

---

YESIM NAZLAR: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening to everyone. Welcome to the At-Large ALS Criteria and Expectations Taskforce call, taking place on Thursday, the 1<sup>st</sup> of September, 2016, at [inaudible]:00 UTC.

On the call today on the English channel we have Alan Greenberg, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Maureen Hilyard, Wolf Ludwig, Yrjö Lansipuro, and Judith Hellerstein. We don't have anyone on the Spanish channel. We have apologies received from Tijani Ben Jemaa, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, and Alberto Soto.

From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Nathalie Peregrine, Ozan Şahin, and myself, Yeşim Nazlar. Our Spanish interpreters today are Veronica and David.

Finally, if I could please remind everyone to state their names before speaking for the transcript and interpretation purposes.

Thank you very much, Alan. Over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Welcome to this meeting. First of all, is there any comments that anyone would like to make on the agenda?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, go ahead.

---

*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.*

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. I'm only on audio, so I really would appreciate if you could occasionally [inaudible] what's going on agenda-wise. I think that it's [inaudible] concerned. I have [inaudible].

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. The first substantive item on the agenda is a very quick review of our work plan. The next is to review what we currently have on criteria and expectations. There's a document that goes along with it, which you may or may not have seen. It is linked to the agenda. There's a brief item at the end on confidentiality of due diligence, which Nathalie would like to talk about, and then Any Other Business.

I will assume the agenda is accepted unless anyone has any quick comments. I'd like to onto the current status. Every time we meet in this group or when we meet as a committee of the whole within the ALAC, my gut feeling is, instead of making progress, we go backwards. We continue to review the same things over again, and we are just not getting to the point where we have something to approve and move forward.

I would like to change how we're doing things to some extent. When we look at the document in a moment, you'll see I have identified things as decided. They have not been formally decided, but through this meeting, I would like to close those out. We will of course go out to comment on the mailing list to make sure that people who aren't on this meeting do not have a problem.

---

For almost every one of them, there are people who disagree, but I think the ones I've marked as decided are ones that we generally agree on and I'd like to move forward.

We'll spend a little bit of time on ALS criteria. We still have a few questions to answer, but not major ones. The expectations are the ones where we really have not made a lot of progress in deciding what we expect of an ALS and how we recognize a good one. I'll have some introductory comments when we get to that section.

With that, my hope is that we can come to some conclusion with the limited number of people on this call, go out to the mailing list, get any other comments, do a revision, and have something to approve by the ALAC, either before Hyderabad, or at worse, in Hyderabad.

With that, if we could go to the document, please. All right – we have an echo that suddenly appeared. All right.

The bulk of items under criteria – as I said – I think we are pretty well locked-in on, but I will review them one by one. If anyone believes that they are radically wrong or that we are going in the wrong direction by doing that, then please speak up as we go ahead.

The first bullet is that there will be no change in the current concept of self-funding large organizational largely led by individuals. That is the basis for how we define an ALS, and I don't believe we've had any arguments to say that it should be otherwise in that.

Number two, we will require multiple contacts. Many of our RALOs right now only require a single contact. Some ask for a secondary one. The

---

history is very often that the secondary one is not necessarily a valid one because it doesn't get used and therefore doesn't get updated.

APRALO I was told, or we were told, has three contacts, and that has worked well. In fact, looking at the records of the RALOs, the three contacts is not something that is consistently done, or at least wasn't the last time I looked at the list of ALSes.

So we do have a question of whether we want two contacts overall or three. That's to be discussed later on. But I think the concept of multiple contacts kept up-to-date I think we all agreed on.

The contacts do not need to be the organizations leaders, but we need to know who the leadership is. Obviously, we have the option of checking with the leadership on whether this is indeed an application that has the support of the leadership.

The ongoing contact must have the ability to communicate with the members of the organization because one of the expectations we have is that they can send things out to their members. We expect them to describe how they're going to do that.

We will not specify a minimum size, but we certainly expect the size to be greater than just the list of the contacts of the organizational leaders. It's a judgment call on exactly what the right size is, however.

