some, as you said, don't even know they are. When you ask somebody, not even in the person's list. I've certainly been in a position where I congratulated a Board member on another ISOC chapter, for example,

about their [inaudible] accreditation and they're going, "What? Who? How? Who did that?" So yeah, it's tidying up there so there's an interface with [inaudible] and I look forward to seeing that change.

I put my hand up, however, from what Alan was saying, and that was this abdication of responsibility. I gave a bit of chapter and verse, surprisingly enough, about where the responsibilities lie on accreditation. And what we might be able to do, Nathalie, is pull out some of that historical context and formalize it as information for ALAC members and the RALOs, that these are ICANN accreditations that have been giving it to the 15-person ALAC to undertake on behalf of ICANN, and the RALO advice [inaudible] to an engagement desire, not so much a total [inaudible].

And so we can tidy a lot of that up, Alan, and I'm certainly looking forward to doing that in this process because to have someone say to you, as you've just outlined, if the region says yes, they say yes and speak no more, and if the region says no, they say no and speak no more. This is a terrifying point to me because it's the ALAC's responsibility to act on behalf of ICANN in this accreditation process. The ALAC members need to learn a lot more about that, as well.

And your report concept there, we could guide that process a little bit more effectively with doing a report to the ALAC, which makes clear. We can even get people to have to say yea or nay to a couple of things before they go into the voting period, which Nathalie also suggested in the proposal to delay between getting information packages and to starting the vote. All good work happening, but we certainly [inaudible] dropped the ball on some of those things, that's for sure. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Alan, you have your hand raised.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yep. Thank you, Nathalie. Just a follow-on on asking questions. We're never going to be in a position that we get notarized documents from the president or whatever of the association saying that they want to be an ALS. But right now, we have so much disinterest that we don't even ask. So it's not a matter of guarantees, but it's a matter of what have we noted over the last couple of years, last number of years, that are problematic with what we are doing today, and rectifying that?

And Cheryl's anecdote of congratulating the Board member of an ISOC chapter, and they say, "What? Who?" is such an anecdote that I think we have to make sure we cover it as we go forward. Thank you.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: I see no more hands raised. I'll hand the call back over to you, Alan. Thank you very much.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, have you muted yourself?

ALAN GREENBERG: No, I hadn't muted myself, but I had switched from speakerphone to not, and I missed a couple of words in the middle. So I didn't realize I was being called upon. All right, but I am now called upon. What I put

together is a quick summary of where I believe we are on the criteria. This is a combination of essentially what was in my original discussion paper plus the discussions we have had. We haven't had a DTC meeting as such, but we have discussed it a number of times at this meeting.

And I think that's where we are right now, that specifically, we are talking about no change in the base requirements that we currently have. Self-funding, largely led by individual users, and the other words that talk about what can there be, and to what extent can there be government or commercial involvement in it.

We had an extensive discussion at the last meeting on trying to work around this issue of phantom ALSes that are just one person or something like that, and the comment from Cheryl was that APRALO has three contacts, and I think that is a good thing, and I don't think that's a bad thing to make mandatory.

In relation to our previous discussion, the contacts don't have to be the leaders, but the application must make it clear that the leaders acknowledge and support this, that the application, this is the group joining and without that, we know we don't necessarily have that level of support.

We need certification. And again, certification means someone says that whoever are the contacts or the lead contact has any ability to communicate with the organizational membership because one of the main reasons we have contacts is to act as a conduit for information back and forth, and certainly outgoing information, at the very least.

We have no minimum size, but we are expecting something greater than just the contacts or the organizational leaders, and I think that's going to be a judgment call when the evaluation is done, what is right and what is reasonable. And what we've discussed before, I think, and the really core of it is we want to know what the nexus point is, what the intersection is between this organization's interest and ICANN.

Too often in the past, and certainly at the very start of this process, when we were doing the initial recruiting of ALSes, we basically said, "You have an interest in the Internet, then this is for you." And not surprisingly, we have found out that that isn't necessarily the case.

