

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: ...ALS criteria and expectations taskforce call on the 22<sup>nd</sup> of February 2016.

On the call today we have Alan Greenberg, Yrjo Lanispuro, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Judith Hellerstein, and Glenn McKnight.

On the Spanish channel there we have Raitme Citterio and Raitme, if you're not on the Spanish channel we will organize a dial out for you shortly.

We received apologies from Vanda Scartezini, Juan Manuel Rojas, Dev Anand Teelucksingh.

Our interpreters today are Sabrina and Marina.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Yesim Nazlar, and myself Nathalie Peregrine.

I'd like to remind you all to state your names clearly before speaking for transcription purposes, and equally to speak loudly and clearly so the interpreters could do their job. Thank you every so much and over to you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Nathalie. Are there any questions on the agenda or can we move forward with the approval of it.

---

*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.*

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier. [CROSSTALK] Just to let you know that I'm not on my computer, so I'll just be shouting my name out if I need to intervene, thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'll try to listen for you. All right, then we'll take the agenda as adopted as shown. And go on to the first item, which is the work plan. My hope, and whether we'll do that or not is going to depend on how successful we are today, is that we use this meeting to add whatever we think as potential ideas for the, both the criteria and the expectations, circulate it quickly, both ALAC and widely to our ALSs. Solicit input.

There will be an extensive meeting scheduled in Marrakesh, and I would like to, by the time we come out of that meeting, if at all possible, have approved the expectations and criteria, and if that's not possible, then at least get it down so that we have one more iteration and approve it soon afterwards.

That will allow us to start working on the application process, and refining documents and things like that, and start gearing up on the staff side to be able to meet the targets that we're looking at, and we'll talk about that as we go forward. It's ambitious, but with the way the IANA issues and accountability is going, that's not going to let up any time in the near future, and we simply have to go on and start doing the work that we are obliged to do in parallel.

So if, in the absence of any specific comments on that plan of how we should be going forward, I'd like to start the review and the first part is

---

ALS criteria. The document that is linked to the agenda, which will be in the Adobe room real soon, hint, hint.

Nathalie, do you have that?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Yeah, I don't see a hyperlink in the agenda Alan. That's why I was bracing myself.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm sorry. I think it was there. Is there not something linked to, where it says work plan?

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: No. Could you please email it quickly? I'll have it up...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. I'm sorry, I'm sure it was there last night. Hold on.

We have a brief pause in the meeting.

It is there as attachments if anyone wants to look at it. Somehow the link disappeared.

Let me put a link to the...

Nathalie, do you have it?

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: I'm uploading it now.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. It really was there last night, or at least I thought it was.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Of course it was, Alan. Cheryl here. We understand.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. This is not the first time that I put a link in and failed to look for it afterwards and notice it was gone. But...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You start forgetting links, and then you forget...

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, well it's the start of the downfall. All right, it is there now for anyone who wants to go to the agenda to link to it.

And it's in the pod. Thank you very much Nathalie. Sorry about that. Okay, this list has not changed appreciably since the last time we looked at it, although I did add a few things that we had talked about, but never made it to the list. The essence of the criteria that we've been looking at is essentially no change to what is approved today, in terms of the overall style of an ALS, that is, we are not changing the, what was defined with great pain last time about the flexibility in ALSs in terms of

---

their actual structure to allow for the different variations around the world.

We are specifying that there should be three contacts, that is something that APRALO has done and seems to have been successful. And if you can't identify three people in an ALS, then I think we have a problem. Identifying, the context does not have to be the organizational leaders, but the leaders must know you're doing this.

Contacts must be able to communicate with their membership, and we want to know how they plan to do that. There is no minimum size measured, mentioned, no specific number, but we expect a demonstration that it's not just the people who are applying for membership, for instance.

We were going to explicitly ask for, why do they want to become part, but be an ICANN ALS? Until now, we have tended, certainly going back in history, we have tended to recruit organizations that had an interest in the Internet, and since we presume they have an interest in ICANN, which often has not proven to be the case, we want to know how, what their online presence is, and we want them to certify that they do understand the commitments going forward.

