

ICANN



EN

ALAC/2007/SD/7

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: 4th September 2007

STATUS: FINAL

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

2007 Staff Document Series

AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**COMMUNICATION TO THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
ICANN**

**RELATED TO THE CHANGES AGREED BY THE AT-LARGE
ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

TO THE PROCESS OF REVIEWING ALS APPLICATIONS

AND

THE GUIDELINES FOR ALS APPLICATION REVIEW

prepared by the Staff

Introductory Note

The ICANN Staff provided the following document as a convenience to the committee on 9th August 2007. A number of the recent changes agreed by the ALAC on 29th July 2007 require notification to the Board of Directors of ICANN, and in one case, requires a slight amendment to the Bylaws of ICANN.

At the ordinary monthly meeting of the ALAC on 10th August 2007, the Committee unanimously agreed that if no objections were made by a Member of the Committee registered within 7 days, the Chairman of the ALAC would direct the ALAC Liaison to the Board to convey this document to the Board of Directors. No objections were raised in the time allotted, though a couple of minor typographical amendments were provided by C Langdon-Orr of Asia/Australasia/Pacific, which were incorporated in this version of the text.

[End of Introduction]

PROPOSAL OF THE AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (ALAC)

FOR REVISING AT-LARGE STRUCTURE CERTIFICATION PROCESS

In its meeting of 26th June 2003¹, the Board of Directors of ICANN approved five proposals² of the Interim At-Large Advisory Committee as follows:

- I. [Proposed Minimum Criteria for At-Large Structures](#)
- II. [Proposed Certification Process for At-Large Structures \(ALS\)](#)
- III. [Proposed Guidelines for the Form of Each Regional At-Large Organisations' \(RALOs\) Memorandum of Understanding \(MoU to be Entered Into with ICANN\)](#)
- IV. [Proposed Procedures for Board Review of ALAC Certification Decisions](#)
- V. [Proposed Application for "At-Large Structure" \(ALS\) Designation](#)

With the creation of the five RALOs now complete, and since those RALOs' MoUs with ICANN contain provisions that ensure the RALOs to have a role in decisions to accredit, refuse accreditation, and de-accredit ALSes, the Board of ICANN is requested to resolve its approval to revisions to elements of the above-referenced as provided below. These amendments also give effect to a new, more transparent and more 'bottom-up' process for ALS accreditation decisions that should ensure that some of the issues that have resulted in Ombudsman investigations in the past don't reoccur.

¹ Details of the meeting and the relevant resolutions can be found at <http://www.icann.org/minutes/minutes-26jun03.htm>.

² These can be found at <http://www.icann.org/montreal/alac-organization-topic.htm>.

Proposed Minimum Criteria for At-Large Structures

It is not proposed to amend the Criteria at the present time. The ALAC does wish to notify the Board, however, of document AL/2007/SD/2.Rev7, *ALS Application Interpretation Guidelines*, in which the ALAC has provided written guidance on the interpretation of the Criteria in order to help ensure the Criteria are applied in a standard and even-handed way and that ALS applications can be reviewed according to a transparent and published process. These Guidelines have been reviewed by the Office of the General Counsel which has agreed that the guidelines in the document do not conflict with either the Minimum Criteria nor the Bylaws of ICANN.

The document is attached as Annex A.

Proposed Certification Process for At-Large Structures

It is proposed to amend this process as outlined below; the workflow of the process is further elaborated in Annex B. The present Certification Process is amended in redline for ease of comparison with the Process currently in force.

The ALAC wish to highlight the fact that the changes to the process proposed below in paragraphs 5,6, and 7 will require a change to the Bylaws of ICANN with respect to Article XI,s4(i). Further information on this change is provided in Annex B.

