

ALS Criteria and Expectations – 01 September 2016

ALS Criteria – DT-C

Decisions:

- No change in current self-funding, largely individual led criteria
- Multiple contacts identified (primary and two? secondary – see below).
- Contacts do not need to be organization leaders, but application must have leadership knowledge and support (confirmation by applicant - with contact info for possible verification)
- Ongoing contact must have ability to communicate with organization membership (linked to operational expectation to re-distribute information from Staff and RALO).
 - Methodology to be used described in application
- Minimum size not specified, but expected to be greater than just contacts and/or organization leadership (judgement call needed to decide if appropriate in individual case).
- Must explain intersection between interests of organization and ICANN.
- Have an online presence (web, Facebook). (ICANN potentially to make basic site available)
- Certification - understanding of Commitments and Expectations

To Be Discussed:

- Number of secondary contacts
- If a member of other ICANN constituency
 - Limitations, restrictions on voting? Impact on Quorum.
 - Limitations, restrictions on individuals from ALS in leadership positions,
- Cross-Region ALS
 - Belong to region where headquartered, or member plurality (at time of application?)
 - Voting?
 - Limit on number per region?
 - ICANN Bylaw implications.

Operational Expectations – DT-E

ALS Expectations

Decisions:

- Report regularly (see below) on contacts, leadership, membership, major activities and "linkages" with ICANN (ie why they are an ALS). To the extent practical, this reporting process will be streamlined and easy. Failure to report to be followed up by staff and RALO leadership
 - Contacts, leadership
 - Membership
 - Major activities
 - Linkages with ICANN
 - Confirmation they still meet criteria and fulfilling obligations
- Redistribute regular ICANN updates to its members (these updates will be created by staff but might be augmented by the RALO)
- Reference ICANN and At-Large prominently on its website (or Facebook or whatever), either on its home page, or on a secondary page which is obviously linked to the home page (such as a pointer for group memberships or affiliations).
- When specific issues are brought to the attention of ALSes, each ALS should evaluate whether they can contribute or not, and if they can ALS members should be involved.
- Respond to specific requests from the RALO as needed.

To Be Discussed:

- Annual or bi-annual (every 2 years) reporting?
- What level of activity is sufficient?
- Is voting an expectation? (clearly not sufficient to alone qualify as “active”)
 - Is participation in less formal polls considered voting?
- To what extent should participation in monthly RALO calls, webinars and other meetings be considered a measure of activity?
 - How do we know a person is a member of a specific ALS?
- To what extent does participation of ALS members (not necessarily leadership) in ALAC and other ICANN WGs constitute activity?
 - How do we know a person is a member of a specific ALS?

Possible At-Large-wide ALS Expectations and Related Issues

- Need to move from presumption that the contact is the ALS. How do we even recognize ALS member participation?
- Monthly RALO Teleconference participation
 - What level?
 - How to define participation: presence or activity
 - Does participation of one person (even the ALS representative) constitute ALS Activity?
 - Does and “apology” count?
- Grace period for ramping up involvement (1 year?)
- Define “inactive” status and implications
 - Is this an acceptable status, or a path to decertification?
- How to recognize a critical mass of participation?
- Should we differentiate between an active single person who is active, and an active ALS?
- Criteria for travel?
- Do we measure activity “on the ground”. Is it sufficient if it is very active but the activity is unconnected to ICANN?