

COMMENTS ONLY - NO EDIT SUGGESTIONS PLEASE

ALS Mobilization Plan

Draft V3.0 - 14 February 2020

Introduction

The task of the ALS Mobilization Working Party (WP) is to make a recommendation to the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) on what needs to be done to allow the full implementation of changes in support of At-Large Structure (ALS) participation in At-Large in accordance with the plans proposed under Issue #2 of the At-Large Organizational Review as approved by the ICANN Board of Directors on 23 June 2018 and 27 January 2019.

Individual unaffiliated members are an integral part of how At-Large will be organized, but they are not an issue to be considered within this WP.

Our focus is not what we have been doing and how we have been interacting with ALSes, but what we need to do in the future. Although we already knew it before, the At-Large Review made it abundantly (and PUBLICLY) clear that what we have been doing was not satisfactory.

As we proceed, we need to remember that most ALSes existed as organisations or grassroots organisations before becoming an ALS. They have their own mandate and reason for existing. Our job is not to change that, but to build upon their strengths and benefit from them.

In the general case, we have to assume that most ALS members will not have an interest in the specifics and mechanics of ICANN and the issues we focus on. If NO members in an ALS will ever have an interest, then perhaps they should not be an ALS.

Overall Target

The At-Large Review Proposal made two specific assumptions related to ALSes:

1. ALSes were still of value. From the point of view of increasing the number of active policy-oriented volunteers in At-Large, the prime ALS value is as a pool of talented, technologically savvy, potential contributors.

2. To reach these potential workers, we need to ensure that there are active ALS communications channels to reach and interact with these potential and/or actual contributors.

These communications channels are needed to meet requirements set out in two of our key documents:

- the ICANN Bylaw requirements: *Establishing mechanisms and processes that enable two-way communication between members of At-Large Structures and those involved in ICANN decision-making, so interested individuals can share their views on pending ICANN issues. (ICANN Bylaws 12.2(d)(xi))*
- The 1st ALS criteria: *Commit to supporting individual Internet users' informed participation in ICANN by distributing to individual constituents/members information on relevant ICANN activities and issues, offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions of one or more of these activities and issues among individual constituents/members, and involving individual constituents/members in relevant ICANN policy development, discussions and decisions. (ALAC Rules of Procedure Adjunct Document 04 - At-Large Structure Framework)*

Although the rules cited above have been in place for many years (the Bylaw requirement since At-Large was created in 2003 and the RoP since the ALS rules were formulated circa 2007), we have never actively enforced them.

An additional but crucial target is to make this as easy to administer as possible (both from a RALO and staff perspective). Rules and processes which do not support our specific needs should be avoided.

We are not trying to write all of the rules in detail here, but just laying out an overall plan for the ALAC to approve, finalize details, and implement.

History

To date, the main ALS-related resources at our disposal have been officially designated ALS Representative(s). As a rule, they have not proven to be effective as active policy-oriented workers nor have they been active conduits for communications to and from their members (with a few exceptions). We will still need a formal representative (and backups), but they will not necessarily be the “active policy worker” that we need to focus on.

In 2015 the ALS Criteria and Expectations Task Force (TF) was convened to identify criteria for identifying potentially effective ALSes and to set what our expectations are. Without a clear statement of such expectations, we can never expect ALSes to meet them! The TF relatively quickly homed in on the core issue and proposals were made on how to rectify the situation. They were documented for discussion but, unfortunately, due to a significant focus on the IANA Stewardship Transition, the CCWG Accountability, and then the At-Large Review, we never got to the stage of the ALAC acting on these recommendations.

During the course of the At-Large Review, it became evident that the Reviewers were focusing on the same issues that the TF had addressed. But although they were informed of its work, they were determined to recommend their “empowered” individual membership solution with its effective elimination of ALSes. Some in At-Large agreed that our future was solely with unaffiliated individual members, although likely not using the implementation suggested by the Reviewers. However, the vast majority believed that ALSes were still a potential asset.

The ALAC was successful in rejecting the reviewer’s solution in favour of a renewed focus on ALSes (in addition to individual unaffiliated members) and recommended changes that were essentially those identified by the TF – a solution that was accepted by the ALAC and RALOs and ultimately the ICANN Board.