Proposed Certification Process for At-Large Structures

1. Submit ~~to the ALAC, in electronic form (provided by the ALAC),~~ a completed ALS application (in English, **and/or in any other languages which the application form may be made available in**) and provide ~~the ALAC with~~ any requested **or relevant** documentation.
2. The ~~ALAC-ICANN Staff~~ will conduct due diligence, reviewing the application and performing necessary tasks in an effort to ensure that the established ALS criteria has been/will be met **and to facilitate the easy review of applications by the At-Large community**. This **due diligence** could include, **without limitation**: requesting references, interviewing the applicant's contact(s), gathering/requesting additional information on the applicant, and (for existing organizations) requesting information on applicant's leadership and operations, verifying general funding sources, and requiring the applicant to demonstrate the identity of their individual constituents. **The information resulting from the due diligence conducted will then be provided to the then-current members of the RALO in the Geographic Region that the applicant organization is based in.**
3. Upon completion of ~~its~~ due diligence, all ~~ALAC~~ **the then-current members of the aforementioned RALO will have an opportunity to** review the application and related documentation **and may then comment in confidence about the applicant in such a way that the anonymity of the source person or entity of the comments may be kept confidential if the source of the comments so wishes; the substance of the comments will be available to the members of the RALO, the ICANN Staff, and the ALAC members until the conclusion of Step 5 at which point the comments will no longer be accessible.**
4. Upon completion of the due diligence review period ~~the ALAC regional Secretariat~~ **will then provide to the At-Large Advisory Committee its view of the advice of the various members that have commented on the application as the regional advice of the region. This will take the form of a recommendation to accredit, not to accredit, or if no comments were received from members of the region, a statement that no regional advice is available in respect of the applicant.**
5. **The ALAC shall then decide whether or not to vote on certifying the applicant in the following manner:**

- a. ~~an ALS, with each ALAC member voting ELIGIBLE or NOT ELIGIBLE~~ Where no regional advice is given, a vote shall be held and the question to be put shall be: “Shall the application for accreditation of [name of applicant] be granted?” The available responses to the question shall be: ‘YES’, ‘NO’, and ‘ABSTAIN’
 - b. Where regional advice has been given, if any member of the ALAC requests a vote on a given applicant to be held, the question to be put shall be: “Shall the advice of the region in respect of accreditation of [name of applicant] be overturned?”. The available responses to the question shall be: ‘YES’, ‘NO’, and ‘ABSTAIN’ where only one answer may be chosen. If no member of the ALAC requests a vote to be held on such an application within a number of days after the regional advice has been given (the number of days to be as determined by the ALAC from time to time), the applicant shall be certified as an At-Large Structure by unanimous consent upon the expiry of the number of days above-referenced.
- 4-6. Where a vote is held in respect of Step 5, the vote shall require a majority of a quorum (as defined by the ALAC in its Rules of Procedure) in the affirmative on the question. Decisions to certify, or refuse to certify, an ALS ~~require a 2/3 vote of all of the members of the ALAC and~~ shall be subject to review ~~according to procedures established by the Boards~~ **provided by the ICANN Bylaws, Article IV, Section 2**. The ALAC will notify the applicant of its certification decision, and, if applicable, provide information on requesting a review of the decision.
- 5-7. Decisions to de-certify an ALS **shall** require a 2/3 ~~vote majority~~ of ~~all of~~ the members of the ALAC **who cast a vote as provided in the Rules of Procedure of the ALAC**, and **any decertification decision** shall be subject to review ~~according to procedures established by the Boards~~ **provided in the ICANN Bylaws, Article IV, Section 2**. Reasons for the ALAC to pursue de-certification action, and to de-certify an ALS, may include persistent non-compliance with significant ALS requirements. The ALAC will provide advance notice to the ALS in question, and the ALS will have an opportunity to be heard and respond to the ALAC prior to a decision on de-certification. The ALAC will notify the ALS of its de-certification decision and provide information on requesting a review of the decision.
- 6-8. On an ongoing basis, the ALAC, **and/or the RALOs**, may give informal advice and support to organizations seeking certification. ~~It is intended that~~ The ALAC **shall** work informally with organizations over time to assist **them** with their efforts to comply with the criteria and achieve the necessary standing to seek certification.
9. **Except as provided below under ‘Suspension of An Application’, the ALAC and the ICANN Staff shall work concertedly to ensure that the process of reaching a decision to certify, or not to certify, an At-Large Structure shall take not longer than ninety (90) days from the date at which an**

application is received to the date at which the applicant is notified of the decision.