And as much as an organization that does good stuff on the Internet is something that is worthy in its own right, it's not clear what the connection is with ICANN, and I think we need to decide if we want that connection there, then we need to ask what it is. If indeed we believe that connection is not important, then I think that's an interesting discussion we need to have. Certainly not what I would tend to recommend.

And I think that's it, and I guess at this point, we need an active discussion on is there anything in this list is wrong, that I didn't capture from previous discussions properly, and what's missing. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. One thing which you have alluded to, which I think is going to be absolutely key on ALS criteria, is the nature of the organization that is applying. And we have seen that some of the more problematic discussions where some peer reviewers thought that

organization was fitting within the ALS criteria and others thought that it didn't, was to do with the commercial aspect of an organization.

We have seen a union of lawyers that was seen by some as being a purely commercial organization that was better suited to go in the BC, the business constituency, whilst others thought, "Well, hang on. No. It's an association. It's an association of whoever it is, doesn't need to be in a BC. It's association with a heavy emphasis on end users."

There's a bit of room around this, some confusion around this, and I really think that working this one out all the way to really focus on what we want at the end is going to help our At-Large structures when they make a peer review of new applicants.

Because, as I said, that's where I found in the years that I was ALAC chair, and you probably are finding it now, as well, was the most conflictual and problematic thing. Is this an organization that should be an ALS or is it commercial or is it noncommercial? Is it academic? Really, really tough discussion on this one. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. Let me say a few words before going down on the queue on that. The current rules, and not only the rules, but there's an interpretation document that goes along with it that talks about how do you recognize a group which is eligible from one which is not eligible? And we spent a lot of time on that and found it was very difficult to be very restrictive because of the norms in different part of the world about how certain organizations are created and what their formal structures are.

So we left that very open-ended. That doesn't mean we shouldn't be asking a question of what are you and how do you operate, and I think, from my perspective, my last bullet point of what's the intersection with ICANN, the combination of the first questions and that one, I think addresses why should this group be an ALS or not. I may be wrong, but I think that covers it in my mind.

Olivier, do you want to come back and tell me where we're missing something? And then we'll go on to Siranush.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Alan. The concern is the actual nature of the organization itself. Who do they serve? Who are their main members? And as Fadi once said, I think it was Fadi, and in fact, Steve Crocker has also said at another moment was, "Well, we are all Internet end users." And that, in a way, plays in our advantage on the one hand because we can indeed group a lot of people under the ALAC banner.

On the other hand, it plays to our disadvantage because those parts of ICANN and even outside of ICANN that don't think that the ALAC and the At-Large, the end user is stakeholder in itself are saying, "Well, you guys are already somewhere. You're already represented elsewhere, either in civil society or the in the business, private sector, etc." I think we really need to clear this one out and basically define who is eligible as an organization to be part of At-Large.

I'm concerned that if we don't really spend time on this, we are going to continue having problems where some regions have one interpretation, others have a different interpretation, and it's not a level playing field at

all. It reached a bad blood because you get people that apply or organizations that apply that then will be rejected on a vote that might even be a very tight vote on this.

Secondly, one other thing that I didn't notice there was also the jurisdiction. And by that I mean, does the organization need to actually have a legal status by being registered somewhere? I know that at the moment, I don't think there is a rule regarding this. I don't know if there should be a rule regarding this. I know that in some countries, it's very difficult to have a legal body that has been registered in one way or other, and you can have unincorporated associations, which are even more active, sometimes, than the incorporated associations.

So that's another facet. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Before going up to Siranush, on that last point, we do specifically have a rule that it does not need a legally incorporated for just the reason that you mentioned. So that was carefully done at that point. Siranush, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just note my screen has frozen and I can't take my agree down? I'm sure I will be agreeing with Siranush, but I'm going to have to reboot.