So like to open the floor right now. Is this sufficient? Are there other things that we should be potentially adding? Is there anything here which should not be there?

Judith, I know you had been talking about new criteria for membership. Is there anything on your list that is not here, that you believe you want to raise?

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, but I'm on a train right now. So I can't speak up as much [inaudible], but I can take it in chat [inaudible] I want to... Just in regards to some of your questions also is that, what other constituencies at ICANN are they involved with?

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. That's a good point to add to our potential list. If I could ask staff to take notes as we go along on the items that we're adding to this list, I would appreciate it. Or at least somebody take notes so we can keep going. So a question in what other ways are they involved in ICANN, through other parts of ICANN?

Now, Judith I presume we're talking about the ALS, not necessarily individuals. Because I think individuals have their own life, and many individuals are multiply linked, and we're certainly not in a position to ask everyone who is a member of that organization to identify where they are.

Now, the thing that will come up once we ask that, and it's not part of this section directly, but the question is, if indeed the organization is a part of, let's say, the NCSG, then should there be any restrictions on voting? Certainly if you look within the GNSO, there are rules between some of the stakeholder groups that if you are a member of, for instance, the registry and registrar stakeholder groups, which is quite valid, you cannot vote in both of them.

---

You have to pick where it is you cast your vote. So we may want to consider something like that. Yes, Alberto, go ahead.

ALBERTO SOTO:

Thank you. Alberto Soto speaking. Thank you Alan. I think there is something that we should be defining in terms of ALS or individual ALS member participation. I understand that any ALS may participate wherever they want, or wherever they can, or whatever their knowledge enables them to. However, there are some cases, I can tell you about those cases, of ALSs that have not participated in monthly meetings or webinars in the last two or three years, or their participation has not been so frequent, or maybe in the last year or year and a half.

So my understanding is that within the RALO, we can speed up the decertification process, although we do try to be as inclusive as possible. But for example, if I have... I mean, this is what I would need. I need an ALS to participate in at least one meeting. That's why we are thinking of metrics.

So, is there any way we could use a new metric or kind of metric, or start using it, for example we think about three people. Maybe we can start requiring a certain threshold of attendance at a RALO meeting, for instance. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Alberto. We're going to be talking about that in the next section on ALS expectations. Right now, we are just looking at the

---

criteria to join, to become an ALS. But that is, those things are on the list to be discussed in the next section. So let's, we'll defer the question for a few moments. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. I had a question, I guess, or [inaudible] anybody else that has been in the non-contracted parties house, which is where most of our ALSs are, most of the ALSs that are both in the GNSO and in At-Large are located. Is there voting actually taking place in the non-contracted parties? Is there formal voting taking place?

ALAN GREENBERG: Certainly if you are a member of various councils, you vote. I don't think in general there is, but maybe somebody who is actually a member can actually advise us on that. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks. Only in terms of elections.

ALAN GREENBERG: Only in terms of elections. So the answer is yes, there is voting for elections, not policy. But elections are what allows you to elect your leaders, so that is voting indeed.



---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so it's Olivier speaking. And the reason why I am asking this question is because I think that the rules in the GNSO, that I understand, or that when it comes down to voting, you cannot have the same organization being able to do what they call this double dipping, as such. But when it comes down to discussions and so, then I think that there is no...

Well, it looks as though there is no rule per se. So do we want to introduce restrictions on ALSs that are already part of the GNSO? I'm not sure. What we do need though is to make sure that people are on the ALAC, or who are regional leaders, so chairs, vice-chairs, secretariats, of RALOS would not assume a GNSO council position. I'd imagine that probably could be a conflict, or maybe a stakeholder group leadership position might also be a conflict.

I'm just throwing this out on the table, whether it's something that we might wish to discuss. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, ALAC positions or liaison positions, that's something that we would want to consider for changing our rules of procedure. We currently have no such prohibition right now. And indeed, that's something we should be discussing. But I don't think that's an ALS issue, from my perspective.

