



AL-ALAC-ST-0317-01-02-EN

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: 31 March 2017

STATUS: Final

AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

Staff Process Summary

Following the publication of the At-Large Review Draft Report, the At-Large Review Working Party (WP), the At-Large group responsible for overseeing the Review, held weekly meetings to discuss the ways for the At-Large Community to respond. The discussions also took place via various mailing lists, Skype chat groups, and other communications channels of the At-Large Community. Extensive input was gathered from the ALAC, the WP, and wider At-Large Community through a number of means including webinars, wikis, Google Docs, teleconferences, and later face-to-face meetings.

A decision was made that in response to the public comment, the ALAC and the WP would submit one comprehensive response as an ALAC Statement, and it was suggested to Regional At-Large Organization (RALO) leadership that they should consider jointly submitting a separate response focused on the issues particularly relevant to RALOs.

In addition, on 07 February 2017, Holly Raiche, ALAC Member of the Asian, Australian, and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization (APRALO) and the WP Co-Chair, developed a table-based input tool to solicit At-Large members' input on each recommendation and implementation in the At-Large Review Draft Report.

On 23 February 2017, Alan Greenberg, ALAC Member of the North American Regional At-Large Organization (NARALO) and the Chair of the ALAC, began developing an initial draft of the ALAC Statement based on the input received to date. The draft was posted on the [At-Large Review Working Party wiki workspace](#) and as a Google Doc for distribution; ALAC members, ALAC liaisons, RALO leaders, and WP members and participants provided significant further input and revision in a bottom-up fashion.

During ICANN58, the [WP meeting session](#) on Tuesday, 14 March 2017 was dedicated to the review of the draft ALAC Statement. In addition, five other face-to-face formal working sessions, including a discussion with the Independent Examiner ITEMS, were held to continue the review and discussions of the draft ALAC Statement. Outside the formal sessions, a small editing team was formed to work in person and remotely to incorporate all the comments received in finalizing the ALAC Statement. Maureen Hilyard, ALAC Member of APRALO and the ALAC Liaison to the ccNSO, led the major editorial review of the draft ALAC Statement.

On 24 March 2017, a final version of the ALAC Statement was posted on the aforementioned wiki workspace and the ALAC Chair requested that ICANN Policy Staff open an ALAC ratification vote. In the interest of time, the ALAC Chair requested that the ALAC Statement be transmitted to the ICANN public comment process, copying the ICANN Staff member responsible for this topic, with a note that the ALAC Statement is pending ALAC ratification. Once ratified, this ALAC Statement will be resubmitted incorporating updated ratification information in the Staff Process Summary section.

On 31 March 2017, Staff confirmed that the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 14 votes in favor, 0 vote against, and 0 abstention. Please note that 93.33% (14) of the 15 ALAC Members participated in the poll. The ALAC Members who participated in the poll are (alphabetical order of the first name): Alan Greenberg, Alberto Soto, Andrei Kolesnikov, Bastiaan Goslings, Javier Rua, Kaili Kan, Harold Arcos, Holly Raiche, Leon Sanchez, Maureen Hilyard, Sebastien Bachollet, Seun Ojedeji, Tijani Ben Jemaa (shown as “1 anonymous” on the online result page due to paper ballot), Wafa Zaafouri. One ALAC Member, Garth Bruen, didn't vote. You may view the result independently under: <https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=6791jzGEtaNYDJKrBAyqYTzv>.

ALAC Response to: The Independent Review of the ICANN At-Large Community Draft Report for Public Comment

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary.....	2
2. Introduction.....	4
3. Recommendations.....	5
4. Recommendation Made Through Omission.....	16
5. Comments on EMM Implementation Guidelines.....	17
6. Methodology.....	19
7. Non-Recommendation Suggestions.....	21
8. Analysis of Prior Review Recommendations.....	23
9. Travel Issues.....	24
10. Volunteer Turnover.....	25

1. Executive Summary

This paper sets out the ALAC response to the various recommendations proposed by the ITEMS Review of the At-Large Community. Those recommendations include steps ITEMS has proposed to implement their proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM).