ALAN GREENBERG: Siranush, go ahead.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

SIRANUSH VARDANYAN: Yes. I just wanted to agree with the point that contacts do not need to be the organization leaders. In some cases [inaudible] RALO would [inaudible] point out the information is being missed when the only contact there is the director or the leader of the organization, and we found out a couple of other people from the organizations who were interested but were not involved in any mailing list, so we encouraged them to become at least to subscribe to mailing list, and it helped, also, for the ALS itself to be aware of the other activities.

And in many cases, it's also activated the participation of ALSes and [inaudible] to the next point that the information being shared by this contact person to the representative of the ALAC. I agree with that point.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Yeah. We're wandering into the ongoing activities, which is Yrjö's design team. So we should try to keep it down to the expectations of what you need to be the join and, of course, perhaps keep on doing them, but nevertheless. I had my hand up to respond to something, but I can no longer remember what it was, so I will put my hand down.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hand up, Alan, I haven't got back in the room.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Just on that point Siranush was raising and does have an intersection both with some of the proposals coming out of the DTA as well as the ongoing stuff that Yrjö will be looking at in greater detail. And we do have to keep gathering and getting these different design teams' work discussed in the committee [inaudible] because there's an awful lot of nexus in each of our work areas with others.

But part of the opportunity of little bite-sized education opportunities and getting to know ICANN and what ICANN does and how it does it going on during the application process concept was to also ensure that there is opportunity to do more than just interact and encourage interaction with just the nominated representatives.

And so we will tend to see in the future, in the utopian future perhaps, our nominated representatives from an At-Large structure being the ones who have the power to vote, the authority to vote on behalf of their organizations, so if A isn't there, go to B, and if B isn't there, go to C, sort of thing. But in fact, we can try and make sure that the wider membership feels comfortable that they are welcome in RALO meetings, in ICANN activities, in work groups, etc., etc.

So there's an, as I said earlier, an awful lot of opportunity, and it's going to be exciting times, if we get it right, of course. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Cheryl. The – okay, I'm going to drop it for the moment but let's go on. Does anyone else have any other comments? Nothing else. All right. We'll go on to DTE, that's ALS operational expectations. Yrjö is chairing that. I have some thoughts, but I know Yrjö, I think Yrjö wanted to make some comments first and then we can go on to what I put together. Thank you.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay. Can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Okay. So yeah, a couple of weeks ago, I sent the list, the [inaudible] DTE some ideas and there wasn't much of a reaction. I think that I got Wolf said that he supports them. But so that we haven't had much interaction within the team as such so far.

Anyway, what I would suggest is that minimum operation expectations are fairly self-evident. I mean, we expect some reports from the ALSes. We expect them to [inaudible] ICANN [inaudible] within their organization and maybe even wider, and so on and so forth. But to my

mind, the heart of the matter is whether we can integrate the ALSes into the advice and policy process of the RALOs and ALAC.

And in this connection, as I said in my [inaudible] list, I think that the recommendation 28 from ATLAS II should be implemented a bit further. I mean, it is implemented in the sense that there is some statistical information about the various types of expertise that are available in the various RALOs, but what we really would need, to my mind, is really to map, as it says in the recommendation, map the current expertise and interests within the membership so that when there are items which would benefit from grassroots input from the ALSes, the RALOs could actually address directly somebody who is known to be the best expert on policy issues or WHOIS or human rights-related issues, so on and so forth.

And the other thing is also that I think that the ALSes should be expected to be active partners in whatever multi-stakeholder Internet governance arrangements there are on a national level. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Yrjö. You raised the issue that I was going to comment on following Cheryl's comment, and I decided to defer it, but I think the time is right now. You made reference to the survey that we did that each of the RALOs did on the trying to categorize and catalogue the knowledge [inaudible] experience that we have out there, and every single RALO did it for the representative or representatives, perhaps, that we have on file.