Now an ALS participating as a voting member of another group at the same time as they are voting for, you know, leaders within RALOs and things like that, that may indeed be considered double dipping, and I think it's a valid thing for us to discuss. I don't feel very strongly about

---

it, but I think it's something we do need to make a formal decision on.  
Yes, Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Let's go with Tijani first.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Hello?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, Tijani? Please, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. Tijani speaking. Indeed, Alan, I think that to be on the ALAC and on another constituency, doesn't disturb a lot if there is not an issue of voting. If there is not an issue of taking decision. So I propose that we accept any ALS, even if they are already member of any other constituency, but when we come to voting, any ALS which is also part of another constituency, should not take part in the decision making. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Tijani, as a follow-on to that, how would you count them? Would you simply reduce the number of ALSs for the purposes of things like quorum? Or would you count it as an abstain?

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: No. We need to reduce the quorum.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Because, okay, okay. Go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. So the suggestion is that, that indeed the way that we're going right now is double voting would not be allowed, or they could opt to not vote in the other organization. So they have to choose which it is that they're going to be able to exercise their power on, I presume. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Cheryl for the record. I'm quite not so concerned about this double dipping business [inaudible]. I'm stretching my memory banks here, [inaudible] if there is a situation, perhaps something is a highly contentious matter about new gTLDs, [inaudible], where, an At-Large structure, not an individual, an At-Large structure, would be called to indicate a formal vote on anything that would be overlap the At-Large work, the [inaudible] work, or indeed, the ALAC work, and that [inaudible], the GNSO, the [inaudible]...

...from time to time because we may have At-Large structures who have quite clearly held public views on numbering and number resource

---

distribution, for example [IPv6 rollout?], that would be [inaudible] more than one space in ICANN. But I don't know, where is this double dipping ever likely to happen between our part of the organizations and other? Where this would be anything that transparently can't account for?

So if you know that an At-Large structure is involved [inaudible]...

I'm just, I'm convinced that we're not [inaudible]... we are talking about criteria for joining [for heaven's sake?]. I don't know.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you. To rephrase that, I gather some people had a hard time hearing you. If I can summarize. You were raising the question of, are there really real conflicts between an ALS and being a member of At-Large and some other group? Given that ALSs do not tend to vote directly on policy related issues.

They do select, help select leaders, however, and that could be construed as a [inaudible]. I think it's not a simple question, and I think it's one of the issues that we do have to question about. Certainly, under criteria, we are asking, are you a member of someone else? And that's a reasonable question to ask, I think.

We've now drifted in... Sorry?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

That's transparency, yes.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And the [inaudible] of individuals in their statements of interest, yes, that's okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Cheryl. We've now drifted into, what do we do with the information? And that's really not membership criteria. So it's a good discussion that we need to have, but I don't believe it's one that we need to have right now, unless we are planning to say, if you are a member of something else you cannot be a member of At-Large, and I don't think I've heard anyone say that.

So I think it has raised an interesting question of operational rules, which wasn't on our list of things to consider but clearly we have to. But I don't think it addresses the criteria issue, since I don't believe anyone has said that you could not join because of it. Anything else that is not on this list, that people think is something we should...?

This is not the last kick of the can, but it's pretty close to the last. So if anyone here has any strong feelings about other criteria that are missing, then I think it's probably a good time to pop up. Nathalie, yes, please.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you Alan. I just wrote a note about it in the chat. It was more, I think, regional restrictions in a way that, when an ALS applies, the

---

application form, one of the first points is what they or their [inaudible] belong to. And this works fine in [inaudible], it doesn't in some other cases, in which, you know, staff has had discussions and discussions with legal.

We decided that given that the other criteria for ALSs were largely met as, [inaudible] this way of allowing entrance, we would go with RALO belonging is where the leadership at the time of the application is based, which is [inaudible] the least. I'm just thinking of this in terms of the ISOC disability and special needs ALS, which was [inaudible] I think, 18 months or two years ago.

So what I would like to ask is, would there be a way of, if an organization has no regional restriction, is there a way to either waiver this for the specifically particular ALS? How do we go about it? Or is it a reason to dismiss [inaudible], which, on a completely personal level, I think would be a huge shame.

ALAN GREENBERG:

That's an interesting point. Thank you for raising it. Our current rules say you belong to a region where the majority, I think it's the majority, but I'm not 100% sure of that, of your members reside. I can't remember if it's citizens of or reside. And in general, for the longest time, we said if you're really cross-multiple regions, then you cannot join.