Currently there is a vague question on the application. Now there will be a more explicit one of just what is the intersection between their organization and ICANN. To a large extent in the past, we have simply presumed that, if an organization has an interest in the Internet, they

---

have an interest in ICANN. That has proven to be wrong in reality, and I think we want to try to flesh this out somewhat more.

They need to have an online presence. I don't think we really care whether it's a web interface or whether it's Facebook, or some other sort of social media. We may in fact want to be able to provide organizations with some sort of rudimentary homepage if they don't have something else. But they certainly must have one if they're going to be an active ALS. The application must say they agree to meet the expectations and ongoing responsibilities of an ALS.

Is there anyone who feels that any of these things are misdirected?

Then for the point of view of this group, we believe that they are decided it will be put out to the mailing list.

The number of items that could be discussed or not crucial ones that this point. At least some of them are not crucial. Some of them are. The number of secondary contacts: I think we need to look at our history and I will ask staff to make some recommendations there.

Number two, there has been discussions – Wolf, I see your hand; I'll go to you in a minute – of membership across various ICANN constituencies, particularly ALAC or At-Large and NCSG or parts of the NCSG. There has been concern expressed that individuals are taking a leadership role in both groups and may in fact be working against the interests of At-Large as we go forward. So this is a discussion that we need to have. It's not one we will have on this call, but it's something we need to resolve moderately quickly.

---

We have always had organizations that I won't say double-dip because that implies some negative. We've always had ALSes that are very prominent in running their ccTLDs. We've always had individuals who are members of NCSG. The question is, is there a problem and do we need to take any action because of it?

Wolf, go ahead.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Alan. Just a comment on the point of the number of secondary contacts because, over here at EURALO, this was a problem a couple of years ago, in some cases, even to find or identify a secondary contact.

I think, meanwhile, it could be solved, but even this was quite a hassle or an effort to find it. I think we shouldn't be too strict in this respect because, as long as the primary contact is reliable, as it was in various cases, then I think a primary contact is enough.

For my ALS, for Comunica, there is still at the moment only one primary contact, and that's me. I think, as long as a primary contact is reliable and responsive, etc., I do not really see the need for a secondary one.

In some cases, of course we had where primary contacts are not responsive. Then it's good to have a second member who can be contacted in urgent cases, like voting, etc. But I think we shouldn't be too strict on this point. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I see some comments in the chat. Would anyone else like to speak? I would like to keep this very brief right now. There is some

---

much more substantive things we need to talk about, and we're not about whether there is two or three contacts. The question is, should we require a secondary contact? Would anybody like to speak either to support –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan, Cheryl here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Very briefly, as you said earlier, APRALO has always requested three. We're talking about new ALSes here. Let's put the opportunity for three to be put down.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. We're not just talking about new. We're talking about existing. But you're saying the opportunity three, but not necessarily requiring three. My question right now is, do we require a second? I'm not agonizing over the third right now.

Harold, go ahead.

Do I have confirmation from the Spanish interpreter that Harold is talking?

---

VERONICA: Alan, this is the interpreter. I cannot here Harold Arcos on the Spanish channel.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you very much. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think it's mandatory that you need to have at least two. We've had a lot of problems when we only have one. People are not getting it. They're not passing on information. We need at least two people/contacts. So I support that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you. Harold, go ahead.

VERONICA: This is the interpreter. Just to confirm, we are not hearing Harold Arcos on the Spanish channel.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Harold, we still can't hear you. If you can speak later, we'll give you an opportunity. We'll move on otherwise.

I'll note that we do have a point of contention on whether we should have a mandatory second contact. I'll put that one on the list.

The other issue that will need to be discussed is the concept of cross-region ALSes. We currently have, I believe, only one right now. That one was admitted into North America because that's where the group is

---

headquartered. The rules do say an ALS must be controlled by people from within the region. That's in the Bylaws.

HAROLD ARCOS: This is Harold Arcos speaking. Can you hear me now?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Go ahead, please.

HAROLD ARCOS: Okay. I hope you can hear me okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, we can hear you.

HAROLD ARCOS: I just wanted to say that I believe it is important to have a secondary contact or even a third contact for RALOs because we have discussed in the past that we only have the participation of individuals, and therefore ICANN cannot guarantee that the information is shared among the members of the organization or among the Internet users in that region.