And the fact that we have a lot of lawyers as representatives or a lot of programmers or a lot of whatever is almost irrelevant. It should be. It should be the power that we have behind the representatives, not just the representatives. And I think that shows the mindset that we're currently in, that the representative is the ALS and it is the sum total of the ALS. And I think that's, perhaps, the single thing that we need to completely change our mindset on. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just give a hear, hear for that? I think that's extraordinarily important.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. You are absolutely correct on this. You're spot on. In fact, I have an example, a recent example where in EURALO, there are quite a few At-Large structures that are very knowledgeable about WHOIS issue and issues of privacy. And one of our ALSes actually responded to a public comment directly but never actually let us know in advance that they were going to do so, and never even contributed to the ALAC's own statement on the issues, which I think is a pity.

And had we known the actual knowledge and the actual talent that we have, not only from the ALS representative, but the ALS itself, we would have been able to actually search, do a search when the public

comment comes out, and [go] to them and ask them directly rather than just having these announcements made out there.

I think that if we want to better involve our ALSes in what we do, we need to target things towards them. Of course, the policy process management system that will probably, much further in the future, we'll do that automatically. But if at least we had a database and knew these are the ALSes, I'm saying here ALSes, not ALS reps, that have this knowledge on this topic, we can even send a private e-mail to them and say, "Look, that looks like something you could really help in. Are you able to contribute to that?"

I fully support this process forward. Now, how do we proceed forward? I would say come up with another survey. I had a look at the results of the first surveys. I felt they were okay, but didn't quite go far enough to get us to know our ALSes better. The other thing is, perhaps, to ask that when a RALO has a general assembly taking place, they would use that opportunity to actually conduct interviews with each one of their ALSes and find more about them. It doesn't need to be the whole complete session, but you can have a staff member and a member of the leadership of that RALO interview each one of the ALSes for ten minutes, let's say, during breaks, lunchtime, this sort of thing.

And this could be something that could start, for example, with EURALO over in Dublin, as early as that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Let's not get into problem solving of how we make it work. Let's try to identify what the issues are and what we want to make

mandatory, not how to fix the problem. Anyone else comment on this. Otherwise, I'd like to briefly go over the notes that I put together. Olivier, new hand? Old hand? Old hand. All right.

What you see on the pod in this link to in the agenda is I just pulled out the items that I had in my original discussion paper, and those are the first five bullets, and then other ones that have come to my mind as we're going forward. A lot of the RALOs really put the emphasis on voting. That is, if you vote, you're a member, if you don't vote, we're going to suspend you.

And perhaps, as a result of that focus, or perhaps it's just human nature, but we have marvelous participation in voting very often, and the people never show up any other time. And if voting is the only reason they're there, we're not doing our job and we're not being very successful. So voting may well be a criteria for continued participation, but it shouldn't be the one that we're focusing on as the main issue. It should almost be an ancillary thing.

The question of should ALSes have to participate in a regular basis – and that doesn't mean you can't miss one – in the monthly RALO meetings, and what does participation mean? Is it simply dealing in? Do you have to actually say something every once in a while? Good questions. But I would have thought that if you don't ever participate in the RALO meetings, why are you here?

Now, the answer may be you're a very active workgroup participant, but you find the RALO meetings a waste of time. That may be a valid answer. But not doing anything is probably problematic. Should we have

a grace period? If active participation is necessary, should there be a grace period that we know it's going to take a bit of time?

Should there be a requirement for substantive participation? Be it workgroups, webinars, again, and do we need to define inactive in a cross-RALO basis? Because right now, these tend to be something that is done purely within the RALO, so do we need any uniformity on some of the rules? Not rules, some of these practices, perhaps, is the best question.

I have nothing more. Yrjö, anything else you want to add or does anything else want to add anything on DTE? We are ten minutes before the hour, so I think we probably need to move on if there's nothing obvious.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: It's Yrjö.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Go ahead, Yrjö.