We modified that sort of on the fly to say essentially wherever you're headquartered, if you have people who are spread over many regions, would be reasonable. I think that's an issue that we do want to capture

---

here, and we may well want to change it. I think that's a good idea, and I'm not going to try to define, on the fly, what the rules should be, but I think that does have some merit.

We did, for those who don't know, have a query, it never came through, but we had a query from an ALS that was physically situated in Latin America, and in fact, in Central America, but whose members were all North American. And I believe, now that I say this, I believe our current criteria is in fact citizenship. So that would have qualified as a North American ALS, and in fact we discussed that with Latin American Caribbean and they agreed, although I don't believe they actually ever applied. Yes Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And I have a question on the ALS criteria. Should we ask whether they also have a referee of some sort? I'm not saying this is a requirement, but it could certainly be considered a plus if it could have a position where they could say, you know, add a reference from an already existing ALS.

As in, this is going to be a peer reviewed level of trust, having appeared already supporting this would be helping. At the moment, we're working with a peer only in the region of which the ALS or the applicant is applying for, since the first step is for the other ALSs in the region to respond, and it might be that some organizations could have a peer elsewhere, or even a well-known person, or somebody on the Board, or somebody in the ICANN community. Just a thought. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Olivier. I don't disagree, but I think that's really under DTA, under Nathalie's design team of the application process. And I suspect there is a whole bunch of other things that we should be asking on the criteria, but not may be a deciding point. And I suppose the other membership is also in that category.

So if we're not going to use it formally as a criteria, but simply as informing us, I think it's probably, we should defer adding that right now, and putting it under the DTA discussion. I think we should capture it here, but I don't think it has to be, it wouldn't be a criteria as such, but in retrospect, the whole issue of membership in other organizations also falls into that category. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Alan. Do you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, well.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Do you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes we do.



---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I hear you Olivier, and I think it is a good idea if it is not a requirement, if it is not a criteria for certification. Because a very bad experience in that, I was asked... I gave a recommendation for one ALS, because I knew the leader. I have known him since there was [inaudible] society, and I strongly encouraged the certification of this ALS.

But it was a [catastrophe?] after that. So it is only [inaudible] is good. If it would be a criteria, I don't think we have to go advocate. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tijani. Go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. This is not a response to Tijani, this is another question I'd like to ask. But this one on [inaudible], the ALS criteria, I note that Maureen has mentioned in the chat, that there is a discussion going on at the moment on one of the ISOC mailing lists, and there is someone speaking in the background.

Anyway, so there is a discussion going on in one of the ISOC lists about the recent application that we've given the green light to. And one of the concerns was that there was some significant commercial components behind them, both industry but also government. And we have had that question being asked in some applications. If a membership is composed of those individual members, but also with a significant organizational membership with industry behind it, what do we do?

---

Is that a criteria that stops them from applying? Or is it something that...? And so far, we've not quite put it on paper, so every RALO has been looking at it in a different way than they were evaluating the applications.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Olivier. I guess I beg to differ, it is on paper. Industrial and/or government participation is allowed, but, and I believe the words we used is, the organization must be largely led by individuals. Maybe controlled, I don't remember if it was led or controlled. So, if indeed, the organizational members are not calling the shots, and making the decisions, and electing the leaders, then it is valid.

If they are, then it is not. And in the example given, the Internet Society of China, I didn't do the due diligence, I hope we did it properly both within the region and staff, and that, at least, in what they said that they did meet the criteria that we're satisfied. So if they did not, and we allowed them in anyway, then we have a problem. But that is pretty well documented. Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Alan, it's Olivier speaking. Thank you for this answer. Now there is an ambiguity here, because what I have heard on some prior discussions in some of the RALOs, was whether the chair of the organization actually comes from the commercial side. Does that preclude the organization, even though it fits the criteria you provided just now? Does that preclude the organization from joining?

---

It's all this thing about controlling the direction of the organization. I don't know how we can resolve this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I would have a great deal of difficulty if an organization is in or out because of who their current chair is. As long as the chair is elected by a group which is largely composed of individuals, I personally don't have a problem with that, and I can think of specific examples in our community, where a longstanding community examples where the chair is in fact, an industry member wearing one of his hats.