On the other hand, when it comes to the members of other constituencies, I believe it is important that we can review. We did this in the past. We need to emphasize, in fact, at least in our region, so that members of ALSes do not have other interests because, for that reason, the government, the technical community, and academia have their

---

own spaces for them. For example, businessmen have their own spaces. Their spaces are defined within ICANN, and they can work there. So –

ALAN GREENBERG: If I may interrupt, we are not discussing the multiple constituencies –

HAROLD ARCOS: If we have agreed on that, and if we take this into account, I believe it is important that, within At-Large, we have to work on the interest of Internet users.

So it is important to take this into account and to see if there are members coming from other constituencies and to review their vote or to restrict, somehow, their vote on certain issues.

Thank you very much, Alan, for your time.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Please, we are not discussing the multiple constituencies. It was simply noted as an item we will have to discuss.

The last one we will have to discuss but will not go into at this point is the cross-region ALSes, where an ALS does not have members exclusively within one region or largely within one region. Currently that is not technically allowed by the Bylaws. We have admitted one that falls into this category, and I think it's something we need to look at going forward, making sure that whatever we do is in accordance with the Bylaws. There's some good reasons why we might want such an ALS, but we do need to make sure it follows our rules.

---

I'd like to now go onto the next session of ALS expectations. The first item that I believe we have general agreement on – again, there are specific individuals who have vehemently disagreed on it, but I think we have general agreement – is that we need some sort of regular, whether it's annual or bi-annual (every two years) reports from the ALS confirming their contacts, confirming the ALS leadership, confirming giving some measure of the membership, major activities that they are doing, and linkages within ICANN as to why they are an ALS.

To the extent possible, we want to make this as easy as possible to do, but if they cannot spend five minutes describing what they're doing once a year, then I think we have a good reason to question how committed an ALS they are.

I'm going to pause after each of these because I think it's important that we have an opportunity for anyone who disagrees to say what they want to now, but again, briefly and concisely.

If I don't hear disagreement, I'm going to assume that this is decided by this meeting. We will pass it by the mailing list.

Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you, Alan. I was just wondering. A lot of ALSes – I know ours does – we try to put information about our own involvement in ICANN on our website, and it's usually included in our [AGM] report anyway. That goes online. So that's one way of getting that message across. Thank you.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I think that's already things that we're covering in further points, but yes.

Harold, I'm assuming that is an old hand, unless I hear otherwise. And the same with Maureen.

Heidi, did you have a question?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Yes, Alan. Briefly, I was just wondering who is to follow up with ALSes on the reports. And should these reports be posted on a public wiki?

ALAN GREENBERG: Whether they are public or not is a good question. I may suggest that we add that onto the To Be Discussed. I'm suggesting, as I wrote it, that it is initially a staff follow-up, but should staff not get any results, then it's RALO leadership who has to follow up one-on-one. Clearly, we will have to specify that in some detail, but that seems to be a reasonable order. It seems to me to be a reasonable order.

Next item – yes, go ahead, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Frantically trying to find the unmute button. Thanks very much, Alan. Did you just say that it was going to be either ICANN At-Large staff or RALO leadership that were going to report regularly on contacts, leadership, membership, major activities, and linkages with ICANN?

---

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Because that sounds like, for 200 ALSes – and in my region, certainly 25 or 30 ALSes – I would have thought that this was a responsibility of the ALSes themselves to do all this and for the monitoring of this to be undertaken by the RALOs ourselves. But not the actual reporting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Failure to report to be followed up by staff and RALO leadership.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Ah. Okay. I can't see that anywhere – ah, okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: It's the third line of the first bullet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well, I'm obviously blind. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. Next item. They are obliged to redistribute ICANN updates to their members. That presumes we are sending out ICANN updates to their members. That is something that I will be working with staff on and we are going to institute very quickly. We've been talking about this for a long time. I think it's time to put it into action.

---

Now, this will be linked to a discussion we'll be having in a few minutes of what is sufficient activity to be an active ALS. We'll come back to what extent we expect input from ALSes or to what extent we expect distribution of information about ICANN from ALSes.