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO: Yeah. I'd like to say something, but perhaps if we could discuss on the e-mail list a bit about this substantive, I mean, getting substantive participation from the ALSes. Then I would like to put something in writing and circulate that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. I guess the real question is, if you don't attend webinars, you don't attend monthly meetings, you don't participate in any – when I say "don't" I mean, nobody from the ALS does any of those things, are you really there? And I don't know how to answer it but I think we need to look at it.

Cheryl, DTI.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I don't have a written report or anything to present. However, we haven't met. One of the good news pieces, however, is that we've got an intention to at least take something to be discussed from an APRALO context on an aspect of individual membership. To some extent, I would suggest it is a criteria issue but it's also, how to put it – it's how to come up with, perhaps, a way that will work for one of the most problematic regions, our own Asia-Pacific, when it comes to individual membership.

We do have to find a smart way that will not allow capture that allows the necessary voting aspects of what we expect occasionally from At-Large structures and from what we would also assume is grouping of individual members rather than each individual member. Otherwise, we could have a single country flooding quite literally hundreds of individual members into capture and things.

We're doing a bit of work on that, and that will transfer across to DTI, as well. But very briefly, and it's good that it is brief this time because of how much we've chatted on the other very important pieces of work that are underway.

The good news story is much of what we can do in DTI will act as solutions or compensators for some of the problems that are being identified in the other DTs. The issue was minimal number and small numbers of participants, even a solo participant, out of an At-Large structure.

Well, the reason that they're probably single persons or two or three at most out of rather larger organizations that are hopefully still engaged with the ALS work, it can be solved if they can have that opportunity to interact and perform what they think is important to input into ICANN and from ICANN into their communities as individuals.

So getting the individual membership working across all the RALOs and getting it working equitably across all the RALOs is going to actually give us a lot of solutions as well as opportunities to do some of these transition pieces. At the moment, APRALO is finding, for example, that we're having an individual membership taken up by keen people who have had an interaction with local outreach, for example, and engagement, and they start working as an individual member within the region, but it is their intention to build a critical mass in some cases and start an association and/or organization that will then become an At-Large structure, and when that happens, of course, they stop being an individual member.

But we can also do that in the reverse. We can have a situation where one or two people who still maintain an interest and a desire to input into ICANN activity can roll back to being an individual member when we "decertify," deaccredit an At-Large structure, which organizationally either doesn't wish to involve or, of course, you might have a change of

management and change of directorship, a change of their own five-year plan, and they may say, "No, we, as an entity, no longer wish to be an ICANN-accredited structure."

So when that happens, the individual membership then can act as a safety net for the individuals with [inaudible], hopefully, do want to engage. And I'm sorry I'm not in the room, if there's hands up, you'll have to tell me because I'm trying to log back in again. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: There are no hands up. I will, however, add a hear, hear to that. I personally know of a number of cases in the last year or two where people said, "I want to participate but I can't get my organization to join as an ALS, and therefore, I can't do anything." And we really have to get out of that mode. Olivier.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yes, we've got to [inaudible] that. Yeah.

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier, go ahead. We're five minutes before the hour and I don't know how long the interpreters can keep on going. So let's try to finish up soon.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alan. Quick one for Cheryl regarding the individual members. As you know, both NARALO and EURALO have slightly different models.

Are we going to study the two models and see which ones would fit better for the other regions?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Indeed, Olivier. The wiki page that I am editing but have not managed to complete, the very top of it looks at any role and any mechanism and process that is enshrined within the existing documentation and rules and procedures for each RALO. And, of course, I somewhat foolishly perhaps started with APRALO because that's the one where we've recently redone the rules and seeing there's more in [inaudible] in those particular part of the rules, I was very familiar with it.

But unfortunately, what has happened is I know that somewhere in the wonderful world of the wiki, there will be the final and updated document, which I'm assuming will be in PDF and Word. The best I could find yesterday in the workgroup area from the rules of procedure review from my region was a penultimate draft of those rules.