ALS applications, ~~ALAG-certification~~ decisions on applications, and other information, as appropriate, will be publicly posted ~~by the ALAG~~.

Suspension of An Application

At stages one through five of the process above, the consideration of an application may be suspended where:

- a. The suspension is requested by the applicant, or;**
- b. The RALO Secretariat of the region the applicant is based in, either at the request of Members of the RALO or otherwise under procedures which may be adopted by the RALOs as they shall determine, requires further information from the applicant which is essential to the evaluation of the application, or;**
- c. Members of the ALAC believe that additional information is essential to the evaluation of the application.**

Wherever an application is suspended under part (a) of this section, that suspension shall be lifted upon the request of the applicant. Where the suspension is under parts (b) or (c) of this section, that suspension shall only last as long as shall reasonably be required in order to acquire the additional information necessary. When notifying the applicant of the additional information, it shall be obligatory to also notify the applicant that the application is suspended until the information is received.

**Guidelines for the Form of Each Regional At-Large Organisations' (RALOs)
Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) to be Entered Into with ICANN**

It is not proposed to amend these Guidelines at the present time.

Procedures for Board Review of ALAC Certification Decisions

Taking into account the Report of the Ombudsman of ICANN, numbered 06-317 and provided to the Board of Directors of ICANN on 12th February 2007, we recommend that the Procedures for Board Review of ALAC Certification Decisions be amended as follows and in conformity with the Ombudsman's recommendations. The original Procedures are modified by redlined inserts and strikethroughs to make the changes easy to read.

ALAC decisions to certify or de-certify an At-Large Structure are subject to review according to **the procedures as provided by to be established by the Board the Bylaws of ICANN, Article IV, Section 2. For the purposes of interpretation of those provisions only, a review of an ALAC decision shall be considered as if it were a decision of the ICANN Board as provided in Article IV, Section 2(2)(b).**³

The ALAC shall ensure when communicating a decision in the negative to an applicant that all such communications provide information on:

- a. The Office of the Ombudsman and how to request a review by the Ombudsman of the decision, and;**
- b. The reconsideration process of the Board and how to request such a reconsideration, and;**
- c. Make clear to the applicant that the ALAC can, in the first instance, be asked to review the decision reached if the applicant believes that the decision is incorrect on any basis, and providing contact information for the applicant to request such a review.**

~~The ALAC proposes that review procedures be established, as proposed below:~~

~~•A request for review of an ALAC decision to certify or de-certify an ALS would be required to be filed within 60 days after the ALAC posts notice of the action on its web site. Requests for review would be submitted by email to xxxxxx. No particular form is required, but requesting parties would include at least the following information:~~

~~•name, address, and contact information for the requesting party (including postal and email addresses);~~

~~•the specific action for which review is sought;~~

~~•the date of the action;~~

³ Since the reconsideration process embodied in the Bylaws envisages that a reconsideration request can only relate to staff action or inaction (Article IV,S2(2)(a)) or ICANN Board action or inaction (Article IV,S2(2)(b)), this sentence is necessary for the Bylaw provision to apply to action or inaction of the ALAC, and allow the Board Reconsideration Committee thereby to reconsider the ALAC decision.

- the facts supporting the request for review;
- the grounds on which the Board should conduct its review; and
- any documents the requesting party wishes to submit in support of its request.

The ICANN Board will appoint three of its Directors to consider such requests and conduct the reviews. The Board appointed review group will notify the ALAC of the request for review. The review group may request additional information from all parties involved in the review, as well as other sources. Requests for review and the Board review group's activities and decisions will be made public on the ICANN website. The review group may, in its discretion, grant a party's request to keep certain information confidential. For any matters that the review group determines not to disclose, the review group's decision will describe in general terms the nature of the information and the reason for nondisclosure.

The review group will endeavor to complete its work and issue its final decision within 30 days of the filing of the request; its decision will be made public on the ICANN web site.

To protect against abuse of the review process, a request for review may be dismissed by the review group where it is frivolous, non-substantive, or otherwise abusive.