The next bullet: they need to, unless they can – I guess we should have to phrase it carefully, but unless they can show cause why it is not appropriate, they need to reference the fact that they are an ALS prominently on their online presence, whether that's on their homepage or linked to it. But it shouldn't be impossible, as it is with many of our current ALSes, to find out that they are an ALS from their website.

Olivier, is that a new hand?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alan, it is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead, then.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. I'm fine with this records thing, but one would have to look at the details of this because I gather that some might use ICANN as a way to beef up their legitimacy locally, as others might not see this as being that important.

The reason why I'm asking this, obviously, is because we have ICANN-accredited registrars and registries and whatever, and they are able to

---

display the ICANN logo and things. I think there might be restrictions with regards to this. So in wording this, we'll have to be quite careful. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, and I think we will need ICANN agreement. But right now, many ALSes do say they're an At-Large ALS and display something on their website. I don't think anyone has ever said that's inappropriate. But clearly –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan. It's Cheryl. Briefly.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Go ahead, Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: As we discuss this further and not necessarily now, we could be very specific that At-Large Structures would have the right, or indeed a member, later, of a RALO, to display the At-Large logo, but not obviously the ICANN one.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. The details will have to be worked out and be explicit. There's no question. The question is, is there any reason why we believe someone should be able to be – "anonymous" is not the right word – incognito? That is, they're an ALS but they don't tell anyone about it. If there's

---

some reason why we need to allow that, then I think we need to bring that out into the open.

We've had too many cases – certainly in North America we've had a number of cases – of people who want to become individual members certifying that they are not a member of an ALS, when in fact, not only that they'd be a member of an ALS, they may be a leader of that ALS. And they don't know that it's an ALS. So I think there's something wrong at that point. All right. For that one, clearly the details will have to be worked out.

Next is: when specific issues are brought to an ALS's attention, ALSes – and that may be the contact person – need to evaluate whether this is one that they need to pursue and give us input or it's one that doesn't intersect with their particular interests. So, again, it puts the onus on somebody to duly consider issues as they come up.

Comments? Lastly, there is a requirement that, when we ask them a question, they answer, presuming, of course, that we are not being too annoying.

All right. The next: Things to Be Discussed. For these, again, we will not do any great –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes. Go ahead, Cheryl.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'm sorry to take you back. I didn't get my mute button off quickly again. That last one – just put an asterisk on that one. We need to come back to that a little later. The immediate question of who is asking what comes to mind. Overly diligent "RALO interrogation" may become an issue, for example. The At-Large Structure is accountable to the ALAC, or is it accountable to the RALO, or is it accountable to ICANN? We need to come back and [sleuth around] on that one again. That's all.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. That's a good point. Yjro?

YJRO LANISPURO: Thank you, Alan. I would like to add something here. I sent an e-mail to the list of this taskforce – the [DTE] Taskforce – on something in October. We were discussing this last time, and that is that the ALSes should participate in the Internet-related multi-stakeholder activities in their area, in their country, representing the end user [inaudible]. Various activities may be Internet governance forums – national, regional, or whatever. But I think it's important that the ALSes are part of the multi-stakeholder setting in each country or other area where they are active. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: That's an interesting comment. It intersects with one of our later points. I'll put it on hold until then. But I think it's an interesting point.

---

Some of the details we need to look at are not necessarily details. Wolf, we'll go to you in a minute. I'd just like to summarize what these are before we go ahead. There's a whole page of other issues that we have to look at, which are the really controversial ones. Whether want annual or biannual reporting, I would thinking annual is reasonable, but other people may have other opinions.

What level of activity is sufficient? That's not a detail, but we're going to have to come up with some way of recognizing activity or not. To what extent is voting part of the expectations? My personal feeling is that ALSes should vote if they have the rights. One expects them to vote on a regular basis if indeed the RALO has votes on a regular basis, but it should not count heavily to indicate that they are active.

To what extent should participation in monthly RALO calls, webinars, or other meetings be considered an activity? In fact, we don't right now even know how to recognize members of an ALS. We could have an ALS that is participating in lots of webinars, but they're not the representative. We don't even count that as something for that ALS. So that's an issue we're going to have to think about. We don't have the ability, and we're not going to have the ability, to ask for full lists of members. So it's something we're going to have to think about.