So I cut out the excerpt because I was also confident that there wasn't much change between that draft and the final. And when I have cut it out and put it into a word document so I can then bring it back across to the DTI wiki page that I'm working on at the moment, the formatting disaster I am still working my way through. I can't tell you how much of my Friday night – I just gave up and went out to dinner because I wasn't going to spend any more time trying to put words back together because I have an 84-page-long document.

Things have [inaudible] three words on each line, it's horrifying. What I did want, perhaps, is if staff could assist me by, if not finding me the

most up-to-date either finalized or draft of the rules of procedure from each RALO. I prefer not to have [inaudible]. What I would love to do is get you should send me an excerpt of anything relevant to individual members, and it may, as it does in the APRALO space, come in more than one place within the rules.

But I want to get those excerpts and put it out so then we can look at exactly what we you've said. Try and develop a best of breed or at least discuss the differences. But I'm infuriated with my inability to find the actual ultimate rules of procedure by doing a simple search on the wiki space, and the formatting disaster that's happened.

Any assistance I can get from staff to not make me try and slit my wrists with a blunt butter knife over this would be appreciated. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl. There are many documents which exist within the ICANN world, and certainly within the At-Large world, but ICANN in general, where you will never, ever find the final document. All you will even find is the draft. That's rule number one. Rule number two is for the longest time, and I haven't seen it recently, to someone's credit, PDFs created on Macs, when you try to cut and paste from them, show up as one word per line.

I've never figured out why and it doesn't seem to happen anymore, so I think someone may have fixed it. But there's a huge number of PDF documents on the ICANN website which you cannot cut and paste with without having to remove all of the artificial line feeds or whatever they are.

Anyway, so much for your rant and my rant, we will [inaudible] now.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Can I just [inaudible], please? Because I [inaudible] I think her proposal [inaudible] is lovely, thank you very much. I would definitely like that, but I also want excerpts, actual excerpts of the relevant rules, where they exist.

ALAN GREENBERG: I don't think it's a particularly difficult job, and I'm sure Silvia can pull out the appropriate paragraphs from either the operating principles or the rules of procedure, because we use those two terms interchangeably and everyone has both of them, and some of the rules are in one and some are in the other. But I'm sure that can be done. That's taken as a request, if no one has noted.

The next item is if I could, is Heidi still on the call? Heidi?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Hi. Took me a while to get off mute.

ALAN GREENBERG: Can you give us a one-minute summary of the resources that you can make available to this working group and its design teams, if necessary, to try to get more detailed information about stuff?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes. I'm very happy to. So we are very fortunate to have additional assistance, temporary assistance, to be able to take part in helping this group. And we were thinking it would be where this person along with other [inaudible]. Can you still hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Can you still hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Okay. And that is Ozan Sahin, who normally works with the Stakeholder Engagement part of policy, and he is ready to begin. I believe he's even on the call and he will be in Dublin and he will be following this group until it can complete this work.

ALAN GREENBERG: In summary, we have a staff person who can do work including, if necessary, contacting ALSes or talking to RALOs, or trying to put things like that together.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Correct.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The last item is planning for Dublin. I had hoped we would be far enough along that we could be presenting something to the group in Dublin, refining it if necessary and perhaps even approving things. We clearly are not at that stage.

The real question at this point is how much time, what do we think we will be able to have be done by Dublin and how much time do we need at that meeting? Anyone have any quick thoughts on that? Nobody does? Let me tell what I'd like to have done then. Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Sorry. I just was going to say I think we do need to have a conversation that includes the regional leadership on some of the things of where we're up to, particularly, for example, DTA, but probably some of the others, as well.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. I'm a little bit disappointed we don't have more regional leadership, other than Siranush, actively participating in this group. We have a prospective chair in Olivier, but yes. What I would like to do is

have each design team – and I know there's significant overlap, and we're going to have to live with that – make a presentation of something that may not be final, because in some of these areas, we have more work to be done than we're likely to get done in the time that we have between Dublin, especially given the fact that some of us are involved in other things that also are high-priority. But I think for each of the design teams, we need to put something on the table as a draft, labeling it as almost complete or really rough, and have a substantive discussion on each of them.