ALSes as a Source of Active Participants

The proposed recommendations focus around ensuring that:

1. ALSes have an interest in ICANN;
2. We have a working communications channel with ALSes through their formal representatives;
3. We have a working communications channel to the **members** of ALSes.

Our goal is to use ALSes to increase the number of active policy-oriented workers and to improve the quality of those we attract. We do not need a huge number of active workers but we need those we do have to be knowledgeable and sufficiently interested that they are willing to dedicate time to ICANN.

We can consider three pools of people.

1. Those who are VERY actively involved with ICANN processes - attend policy Working Groups (WGs), contribute, draft statements
2. Those who are familiar with the issues do not participate a lot perhaps due to time constraints, but who may comment on our draft statements and provide input. There needs to be a wide range of skills and talent among them, but all passionate about users. This is the pool of ALS members (and unaffiliated members) from whom we draw the more active workers.
3. The larger pool of ALS members and Individual Members from whom we might draw the more active workers.

People may move between groups 1 and 2 based on their time availability and their interest in the current hot topics. And if we do our job right, we will have a slow progression of people from group 3 upwards. Our proposed communications program is targeted at:

- enticing people from group 3 to group 2;
- getting and keeping group 2 up to speed; and
- encouraging group 2 to move to group 1.

ALS Expectations

Current Criteria (established in 2007)

1. Commit to supporting individual Internet users' informed participation in ICANN by distributing to individual constituents/members information on relevant ICANN activities and issues, offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions of one or more of these activities and issues among individual constituents/members, and involving individual constituents/members in relevant ICANN policy development, discussions and decisions.

FINAL: Subject to rewording to include new details.

2. Be organised so that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region in which the ALS is based will predominate in the ALS' operation. The ALS may permit additional participation by others that is compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region.

FINAL: May require a change subject to discussion on ALSes which span regions.

3. Be self-supporting (not rely on ICANN for funding).

FINAL:

4. Post on the Internet (on the ALAC's website or elsewhere) publicly-accessible, current information about the ALS's goals, structure, description of constituent group(s)/membership, working mechanisms, leadership, and contact(s).

REVISE IF NEEDED ONCE REST OF WORK IS DONE:

5. Assist the RALO in performing its function.

FINAL:

- **FINAL:** Report biennially (every two years). Report will include identifying ALS leadership, formal ALS representatives to ICANN, membership (approximate numbers and perhaps demographics (students, business, internet professionals, etc.)), "linkages" with ICANN (i.e. why they are an ALS) and (if any) ALS activities related to ICANN and how to address next bullet. To the extent practical, this reporting process will be streamlined and easy. The report, excluding personal information (names, contact details) will be posted for public access.

[Implementation Notes: Probably an online form. Implementation would probably be carried out on a rotating basis to spread staff effort throughout the year.]

- **FINAL:** Redistribute targeted ICANN At-Large updates to its members. Alternatively, provide an e-mail address for direct distribution by ICANN. This requirement could be waived on a case by case basis where the ALS has a mandate that clearly maps to only a specific aspect of ICANN and agrees to act as a resource for issues related to that aspect (such as phishing or spam, etc.)¹.

[These updates will be created by ICANN staff but might be augmented by the RALO. They must be aimed at people who have little or no knowledge of ICANN and its terminology and buzzwords. They will be delivered in all of ICANN's official languages (as selected by ALS). We will need to give ALSes an expected communications rate and that might typically be 1 per month, but it could be as little as 3 per year or unusually as much as 3 per month depending on circumstances. We will need to gear up to respond to people who do contact us in response to our messages. If a redistribution address is not provided, ALS representative will certify that redistribution will happen. Distribution material may include questions or links (which can be tracked) to facilitate understanding how effective distributions are. It is expected that in some cases, an ALS may distribute our material to a wider audience than its members and there would be no prohibition about doing that.]