Proposed Application for “At-Large Structure” (ALS) Designation

The ALAC, in concert with the At-Large community through the RALOs, is in the process of amending the At-Large Structure application form.

It does not believe that the Board of ICANN needs to approve changes to the form, as the content of the form is a matter of administrative convenience.

Appendix A:

Document AL/2007/SD/2.Rev7, *ALS Application Interpretation Guidelines*

Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

2007 Staff Proposals Document Series

AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PROPOSED GUIDELINES TO AT LARGE STRUCTURES (ALS) APPLICATION EVALUATION

prepared by the Staff

Introductory Note

This document was presented to the At-Large Advisory Committee by the Staff in February 2007 for evaluation by the At-Large community. After extensive consultations, the ALAC voted to accept the version in Revision 5 on 29th June 2007, subject to a *toilette finale* by the staff; the result of that effort is Revision 6.

After and subject to the results of a review by the Office of the General Counsel, and any changes or amendments that may be required, this document will be disseminated to the RALOs for use by the worldwide At-Large community to evaluate ALS applications. It provides a written understanding of what kinds of applicants should be recommended to the ALAC for certification by them.

Having this guidance in written form, (based in part upon the analysis by ALAC of nearly 100 applications) should lead to greater consistency in the decisions reached on ALS applicants especially as the process of handling of applications is being decentralized, both to accommodate increased application volumes and to accommodate the increased role that the regional At-Large communities are undertaking in their Memoranda of Understanding with ICANN.

[End of introduction]

PART I

Criteria Used for ALS Accreditation

There are two sources that contain the criteria for accrediting ALS applications:

1. The Bylaws of ICANN, in Article XI, Section 2, Part 4(i)¹, and;
2. The “Minimum Criteria for an At-Large Structure”² (in this document simply the “Minimum Criteria”) as proposed by the Interim At-Large Advisory Committee and accepted by the Board of ICANN on 23rd June 2003³ in Resolution 03.102

Bylaws of ICANN

The relevant provision is as follows:

“...The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures shall be established in such a way that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region (as defined in Section 5 of Article VI) of the RALO will predominate in the operation of each At-Large Structure while not necessarily excluding additional participation, compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region, by others”

Minimum Criteria

The Minimum Criteria elaborate upon the Bylaw provision and state the following five criteria.

Any change to the Minimum Criteria would require ICANN Board assent before the modifications can be brought into force, which would itself also require a public comment period:

- “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 constituted 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.”

¹ <http://www.icann.org/general/bylaws.htm#XI>.

² <http://www.icann.org/montreal/alac-organization-topic.htm#I>

³ <http://www.icann.org/minutes/prelim-report-26jun03.htm>

PART II

Evaluation of Applications

The Minimum Criteria, which incorporate and expand upon the relevant Bylaw provision and which was approved by ICANN's Board in 2003, shall predominate in evaluating ALS applications.

First Criterion

The first criterion, as agreed with the board, is as follows in black text:

“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.

The requirements for fulfillment of this criterion are as follows:

A declaration of compliance on the application form shall be required. The due diligence undertaken must attempt to verify that the information provided by the applicant is credible and that the applicant is likely to be able to ‘live up’ its obligations. An ALS has a responsibility to disseminate ICANN information, and to solicit feedback from its individual user participants.

Second Criterion

The second criterion, as agreed with the board, is as follows in black text:

2. Be constituted 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.

The guidelines for evaluation of whether or not an applicant fulfils this criterion are as follows.

Guidelines Relevant to All Applicants:

1. There is no requirement that an organization be legally constituted, or otherwise, or of any particular structure, excepting as otherwise provided in these Guidelines.
2. If an organisation receives corporate or government funding or has members who are government agencies or for-profit entities such members are allowed, provided such members do not interfere with, direct, or otherwise affect the mission, purpose or operations of the organisation.
3. Where a RALO believes that these Guidelines would have the effect of denying otherwise *bona-fide*⁴ organizations being accredited due to the unique characteristics of the development of that Region's Internet community, the RALO General Assembly shall notify the ALAC in writing of the need to modify these Guidelines and the reasons for doing so. Where the ALAC does not

⁴ bona-fide in this context meaning “legitimate” or “acceptable”.

object, and the ICANN General Counsel does not see the variation as in conflict with the Bylaws of ICANN and the Minimum Criteria as set by the Board, the modification shall prevail over the clause, or clauses, in question in these Guidelines for that RALO.