It's going to be a really difficult discussion to have because it's really easy to go off on tangents. And I will do my best to lay the ground rules out and then to keep it focused. My feeling is we need at least a half hour, on the average, on each of these design teams, and that means we need to allocate at least two hours total. And if it's to include the secretariats, that means it has to be on the Sunday or the Tuesday sessions.

Anyone strongly disagree?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Other than Heidi and Gisella, who are going to tell me it's going to be impossible. They're not allowed to say anything.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I don't disagree but –

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Yeah. I don't disagree, Alan, but I do think it's probably more appropriate on the Tuesday, I suppose, which would change a lot of the scheduling. But it may not be impossible to, perhaps, even split it if we can't get the lumps of time you desire.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. Even, I missed the verb.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: But you could split it because –

ALAN GREENBERG: Split it. Oh, no. I wasn't saying two contiguous hours necessarily. I was saying two hours, probably two one-hour chunks, and since secretariats may not be there on the Saturday, it really has to be Sunday or Tuesday. We are meeting Saturday, but the only people who are guaranteed to be there are ALAC members and chairs.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Agreed.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So I think we have a plan. I really do not know at all whether we've already allocated that much time or if on the right days, but we'll work around it and try to do our best. Any other business?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, did you note in the chat Heidi's already got you an hour on the Sunday, but may be that we need to grab an hour additional time on a Tuesday, but [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I wasn't looking at the chat but we'll work it out somehow, even if we have to start at 3:00 in the morning. That will be easy according to Cheryl's standards. Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Quick question regarding ALS vote weighing on a per-country basis. This is in use in LACRALO, the larger one by number of ALSes, the largest region by number of ALSes. Is this work within the remit of this working group?

ALAN GREENBERG: Probably not. And I will tell you that it is in use in LACRALO. It has been suggested that it might be appropriate for AFRALO. And there is a strong push in LACRALO to stop doing it. So the vote is out. But I'm not sure that an internal voting mechanism is within the remit of this group.

I would entertain a discussion on it on the mailing list to start with, advocating why you think it is or not, but it doesn't sound like it's within the remit of what's formally on our table.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is it, perhaps, the remit of the secretariats to discuss this with each other?

ALAN GREENBERG: It certainly is. Why are you asking, I guess.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. I'm asking because having seen the growth of the number of ALSes that we have in each region, to me, my personal feeling is that the weighting on a per-country basis somehow alleviates the danger for capture. If a specific country has an overall plan of, perhaps, influencing the work in a region more, than they could very easily start creating a number of At-Large structures with various names, with various numbers of people, and edge towards capture.

I think that's what Cheryl might have alluded to, actually, earlier our call. And so I wonder whether there should be first some discussion and some study of the advantages and inconvenience of a per-country weighing scenario, and secondly also whether there would be the ability to perhaps harmonize this across the regions rather than each region having its own way of thinking.

ALAN GREENBERG:	Okay. A couple of things and then I'll go to Cheryl. The reason it's being considered in AFRALO is for exactly the reason you suggest, because some people believe that some people in some countries are trying to stack the deck, so to speak. The reason it is being objected to in LACRALO is countries where there are a significant number of ALSes feel that they have been disadvantaged by this and no one's listening to them because they have less weight than other ALSes in a country where there may only be one.

So it depends which side you're arguing on. Again, I'm not sure it is within our remit. I believe Cheryl was talking about the same effect but with individual members, but the impact can be there. One thing that we do need to discuss that we haven't yet is if you read the bylaws, the bylaws imply that the ALS – that the criteria for certifying an ALS may vary by region to region.

That was not implemented when we did the original one. We went for uniformity. I personally believe that that should be stricken from the bylaws because I believe that could introduce a really deleterious effect if each region can set radically different criteria depending on their local needs or what they perceive as their local needs, or what the leaders at the time perceive as the local needs.