Remember, we're going back to the situation where in many parts of the world, there are not a lot of people who are active. And almost everyone wears multiple hats. Tijani and then Cheryl.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you very much Alan. Tijani speaking. I think it is not controlled by governments or by financial interests. And I think that the same will apply, no, not the same. I don't think that if the chair comes from a company or even from the government, you may have someone who is working with a government, but on a NGO, NGO working for the interest of the end users.

We will not prevent them to be an ALS because the NGO, the mission of the NGO is the defense of the end users' interest. So even if the chair is coming from the government or from the industry, I don't think it is a problem. I will say that, [inaudible] are for the [inaudible] things. When

---

we say they don't have to be controlled by governments, I will mean formally because we cannot know what is behind it.

So they don't have to be formally controlled by the industry or by the governments. This is only what we can do. And with the practice, we may know, or we may concern that it is true or not. That's all. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. You're quite correct. If we exclude organizations which might surreptitiously be controlled by the government, we will be excluding a fair number of countries. Cheryl, and then I would like to close the discussion so we can go on to expectations. Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Thanks Alan. Cheryl for the record. Indeed, I agree totally with Tijani's points there, and your information, you would be excluding enormous swages of emerging and developing economies, and certainly within the Asia-Pacific region would be impossible.

Again, this is a transparency is important. This is not criteria issue as far as I'm concerned. It is a transparency issue. And I could go check about that, I suggest, that not everybody who was feeling paranoid is justified. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Cheryl. For the interpreters, if there was a problem understanding Cheryl, I heard her quite clearly. She's basically agreeing

---

with the past speakers and saying that it is an issue of transparency. We want people to declare things, but we can't control what goes on undercovers within a country, and nor should we even try to do that.

Any final comments? Seeing nothing, then I think to summarize, we have added a number of things which are largely not absolutely criteria but for information in the process, and I think, so we'll take that into account in DT A, but I don't think we've really added anything in this particular section. So we're going to go ahead pretty as it was before.

And now going on to DT E please, it's the same document it's just the next page. Oops, okay. Thank you very much. All right. The items we've had before, these are all from previous lists. So we want some level of annual report, I know we've been told by some RALO representatives, that if we ask for any form of annual report, they'll simply never do it.

I think that's a good indication that they're not willing to do a lot, and maybe that is a good reason for not having them. Now by expectations, we are talking about things that we expect people to do to be able to continue to qualify as an ALS. We want to be able to send out specific information on a monthly basis perhaps or on a subject basis, and we expect ALSs, perhaps with some qualifications of whether it's of interest to them or not, to redistribute this to their members.

So in other words, we want real communication going out to their members, reminding them that ICANN is around and what they're doing. We want the ALS to not be ashamed of the fact that they're an ALS. So their website, Facebook presence, whatever, should make

---

reference to the fact that they're an ALS, and you know, we can decide in detail what it must say. But again, it shouldn't be a stealth ALS as some are right now.

We have had situations where people applied in North America, applied to be individual members because they didn't know that an organization they are a proud member of was an ALS. And we're not talking about small organizations, we're talking about large ones. So, we want ALSs to, on a regular basis, if we say we are going to be looking at some subject, new gTLDs for instance, that we want that information to be discussed within the ALS, and if it is applicable to their particular ALS, that we solicit input from the ALS.

And they should be required to respond to specific requests, be it surveys or whatever, reasonable requests from RALOs. The ones that have been added recently, and the question is, to what extent do we want to add these as criteria? And I think some of them are interesting.

Many of our RALOs, perhaps all of them, have had a voting requirement. But some RALOs don't do an awful lot of voting. So the question is, to what extent do we want someone voting once a year, to be considered active? So maybe voting should be there, but to what extent does it really important? The other question that comes up in this list is, should these be At-Large wide issues, or should they be something that a RALO decides to add on their own volition?