- **FINAL:** Reference ICANN and At-Large on its website (or Facebook or whatever its Internet presence), either on its home page, or on a secondary page (or comparable). The intent is to ensure that the ALS members and others looking at its web presence

¹ To not allow this exception would require that the ALS distribute what would effectively be messages unrelated to their rationale for existence - ie Spam!

are aware that the organization is involved with ICANN through At-Large.

- **FINAL:** When specific issues are brought to the attention of ALS representatives, each ALS should evaluate whether they can contribute or not, and if they can, their ALS members should be involved. Respond if surveys or other issues are brought to their attention.
- **FINAL:** Provide an e-mail address or web link which will be publicized (via the At-Large web/wiki) for prospective ALS members or others to contact the ALS.
- **PREVIOUS VERSION (03 Feb):** There will be a Wiki page for each ALS with basic information about the ALS, created by staff, but updatable by the ALS if they wish. [Currently, most but not all ALSes have a Wiki page, but in MANY cases, its only content is the ALS name.]

FINAL: If an ALS does not have a functioning web site (or Facebook presence or comparable) with basic information about the organization, At-Large will provide a basic Wiki space populated with information originally from their application. The ALS will have the option of being able to update this space if they wish.

- Do we need a grace period for ramping up involvement and meeting expectations? If this related to reporting cycle?

ON HOLD PENDING FINALIZATION OF EXPECTATIONS LIST: When announcement of the new expectations is made, we will give each ALSes 12 months to put any new procedures in place. However, we will not be actively and thoroughly verifying until the next biennial report. [This item is on hold until the full list of expectations is known.]

- **FOR FINAL REVIEW:** Each ALS will designate two representatives, one of which will be designated as prime. Both representatives will be sent general mailings and unless the ALS requests otherwise, mailings requiring action will go only to the prime representative. An ALS may at its option also specify a third representative.
- **FOR FINAL REVIEW:** Representatives do not need to be organization leaders, but an ALS application must have leadership knowledge and support.
- **FOR FINAL REVIEW:** There is no formally specified minimum number of members for an ALS, but it should be more than just the representatives and the ALS leadership. [Rationale: If there are no additional members, the ALS cannot fulfil its prime role of informing its members about ICANN with the hope that they will become actively involved in ICANN policy activities.](judgement call needed to decide if appropriate in an individual case).

ON HOLD PENDING FINALIZATION OF EXPECTATIONS LIST: If an ALS does all of the

above, is that sufficient to justify their continued status as an ALS?

Not an ALS Expectation, but “Suggestions”

- **FINAL:** ALS could, or perhaps should be encouraged, to survey their members (not just ALS reps) and provide lists of “areas of expertise” on which ALAC or RALO could request input or assistance. At-Large should set a “standard” survey format to ensure results are comparable and readily combined into a single database.
- **FOR FINAL REVIEW:** Participation in Intergovernance (multistakeholder) activities is often complementary with involvement with ICANN and At-Large. ALSes may wish to consider whether such involvement makes sense for them.

Not an ALS Expectation

- **FINAL:** Vote if there are things to vote on.
- **FINAL:** We will not track participation of an ALS in our various activities. We WILL need to track participation of individuals (whether a member of an ALS or an unaffiliated member) in activities (including GNSO, CCWG, etc), probably using the forthcoming ICANN Client/Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System. Since individual records will likely include a RALO and ALS (if applicable), we may be able to derive ALS numbers, but it is not a requirement.
- **FINAL:** We will expect each ALS to produce active participants and will therefore not evaluate them on that basis. Such statistics will however be an interesting measure of our success with this program.

Other Notes:

- **FINAL:** We are not looking for 100% certainty. This applies to whether ALSes are perfectly meeting our expectation, or to identify whether a person is active in a meeting or just listening. We do however want a level of comfort that things are working as expected, and we should investigate anomalies when identified.
- **FINAL:** “On the ground” activities of an ALS which have no direct relevance to ICANN (perhaps the reason the organization was originally created) enhance the ALSes local credibility if and when the ALS, as an group, might become active in ICANN.
- **FOR FINAL REVIEW:** Although the WP members generally felt that RALOs should not make rules related to ALS participation, but the group decided that we should be silent on the issue at this point. That notwithstanding, if a RALO should make such a rule, the ALAC would not be bound to consider it in the case of an ALS decertification request from a RALO.