So I am going to strongly advocate that when we eventually change the bylaws – and they will have to be changed because of the work we're doing right now – that we, in fact, remove that. But that is probably something we need to discuss further. Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I agree with you totally on that last part. But to Olivier's point, which is I'm just going to put on the ALAC review hat at the moment, that is something, of course, which rightfully should, could, and I would encourage [inaudible] looked at as we go into our next review of ALAC, which will focus not just on the 15-person ALAC and relationships with Board, etc., but also quite specifically on ALSes and regional At-Large organizations.

So I think it's certainly something that has to be dealt with. We're aware of it with Asia-Pacific because if you want to stack a deck, believe me, we can have that as an art form. We've got the numbers [inaudible] and I'm happy to do that, have no problem with that at all. You want to do capture, I know how to do that very well. And I can run a quick program to make sure that that happens.

But there is more ways than just voting weighting by country to fix these issues, and one way, for example, that we do do this in Asia-Pacific is the criteria for voting in some of our organizations. And here, I'm talking about things like our regional IGF work and things like that. You have to have been active in the last six months to vote.

So there's a set of activity criteria that are put out, and some years you'll get to vote and some years you won't. Because whatever reason, you broke your leg and you were having an operation, you sat on the necessary number of meetings to do that. Those sorts of things. There's a bunch of ways we skin this stuff, but it certainly doesn't need to be killed, slaughtered, skinned, dissected and the [inaudible] will come at you [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl, and I agree. The At-Large review is probably the proper place to have that discussion. And I honestly don't know the right answer. I started off with a personal position that I thought there's the concept of country-weighted voting was absolutely ludicrous and there was no reason to do it.

I am changing that position in regions where there are, number one, a large number of countries, number two, the size of the countries varies radically, and where there is often, I'm not quite sure how to say it because what I'm going to say isn't quite the right words, but there is often strong political issues and undercurrents going on. Certainly, in some of our regions, that is very much the case.

So it's a good question and I'm not sure there's a universal answer. I know that if you went to the North American region, you would not find a lot of support for –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: [inaudible] don't have a lot of countries.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we have two countries but we have a number of territories, and it's not clear that the territories would not end up getting the same weighting as the country. And that clearly would not be appropriate because that would provide an opportunity for capture. Capture by the smallest entities, not the largest, nevertheless. It's not clear there's a one size fits all but it is a rather interesting discussion.

Any last words? Then I call the meeting to an end [inaudible].

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Hang on, [inaudible]. Sorry. Just because you may not have been noticing the chat again, Alan, when Heidi pointed out that on the Tuesday, the schedule starts at 8:30 and finishes at 8:00 PM, that is, can I just say, bloody stupid, and I do hope the interpreters don't mind my profanity there, but that was the nicest profanity I can come up with for it.

You might have to just make it a tasting plate for these topics and just give us 15 minutes each or probably 10 minutes with a bit of intro and a bit of extra time in the hour that is dedicated to it on the Sunday. Because that is the most ridiculous schedule I've ever seen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, if I may add my personal rant, you will recall that we distributed a list of possible speakers for people to identify the ones that they really wanted and the ones that, perhaps, we could say no to this time. With very few exceptions, everyone said everyone is essential.

We've got a lot of people coming who are taking a lot of time and I question how effective that's going to be. And I may end up perhaps with the ALT or perhaps on my own with Leon making some executive decisions.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: That would be wise.

ALAN GREENBERG: May I now adjourn?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Oh, it's 6:15 in the morning here in Australia, so have a great evening, everybody else.

ALAN GREENBERG: Your day is just starting, then.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'll have a Saturday and you can all have a Friday.

ALAN GREENBERG: Are you on Skype, Cheryl?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I will be in a moment but more [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: I will ask you a question on Skype. It will [inaudible] one quick question. Thank you all. Bye-bye.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bye, all.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks very much. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]