And right now, the criteria for participation in RALOs are largely RALO driven, not At-Large driven. The other one that has come up a number of times is monthly, participation in monthly teleconferences, and I've

---

heard comments that range from, if you don't come to half of the monthly meetings, and I'll add an editorial comment. No matter how boring they are, that you cannot continue to be a member. On the other hand, there are ALSs that have contributed things to our organization, but don't come to the monthly meetings.

And the question is, should that be a reason for ejecting them, or should there be some more subtle metric which factors in other things? Should we have a grace period? That is, some of these criteria, these expectations don't kick in immediately because we know there is a building time?

Should participate in webinars, working groups, regional statements or whatever, how do we count those? Should there be a requirement...? You know, you don't have to do these to stay as a member, but you can't travel without them. And then we need to define what inactive means to help guide RALOs in terms of decertification process.

And we have a queue, so I'll go to Judith first.

Can't hear you Judith.

Judith, cannot hear you. I see you asking the question, what do I mean by a steal ALS? A stealth ALS is one that [inaudible] is an ALS, but we never see them.

All right, let's go to Cheryl first and we'll try to get Judith online. Staff can figure out if she is on the bridge or not. That would be appreciated. Cheryl, go ahead.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thanks Alan. It's Cheryl for the record. I'm just a little concerned here with what we seem to be sitting in some of these expectations, is going to be very blurry between individual performances and actual At-Large structure commitment and performance. I'm not saying how right or wrong that is, but it seems to me that this [listing], quite literally can be performed by an individual without any real impediment on the At-Large structure being vibrant and healthily involved with ICANN.

You know, are you going to have some sliding scale whereby a proportion, and I'm saying this not tongue in cheek, but with terror and dread, a proportion of one's memberships have to perform any and/or all of these expectations?

You've got to be very careful what you wish for here. It can be an awful lot of well-meaning intentions ending up in slippery slopes. I certainly think that flexibility is going to be essential. I have no problem with things such as they've been put forward by regions like AFRALO in the past, whereby inability to have an At-Large structure represented in a number of things including a proportion of meetings, etc. and votes, if and when they're called, effect other things such as the ability to hold future votes, or to be classified as a level of activity, active or inactive, or indeed for consideration for travel slots.

But flexibility is going to be key here. And I do agree Alan, we've had extraordinarily valuable input from individuals as well as in the name of groups as At-Large structures, from entities which don't, for whatever reason, frankly give a damn about moving up to RALO meetings, which can be, quite honestly, as irrelevant as to their own core businesses and criterias.



---

That should be a reason to call on them for some input or activities, but they're there. It's just that they don't turn into forming [inaudible], and I can't really fault them for that. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. To summarize, Cheryl pointed out number one that we need to be very careful about criteria, claiming criteria for an ALS when in fact, one person can satisfy it. And in fact, we know, with our current group of ALSs, that many ALSs only have one person. And does one person actually participating even fervently participating, actually mean their ALS is active or not?

And that's a really good question, I don't have the answer. The second thing is that ALSs, and I'm going to paraphrase what Cheryl said, but ALSs come in different flavors. And some may be very useful contributors, but really don't care about attending meetings because there is just very little intersection between what they do and what happens at those meetings. So I think those are all important things.

I really don't, I don't know the answers, but I do think we have to consider it. Judith, you're next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG:

We can.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Oh great. So I figured out the mute button. So my question is, on the ALS, I like the idea... I think we need to [inaudible] on the participation, that it's not a majority of the meetings, but maybe at least one-quarter of all [quorums], unless they have a conflict for some reason. They could be active in a working group too.

And maybe they just can't meet the calls because the time is bad for them. But if we see some activity of the ALS, either in the working group or in other areas, I think that is, can be used for voting as well. And then I also like the idea of, is of an ALS is [inaudible], but it could be active, I should think that that is really what counts, as opposed to a larger ALS is not very active at all.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Judith. I guess one of the things as we carry this discussion forward to remember, is the list at the top of the page, that is things like regularly redistribute things we get, they get from ICANN, give feedback. Those are things we're not doing today. We're not sending them things to redistribute. We're not telling them they have to redistribute.

Today the only measures we have had of are the alive is, do they come to meetings or do they vote? Or do they come to a regional assembly? If we are going to have more really real substantive work to do, there may well be ways we can gather a sense of being alive without having to have the meeting attendance or voting.