To what extent does participation of ALS members in ALAC and At-Large working groups constitute activity? Again, how do we know who a member is?

So those are things that, again, I don't want to discuss in depth right now, but they are going to be really critical issues in recognizing how we identify an active ALS.

---

I have two speakers, Wolf and Judith. And Nathalie. Wolf, go ahead.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks. I fully agree with the last point on reservations or reflections you made on how to measure involvement or participation. This really has to be looked at and discussed closer.

Let me come back to a point under the action items, Point 1, where it says: staff to send initial request for ALS reports; if no response, RALO leaders to follow up.

This in my opinion also captures the question – reports biannual – every year or every two years. Just as a practical consequence, I can tell you, if staff sends such an initial request to our EURALO ALSes, I risk any bet that there will be a no response quote of more than 80%. Most of them will simply ignore it or feel it as a new imposition.

The consequence would be then that the RALO leaderships have to follow up. I can promise you that this follow-up would mean for Olivier and me, at the minimum, one to two working days each. This is something that also has to be taken into consideration: the practicality of certain actions or things – this idea which in my opinion is a little bit far from being realistic. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. I will ask the general group – and we'll do it in our e-mail – if we are not going to expect some sort of annual input, how do we know they exist at all? And why should they bother being ALSes? Judith next.

---

WOLF LUDWIG: May –

ALAN GREENBERG: Wolf, let's do it online. But I want you to consider it. Judith, go ahead.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I do have a question on the level of activity. I think it's important in figuring out who is working on the groups. Maybe if they don't recognize the ALS, maybe the group leader or someone else can say – or the people going on the call find out from them what ALS they are in or what constituency they are in. That way, if our members are participating in events, they can be recorded. That way, it will be known.

But also I was wondering, with straw polls and the other voting: yes, I think any of these less formal polls also could be considered voting in that sense.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: So that's just my [thoughts]. Sorry about the...

ALAN GREENBERG: Nathalie, I think you were next. Then we'll go to Harold.

---

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Thank you, Alan. This is Nathalie Peregrine from staff. Just a remark regarding the fact that, if we do recognize primary contacts sometimes from new ALSes, the chances of us recognizing secondary contacts are remote.

One [status] we had was the formal and informal ALS welcome webinars that we held last year and that we're holding again shortly. We asked the new ALS primary and secondary contacts to sign into the Adobe Connect room with not the whole name of the ALS after their names, but at least the acronyms.

It didn't mean that they gave an instant visibility of instance [inaudible] very predictable from where which RALO most new ALSes came from, which were more active. I know it might be a hard habit to get onto – we've been logging in for years to the AC without having to do ALS acronyms – but in terms of visibility for new ALSes regarding older members and vice versa, this might be a key for you to see a snapshot during a conference call which new ALSes are participating or not without having to go through thousands of attendants sheets and comb through a lot of data.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I'll point out that checking who people belong to is easy if there's only a couple of them. If indeed we ever get lots of activity, we would have trouble with that.

Harold, go ahead, please.

---

HAROLD ARCOS:

I wanted to talk about the participation, the engagement. This is an aspect that is always leading us to the previous discussions on the subjectivity of these measurements.

If we have an ALS with various members, very probably among the various members, among the participation of various members, this ALS may be more active. But if we recognize involvement or participation of one member, that one member may find it's more difficult to have more spaces for participation.

So participation on the basis of how many appearances a member will have becomes something imbalanced because, in theory, the more members an ALS will have, the more participation it will have. So this is an aspect that is, once again, leading us to asking whether in ICANN we can recognize a member with the same weight and with the same capacity and voting ability than a group that is democratizing ICANN information to more end users.

In a different standpoint, I actually agree with what Olivier and Wolf have been saying because following up also implies reinforcing the RALO. However, at each RALO, we have a certain autonomy for the follow-up, for the monitoring, so with support from staff, we may create or build good work from the RALOs to identify who the ALS members are. Not every person, not any individual, can access a webinar or a talk on behalf of an ALS if they're not registered under that name. If they want to register, they need to be [inaudible] then that's fine. But if you are doing this on behalf of an ALS, then there should be a list including some kind of link where this person is mentioned.