Additional Guidelines Relevant to Umbrella Organisations Only:

4. An organisation that has a membership composed largely of organizations (“Umbrella Organisations”), shall be eligible, provided that:
 - a. Individual internet users are engaged directly or indirectly in the organisation, and;
 - b. The mission and main purpose of the applicant organisation and/or the membership should directly relate to the interests of individual Internet users, and;
 - c. Neither the applicant, nor a substantial proportion of the applicant’s organizational members, may be controlled or directed by for-profit or governmental entities, save always that the RALOs may avail themselves of the flexibility in point 3.

Additional Guidelines Relevant to Non-Umbrella Organisations Only:

5. A Non-Umbrella Organisation should be:
 - a. Largely, or entirely, composed of individuals and governed entirely by them,
 - b. Focused on the interests of the individual Internet user, and;
 - c. A not-for-profit entity.
6. A Non-Umbrella Organisation should not be a governmental department, agency or affiliate.

For example: an ‘Umbrella NGO’ where the NGO’s organizational members are themselves controlled by and for the benefit of individual Internet users would fulfil the criterion. However, if an Umbrella NGO were to be composed largely of groups with little connection with individual Internet users’ interests, or if an Umbrella NGO has no ability for individual internet users to participate in any way in it’s work, either directly or indirectly, that would be grounds for determining the applicant to be ineligible.

Clearly, it is necessarily easier to determine that an organisation fulfils the requirements of the second criterion if it is composed entirely of voting, individual user members. However, as stated above, the requirement that “...participation by individual internet users ... will predominate in the ALSes operation ...” could be fulfilled by groups composed of organizations to the extent that it is clearly the case that the group members are themselves controlling the organisation for the benefit of individual Internet users.

Third Criterion

The third criterion, as agreed with the board, is as follows in black text:

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

The guidelines for evaluation of whether or not an applicant fulfils this criterion are as follows:

A declaration of compliance on the application form shall be sufficient.⁵ Additional information may be requested by ICANN staff or the ALAC or Regional Secretariats to verify the compliance with the declaration.

Fourth Criterion

The fourth criterion, as agreed with the board, is as follows in black text:

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).

The guidelines for evaluation of whether or not an applicant fulfils this criterion are as follows:

Where an applicant does not itself have a web presence at the time of application, a declaration of an intention to meet this criteria in a timely manner, and to keep the same current (either directly or via the help of the RALO Secretariat or ICANN At-Large staff) shall be sufficient.

Fifth Criterion

The fifth criterion, as agreed with the board, is as follows in black text:

5. Assist the RALO in performing its function.

The guidelines for evaluation of whether or not an applicant fulfils this criterion are as follows:

A declaration of compliance on the application form shall be sufficient.

General Obligation of Applicants

Each ALS must inform the RALO in writing if it is unable or unwilling to continue to comply with any of the obligations or requirements of ALS status, and the RALO shall similarly inform the ALAC.

The General Obligations will be moved to a document for ALS applicants once that document is created.

⁵ The intent of this criterion is to make clear the applicant will not expect ICANN to provide funding for general operations. It should be noted that ICANN at times subsidizes meeting costs and travel and expenses for participation by the ALS community in ICANN and ICANN-related activities.

PART III

Materials and Sources of Information to Use in Evaluating the Application

Those evaluating ALS applications shall rely on the following sources of information when evaluating an application for accreditation:

1. The application form;
2. The Due Diligence Form completed by ICANN Staff;
3. The web presence of the Applicant organisation, if any;
4. Information that can be searched for easily on the public Internet.