---

If we're going to go ahead with the first items, we're adding a whole new perspective to the way that we might be able to monitor or measure activity. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. Tijani speaking. I think that the most important metric of the activity of an ALS, is its activity on the ground. And we are not talking about that. This is something which is the most important, in my point of view, because an ALS which doesn't have an existence on the ground, is not an ALS at all. It is only a structure to be a member of ICANN, and it's not, there is no interest in it.

I think the, not the criteria, the metric of the activity, the most important one is the activity on the ground. And this we can also ask for, not only report a real, how to say, program at the beginning of the year and the report at the end of the year.

We can also ask to invite us, to invite some of the other ALSs or some members of the RALOs or some members of the ALAC, to attend those activities. This is the way to know if we had really ALSs, or if we have only main. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Tijani. Interesting comments. I'm not quite sure how we implement it, but I like to pursue that. Yrjo.

Yrjo, go ahead.

---

He says the microphone is showing he's talking, but I'm not hearing anything.

We're still not hearing anything, but the Adobe Connect microphone does say it's hearing something.

It is now muted.

YRJO LANISPURO: Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Now we can hear you.

YRJO LANISPURO: Okay. Thank you. I'm sorry. The many ALSs are also something else. That is to say, for instance, ISOC chapters, and then we may talk about their activity on a local level, and it's mainly in many cases, ISOC chapters. And that being an ALS is their interface to the At-Large, so that is, I think it's very difficult to impose any, you know, one size fits all requirements on attendance of meetings and so on and so forth.

I think that the most important of these expectations, is actually that whether we can get the, whether we can use the expertise that is available at the ALSs, whether that can be used for the advice drafting and other substantial work that we are supposed to do, and I might just add that in EURALO, we're actually trying to go a bit further in the implementation of recommendation 28 of ATLAS 2 in that we should try

---

to find out what kind of expertise is there in the ALSs, so that we can actually ask these people directly for their input when such items come up, where they can help. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. That's, I think, a really good intervention.

Other comments? Well, if I can try to summarize where we are then. It's quite clear that we want active ALS activity in the ALS, and we want potential contributions. It is far less clear that the kinds of metrics that we've been using before are any measure of that activity. Certainly voting and attendance at a monthly meeting, where you might not be saying anything, but you simply dialed into the meeting, does not seem to be an indication that you are a contributor.

And either contributing to our processes, or taking the information from ICANN and making it widely available, I think are what we're looking for. So I think we need to do more work on this one. But I think we're starting to identify what isn't going to work. Several people have said we need flexibility, and flexibility, of course, is at odds with rules that we originally follow and can be said to be following our rules, and that's one of the criteria that often gets used in saying, are we being fair or not?

So I think we still have some work to do on this, but I think we're making some headway in terms of understanding where we're going to go in the future. Tijani, go ahead.

---

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you Alan. The flexibility is not, for me, is not respecting the rules, or be flexible with the rules. The flexibility should be in the rules. I mean, we have several kinds of activities that ALS may have, such as on the ground activities that as contributing in our work, adopting the statements, attending the meetings, etc. discussing, etc.

So all of those metrics can be used as a compilation. So if you have, if you want, an average, I don't know, X% of all of those, you are active. If you don't have it, you are not active, that's it. So it is the flexibility, you may not be active on the ground, but you are very active in drafting statements, and contributing in our work, etc.

And you may not attend all the monthly calls, but you can be on some working groups, etc. So this is, if you want, we have to find the formula to, a flexible formula so that people who are active, even if they are not active in everything, they may be active, they may have the status of active. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much. I ask that to be captured, because I think that's really an important issue. It's not failure to meet a single criteria, but it's not meeting any of them. I'll ask the question that Cheryl asked though, and I don't necessarily want an answer, but I think we have to think about it. How do we recognize an ALS that's active from one individual that's active? And does it matter?

Up until now, we've basically said that's good enough. You know, we have done what we called surveys with ALSs, and were quite happy that one person responded. So the real question is, to what extent can we

---

demonstrate that there is a real ALS there as opposed to one warm body? And then I think it's one of the things one has to come to grips with as we move forward.