Other issues to address:

- Tracking participation (monthly meetings, webinars, WGs) of ALS Representatives and members:
 - As a metric for being “active”. If so, how much is enough? Does it matter who (representative or member);
 - As a metric to gauge involvement;
 - Note that tracking participation is an issue that we have grappled with and with virtually no success for well over a decade now).
- Tracking number of new active participants coming from ALS.
- Is 100% certainty necessary?.
- Is ALS “on the ground” activity relevant (or sufficient) if activity is unconnected to ICANN?

Details

ALS Certification Criteria (initial and ongoing):

The current ALS criteria are documented in the Rules of Procedure Adjunct Document 04 - At-Large Structure Framework (<http://tinyurl.com/ALAC-RoP-AdjDoc4-2013-07>)

- No major changes are foreseen other than those discussed in this document. The two core requirements will definitely not change::
 - Largely individual led;
 - Self-funding;

From the Framework:

Minimum criteria for an At-Large Structure:

1. Commit to supporting individual Internet users' informed participation in ICANN by distributing to individual constituents/members information on relevant ICANN activities and issues, offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions of one or more of these activities and issues among individual constituents/members, and involving individual constituents/members in relevant ICANN policy development, discussions and decisions.
2. Be organised so that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region in which the ALS is based will predominate in the ALS' operation. The ALS may permit additional participation by others that is compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region.
3. Be self-supporting (not rely on ICANN for funding).
4. Post on the Internet (on the ALAC's website or elsewhere) publicly-accessible, current information about the ALS's goals, structure, description of constituent

group(s)/membership, working mechanisms, leadership, and contact(s).
5. Assist the RALO in performing its function.

- Two (three?) representatives ; [Who do mailings go to?]
- Contacts do not need to be organization leaders, but application must have leadership knowledge and support;
- Must provide an e-mail address that will (automatically or with manual intervention) reach their membership. 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 an individual case).
- Must explain intersection between interests of organization and ICANN.
- Must have an online presence (web, Facebook, etc.)
- Exceptions: ALSes with particular expertise/focus
- Certify understanding of Criteria and Expectations

Other Issues to be Addressed

- Rules if ALS is also a member of another ICANN constituency/SG.
- Cross-Region ALS – Belong to region where headquartered, or member plurality (?) (at the time of application?)

Staff expectations

- Annual/Biennial ALS report
- Monthly “What’s Going On”: Simple terminology; multiple languages
- Briefing documents on new activities of potential interest: Simple terminology; multiple languages
 - Both of these are expected to be new, although perhaps based on material in existing ICANN documents. This is a key part of the ALACV/GAC Advice.
- Tracking where expectations have metrics
- Welcome webinars

Possible specific (optional?) ALS tasks

The RALO will commit to serving as the main forum and coordination point for input from individual Internet users to ICANN in its region and to working with the ALAC and ICANN in conducting the following activities:

1. Keeping the community of individual Internet users in their region informed about the significant news from ICANN;
2. Distributing (through posting or otherwise), in languages appropriate for its region, news about ICANN and information about items in the ICANN policy-development process of interest to individual Internet users in its Geographic Region;
3. Promoting outreach activities in the community of individual Internet users in its region;

4. Developing and maintaining on-going information and education programs in its region, regarding ICANN and its work;
5. Making public, and analyzing, ICANN's proposed policies and its decisions and their (potential) regional impact and (potential) effect on individuals in the region
6. Offering Internet-based mechanisms that enable discussions among members of ALS in its region; and
7. Establishing mechanisms and processes that enable two-way communication between members of ALS in its region and those involved in ICANN decision-making, so interested individuals can share their views on pending ICANN issues.
8. Periodic review: At-Large Structures and RALOs shall participate in periodic reviews (at least once annually) of how they are contributing to the ALAC charter and fostering informed participation of individual Internet users in ICANN, and they will contribute to the ALAC's reports to the ICANN Board on the structure, activities and results of the ALAC and the At-Large infrastructure.