That's all. Thank you, Alan.

---

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much, Harold. That last item could be problematic, but let me go on to the next subject I want to talk about.

We have worked on the presumption since the beginning of At-Large in the current format that one of our reasons we have ALSes is to have them contribute to policy development and other processes. That's being proven largely a target we cannot meet because the actual number of people that we have been able to get involved in the formulation of our statements, for instance, from ALSes, the input we've had from RALOs in general, has been very, very minimal.

I suspect that is not a fixable problem. I question at this point – my thoughts have evolved over the last number of months on this – whether the target in fact should be the only one. We have been talking about sending out monthly reports of what is going on in ICANN, requiring that this information be disseminated among the members of the ALS.

The question I'd like to ask this group is, to what extent is that indeed sufficient for being active? In other words, if we have a group on the ground who is regularly taking information about what ICANN is doing and what At-Large is doing – but specifically ICANN – and sending it out, and we make sure that information is palatable and acceptable to people, and they are distributing it to their members, it's essentially a broadcast facility. We're not necessarily expecting input on anything. But what they are doing is telling their part of the world what ICANN is, what ICANN is doing, and what the issues are.

---

It strikes me that, if we could in fact make that happen on a regular basis, we now have an organization on the ground in countries that are disseminating information about ICANN. I think we're doing our job at that point. It is really required that we get information back if we are a good dissemination facility on the ground? That's the question I'm raising.

Harold, I think that is an old hand. If not, I'll call you after Wolf. Go ahead, Wolf.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks again, Alan. I share most of the reservations or reflections you have done in your last point. I think I've been involved now almost ten years in EURALO and EURALO's leadership. I think I have a part [inaudible] about what is feasible, what is possible, and what is realistic or less realistic.

Therefore, I always argue that the definition of activity cannot only be in one way or respect, whether an ALS or all our ALSes may serve as an additional distribution channel for ICANN info or At-Large info to their respective audience.

If you really expect them being a distribution channel for ICANN info, I can clearly tell you that 80% of our members would not fulfill such a criteria. But to my understanding, this was not a major criteria in the past so far.

One of our main criteria for activity was whether an ALS is in a related net policy area – like privacy, like openness, or like, stability, etc., all which are essential for ICANN's policy – were active on the ground in

---

their country, whether they have good connections and good networks, and whether they participate in national IGFs, as you were mentioning, etc.

There are plenty of opportunities, and this would be my still major expectation of the European ALSes. I want to have and keep them busy on the ground, being an active in sense that is helpful for us, which is helpful in a user representation, typically, reflecting what the government is doing, what is done by the government in a wrong or a negative way, etc.

But I would not put down expectations on an ALS to be just a further distribution channel of ICANN policy or of ICANN's policy development. If we impose such new criteria, I could predict that the majority of our ALSes would fail, would object, etc., and this would bring us into some troubles. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Wolf. On the chat, Judith is saying that she doesn't know how we would monitor dissemination and that, in her mind, if someone does not participate in a working group, make comments, or be active on monthly calls – I don't know how you measure "active" – they are not a valid ALS.

We have some very different views here. If a group – and I'm questioning partly as a devil's advocate, but partly in reality – is active in something vaguely related to what we do – privacy or human rights or IGFs I think is related to what we do but not actively what we are doing – but they do not disseminate information about what ICANN is doing to

---

their members and they do not feed anything back into us, I find it hard to understand why they should be an ALS.

So, again, we really need some activity on the mailing list to bring these things forward. We're having some very different positions here on what people believe is active and how we recognize them.

Maureen, I see –

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah, go ahead, Cheryl. I see Maureen has a comment. Maybe she wants to speak, but Cheryl, go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I'd actually like to hear what Maureen's comment is first. It may be the same thing.

ALAN GREENBERG: All right. I will read it. "PICISOC is a unique umbrella. APRALO, ALS in the Pacific. The other four Pacific ALSes include members of PICISOC, so its e-mail list is used for disseminating ICANN information from any one of the ALSes to all PICISOC members." She's saying they're already doing that.