All right, I'd like to go on to just the next items. The meeting is almost over, but I want to identify what they are. There is a section of RALO expectations, what do we expect RALOs to do? Now, we've said in some cases we are going to do communication directly from At-Large staff on a monthly basis, to the RALOs, or directly to the ALSs. Do we have particular expectations of RALOs, other than to conduct regular meetings?

And you know, some RALOs are very active, others have done almost nothing in terms of, you know, demonstrating activity. And as example, North America, for the last number of months, has had a monthly newsletter, which I think has been a very effective vehicle to demonstrate what's going on and help other people understand what's going on.

So the real question is, do we expect RALOs to have specific activities? Latin American Caribbean has had, on occasion, working groups looking at specific issues, preparing statements. So again, we're almost out of time, but I would like people to think and contribute on the list in the next day or so.

This will be on the ALAC meeting tomorrow, so anything that you get to us prior to the ALAC meeting, which is tomorrow morning my time, will be incorporated into what we present to the ALAC. So I would appreciate anything you can do on that.

---

The last section on this is staff expectations. We've been talking about a monthly what's going on type briefing. Briefing documents on particular subjects that are of interest. And when I say briefing documents, we're talking something that is in a language that, you know, non-techno speak language that people might be able to understand and decide whether they're interested or not.

And if we are going to have specific metrics and things to track, then I think we expect staff to take responsibility for some of that, but clearly we have to define what that is first. Any comments on this?

No? Go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Alan. It's Olivier speaking. I'm just putting my hand up for the any other business.

ALAN GREENBERG: Then if nobody has any more comments on the substantive issue, then we're on any other business.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Alan. Olivier speaking. And one thing which has fallen through the cracks was a request from the RALO secretariats to pass ATLAS 2 recommendation 43 to this taskforce working group, whatever you call it. I'm going to put a link on the agenda chat, on the Adobe Connect chat.



---

That recommendation says RALOs should engage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements. And the secretariats felts that is a good fit with the ALS criteria and expectations work. So I was just going to alert you to this, and hopefully that would be accepted and I'll be happy to hear your feedback on this. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. To read it for those who haven't looked. It says, RALOs should encourage their inactive ALS representatives to comply with ALAC minimum participation requirements. Well, to start with, I would claim that is improperly worded. It's not the inactive representatives that we're worried about, it's the inactive ALSs. So but, I think that's basically everything we're talking about.

Clearly, you know, the recommendation says RALOs should encourage, but I think it's a combination of RALOs should encourage, ALAC should encourage, and we need to put in place processes by which we can ensure that the ALSs are active.

So I think implicitly we are covering this. The exact mechanisms, I think, should be interesting. Any other comments on this? This one comes right on to the empty list that we have of RALO expectations. Yes, go ahead Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much Alan. It's Olivier speaking. And I'm glad to hear your response here. So in order to, for the ATLAS 2 implementation

---

taskforce to be able to close this recommendation, I think that this recommendation can at the moment say, pending the work of the current taskforce that you are chairing, and perhaps as a closing point, when the work will be finished, it will be interesting to link to the report of this working group, which will basically say what expectations are needed and so on, and how these will be enforced, etc.

That would certainly be a great way to closet his one off in the future.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Thank you Olivier. On the RALO expectations, I'll also point out there are expectations that are maybe not as clear as they should be, in the various memorandums of understanding, the RALO is fine with ICANN. And I guess as part of this, we should summarize what those are, and decide whether those are still relevant and the right ones are not. So I'll take that upon myself to make sure that gets done for tomorrow.

Any other questions?

Olivier, I assume that's an old hand? Yeah. All right, I thank you very much. I will try to summarize, by late today, what has come out of this meeting. And it is an agenda on the ALAC meeting tomorrow, so I encourage everyone on this call to, if you can, make that meeting, if you weren't otherwise going to be there. And we'll continue that. We don't have a lot of time to discuss it, but it will be raised and there will be a much more extensive discussion on it in Marrakesh.

---

And we may or may not come to closure there, but I'd like to get an awful lot closer than we are today. Thank you all very much. And see you on the next call. Bye-bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**