An application should rely only secondarily on the perceptions of members of the At-large community. Any evidence provided by independent third-party sources of information (to the extent such sources are available) should be decisive over the perceptions of an individual. Otherwise, an applicant runs the risk of being declared ineligible for accreditation based upon hearsay or an individual person's perceptions, biases, or other non-evidence-based criteria. At the same time, it is understood that evaluation of ALS applications cannot become an exhaustive investigatory process and that those who are evaluating applications are frequently volunteers doing their best in a voluntary capacity.

Where a question about eligibility remains, the At-Large staff or regional Secretariat should be asked to make independent enquiries of the applicant, or those in a position to have objective evidence about the applicant.

In general, an evaluation should rely upon the preponderance of the information available, and upon the total picture presented about an organisation.

Appendix B:

Modification to the Bylaws of ICANN

The following proposed modification to Article XI, Section 2(4)(i) is submitted, again in redline to the original. We also propose some slight changes to the structure of this provision to make it more readable but which do not otherwise alter the meaning of the paragraph. The original provision is reproduced directly below for ease of comparison.

- i. The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures within each Geographic Region shall be established by the Board based on recommendations from the ALAC and shall be stated in the Memorandum of Understanding between ICANN and the RALO for that Geographic Region. The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures shall be established in such a way that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region (as defined in [Section 5 of Article VI](#)) of the RALO will predominate in the operation of each At-Large Structure within the RALO, while not necessarily excluding additional participation, compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region, by others. Each RALO's Memorandum of Understanding shall also include provisions designed to allow, to the greatest extent possible, every individual Internet user who is a citizen of a country within the RALO's Geographic Region to participate in at least one of the RALO's At-Large Structures. To the extent compatible with these objectives, the criteria and standards should also afford to each RALO the type of structure that best fits the customs and character of its Geographic Region. Once the criteria and standards have been established, the ALAC shall be responsible for certifying organizations as meeting the criteria and standards for At-Large Structures. Decisions to certify or decertify an At-Large Structure shall require a 2/3 majority among all of the members of the ALAC who cast a vote, provided at least nine members of the ALAC cast a vote according to procedures adopted by the Committee. These decisions shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board. On an ongoing basis, the ALAC may also give advice as to whether a prospective At-Large Structure meets the applicable criteria and standards.

The modified provision follows:

- i. ~~i.~~ **Membership in the At-Large Community**
 1. The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large Structures within each Geographic Region shall be established by the Board based on recommendations from the ALAC and shall be stated in the Memorandum of Understanding between ICANN and the RALO for ~~that each~~ Geographic Region.
 2. The criteria and standards for the certification of At-Large

Structures shall be established in such a way that participation by individual Internet users who are citizens or residents of countries within the Geographic Region (as defined in [Section 5 of Article VI](#)) of the RALO will predominate in the operation of each At-Large Structure within the RALO, while not necessarily excluding additional participation, compatible with the interests of the individual Internet users within the region, by others.

3. Each RALO's Memorandum of Understanding shall also include provisions designed to allow, to the greatest extent possible, every individual Internet user who is a citizen of a country within the RALO's Geographic Region to participate in at least one of the RALO's At-Large Structures.
4. To the extent compatible with these objectives, the criteria and standards should also afford to each RALO the type of structure that best fits the customs and character of its Geographic Region.
5. Once the criteria and standards have been established **as provided in this Clause i**, the ALAC, **with the advice and participation of the RALO where the applicant is based**, shall be responsible for certifying organizations as meeting the criteria and standards for At-Large Structure **accreditations**.
6. Decisions to certify or decertify an At-Large Structure shall ~~require a 2/3 majority among all of the members of the ALAC who cast a vote, provided at least nine members of the ALAC cast a vote according to procedures adopted by the Committee~~ **be made as decided by the ALAC in its Rules of Procedure, save always that any changes made to the Rules of Procedure in respect of ALS applications shall be subject to review by the RALOs and by the ICANN Board.**
7. ~~These~~ **Decisions as to whether to accredit, not to accredit, or disaccredit an At-Large Structure** shall be subject to review according to procedures established by the Board.
8. On an ongoing basis, the ALAC may also give advice as to whether a prospective At-Large Structure meets the applicable criteria and standards.