Go ahead, Cheryl.

---

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR:

Okay. Thank you. Look, Maureen and I and some others on this call have worked in a number of forums, looking at metrics and measurements and performance criteria for At-Large Structures and in their individuals, as well as leadership within RALOs and the ALAC. We're always going to have significant diversity of view on a number of key points because it's variability we have within our regions.

So it appears to me that what we have is probably going to be a set of hierarchical opportunities for interaction, some of which are less negotiable than others. But it may be that, of a list of seven things we would categorize as a demonstrably active At-Large Structure, one would expect no less than three and hopefully even up to seven of them to be ticked off on a checkbox, etc., etc.

So what we may end up with is a core group of identifiables, which could very well include the activity at the edge communities that they are residing in in the multi-stakeholder model, as both Yjro and Wolf have outlined as important, and I would suggest is also important for APRALO and probably vastly more important as to whether or not somebody does nothing more than their shopping or their banking at a monthly meeting. Our activities at monthly meetings are only one measure for our region, and certainly not a yay or nay one. Now, other regions might have different views.

So I suspect what we'll have is a set of expectations; some or all of which being met is a measure of one activity. But to represent the AFRALO views that I am aware of – the AFRALO view, of course is: if one ALS or member or member is less active, that is okay. They simply are categorized within the region differently. That difference often results in

---

the ability of the right to have a vote, if a vote is called, and the right or “reward” to pursue something, such as supported travel if we were having a summit.

So let’s still be flexible here and not get our knickers in a knot too much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you, Cheryl. I must say I’m not particularly in favor of multiple levels of membership, in that a group that does not participate in any way, that does not want to tell us once a year what they’re doing, that doesn’t attend meetings, that doesn’t contribute, and that doesn’t disseminate information – I’m not quite sure what the value of that group is.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Alan, if I may – I’m playing devil’s advocate now – if they are in a region where they use a vibrant multi-stakeholder model and they are active in theirs, I actually think that’s okay. So, as I said, two or three of those things might be barely negotiable. They might be absolutely essential. That’s yet to be determined. But let’s still allow for some flexibility.

ALAN GREENBERG:

I guess my question is, how do you recognize them? Other than having a Wolf who knows everything about every ALS and will certify that they are indeed active. I’m not sure that’s something we can legislate.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR:

Legislature and preference are vastly different ends of the spectrum.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Yjro, and then Olivier.

YJRO LANSIPURO: Thank you, Alan. I think that these ALSes are, well, different. Even within EURALO, there is 30-odd organizations, a picture of great diversity. One size does not fit all. So what I think is that, of course, there has to be some basic expectations that all ALSes have to [inaudible]. That threshold should now be rather low, but at the same time, we should try to, at the RALO level, develop the relationship interaction with ALSes that show more potential.

In EURALO, we're now actually engaged in an experiment, trying to get from the ALSes contacts who have special expertise and knowledge to participate in some of the At-Large policy-making/policy development advice. But that's pretty much what the RALOs have to do individually with each ALS. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We have one other topic I do want to cover before we close, just to introduce it. Olivier, you had your hand up for a moment. Did you want to speak? If so, briefly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks very much, Alan. I was in two minds on whether I should speak or not. I just wanted to add one thing. I've heard some faults here of people saying, "Well, ALSes can be active locally, but they don't necessarily need to be active with At-Large or with the ALAC and the

---

[inaudible] ALS.” I have a real concern with ALSes that do not carry out the ALAC’s mission. The ALAC’s mission is to go out there, is to act as a bridge with the end user. Therefore, an ALS, for me, needs to be active in a RALO. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

May I suggest that the EURALO leadership needs to come to a unified position?

All right. The other item I wanted to mention – we’re not going to have much time other than to mention it, but we will have to pursue it – is the issue of whether due diligence and the discussions about ALS certification should in fact be confidential. To what extent to we get active involvement from the RALO in making these decisions? If we have confidential information that we cannot make public, how do we do this? To what extent?

Nathalie, do you want to give a sentence or two about the issue and perhaps introduce things that might address it? We are short on time, so I’m putting you on the spot, I know.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE:

No problem. Thank you, Alan. I wanted to touch briefly on this, and it might be a discussion that’s much better led by a mailing list. We talked about this [inaudible] of due diligence and equally [inaudible] to come up with a RALO checklist, if you remember, reminding RALO leadership and the [inaudible] members that there is due diligence [which is translated] to RALO leadership [inaudible] on the RALO mailing list that

---

would be summarized by RALO leadership or by other means, as we've seen recently.

The next [cut] was that, in the ALAC Rules of Procedure [inaudible] – and I'll give you the text and I'll circulate the e-mail on the mailing list – it does mention that the discussions of the regional [inaudible] must be done by existing RALO members, but the comments must stop upon accreditation, but equally the comments must no longer be available after accreditation. I think the exact text says "No longer accessible after accreditation." So this means that any discussion that was taking place on the public mailing list on a wiki space therefore would not be conforming to the text.

So whether I'm reading too much into this or whether this is something we might want to think more on is something I'll be talking to you about on the mailing list very shortly.

Thank you, Alan. Over to you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay. Thank you very much. I think that's another one of these things that were are not accordance with what the Bylaws and other rules say right now, and we need to come up with something that fulfills the function and meets whatever the words are that we have associated with it.

I wish we had scheduled a longer time. We didn't, and we will reconvene again. I am going to go over the transcript and try to put a summary of what we're saying. At this point, in terms of expectations, we have some very different views here. It could be that, in some cases,

---

we have RALO-specific rules, but I worry that we may be moving in a direction where we have no demonstrable way of showing that an ALS is in fact doing anything related to ICANN or perhaps related to Internet governance, other than taking it on faith.

If we're in a situation where people will not report what they're doing – I'm willing to accept what they say – but they won't even contribute that, do not provide input to us, and do not disseminate information about us, then I'm wondering what the intersection is with ICANN. I think we're doing to have to tackle this.

I thank you all for participating. We're going to have to continue this, but we do have to come some level of closure, even if the closure is: it's a free-for-all, and we don't care. I suspect we do care, and moreover, with the At-Large review, the indications I've had from the reviewers so far is that they seem to think it's important also. Although we're not bound to do what they think, we will have to deal with any recommendations they make if indeed they're in that direction.

Any closing comments from anyone?

CHERYL LANDGDON-ORR:

Alan, it's Cheryl, very briefly. Remember, we still do have an opportunity to explore nexus and intersections and [inaudible] off some greater ongoing discussion on some of the specifics of these things. If we take a macro view out of this working group, your Metrics Working Group is just sitting on the back burner. We don't want trip over each other with this work, but some of these can of course can be continued within that fora.

---

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl, I agree completely. I think this group needs to set the ground rules, and the ALAC needs to approve that. If what we say is that we have a laundry list of seven ways that an ALS can be active, and as long as you're active in one of them or two of them or whatever we decide, you're active, then the Metrics Group can take over and try to put process around that.

But I think that –

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: That's all I was saying, Alan. I think we just need to not try to follow the ocean here.

ALAN GREENBERG: I'm agreeing with you, but at this point, we have diverse opinions that do not give the Metrics Group the tools it needs to start putting the details on. We need to come to closure on that, or decide that we don't have any rules, and then the Metrics Group clearly doesn't have anything to do.

CHERYL LANDGON-ORR: Yeah, right. Thank you, Alan. Thanks, everybody.

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, to be clear, if what we say is, "You have to apply. You don't have to meet a lot of criteria, and once you've applied you're an ALS for life

---

and we're not allowed to question that," then the Metrics Group doesn't have much to do.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Well, Alan, apart from anything else, just remember that even the founding At-Large Structures, the signatories to the MoUs in each of the regions, have signed up to agree to a basic set of mission [precedences], and it does include a communication, two-way, and the opportunity for input into ICANN policy development processes and other practices. So we do have a baseline.

ALAN GREENEBERG: Yeah. We have the opportunity. The question is, what is mandatory? More discussion in the future. I will try to do justice to this call. Please respond on the mailing list and tell me where I got it wrong. If you have any insight as to how we go forward from this, please contribute it. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, everyone. Bye.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**