The ALAC fully supports eight of the sixteen Recommendations, partly supports a further five, and rejects three (see the chart below). The Recommendations that the ALAC supports are generally about the ALAC's roles in outreach, awareness raising and participation in ICANN policy and processes. The ALAC also supports a renewed emphasis on individual members and the recommendations relating to staff involvement and assistance with ALAC and RALO processes. Indeed, the ALAC and the RALOs are already following many of those recommendations or are in the process of their implementation.

However, a strong focus of ITEMS' Recommendations and Implementation suggestions involve significant structural changes to the At-Large Community. A central component of the ITEMS' Recommendations is the implementation of their proposed EMM. Other proposed structural changes include a merger of RALO leadership with ALAC Membership, the introduction of "Rapporteurs"; the creation of a "Council of Elders"; the elimination of At-Large Working Groups; and the appointment by the ICANN Nominating Committee (NomCom) of our community Liaisons. The ALAC believes that these proposals do not recognise existing policies that admit and support individual members. They also do not recognise the barriers to participation in ICANN processes that individuals face. Nor do they recognise the importance of ALAC and RALO structures that support the At-Large participation in ICANN policies as well as ICANN's outreach into the wider global community.

One important view that will come through in this paper is strong support from the ALAC for the RALOs and At-Large Structures (ALS), and the important role they play in regards to outreach at the local and regional level. In recognition of this, a separate paper from the Regional At-Large Organisations will address the specific issues of the Review Team's recommendations from an ALS and regional point of view.

A summary of the response given by the ALAC in support (or otherwise) for the Review Team's recommendations, is provided below:

RECOMMENDATION	ALAC SUPPORT
1. At-Large Members should use regional events as opportunities to proactively raise awareness among end users about At-Large and ICANN-related activities.	Yes
2. At-Large should be more judicious in selecting the amount of advice it seeks to offer, focusing upon quality rather than quantity.	Yes
3. At-Large should encourage greater direct participation by At-Large Members (ALMs) in ICANN WGs by adopting our proposed Empowered Membership Model.	Partly
4. At-Large Support Staff should be more actively involved in ALM engagement in policy work for the ALAC, drafting position papers and other policy related work.	Yes
5. At-Large should contribute to meetings between ICANN and international I* organisations to engage in joint strategic planning for cooperative outreach.	Yes
6. Regarding the selection of the At-Large Director (Seat #15 on the Board). NomCom vets nominees and a successful candidate is chosen by random selection from their selection.	No
7. At-Large should abandon existing internal Working Groups and discourage their creation in the future, as they are a distraction from the actual policy advice role of At-Large.	No
8. At-Large should use social media much more effectively to gather end-user opinions (Twitter poll/Facebook polls, etc).	Yes
9. A part time Web Community Manager position should be made available to support At-Large.	Yes
10. Consider the adoption and use of a Slack-like online communication platform. An instant messaging-cum-team workspace (FOSS) alternative to Skype/Wiki/website/ mailing list.	Conditionally
11. At-Large should replace 5-yearly global ATLAS meetings with an alternative model of annual regional At-Large Meetings	No
12. As part of its strategy for regional outreach and engagement, At-Large should put a high priority on the organisation of regional events.	Yes
13. Working closely with ICANN and ISOC regional hubs, At-Large should reinforce its global outreach and engagement strategy to include SIGS into At-Large regional gatherings.	With reservations
14. In the interests of transparency, all At-Large travel funding should be published as a “one stop shop” contribution to the At-Large webpage.	Yes
15. At-Large should be involved in the CCWG on new gTLD Auction Proceeds with a view of gaining access to these funds in support of the At-Large Community.	Partly
16. Adopt a set of metrics to measure the implementation and impact of the EMM and track the continuous improvement of the At-Large Community.	Partly

2. Introduction

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) welcomes this opportunity to comment on the *ITEMS Review of the ICANN At-Large Community* (Review).

At this stage, it may be helpful to clarify the use of the terms, ALAC and At-Large, in order to reduce any misunderstandings about their use in this document. The ALAC refers to the 15-member Advisory Committee, two members of whom are selected by each of the five Regional At-Large Organisations (RALOs) and five members by the NomCom, one for each of the five ICANN regions. The At-Large Community is comprised of the ALAC, the RALOs and all of the ALSes and individual members within the RALOs. The term “At-Large” is synonymous with “At-Large Community”.

The ALAC particularly welcomes the Review’s clear statement of ALAC’s four responsibilities:

- *To serve as a “primary organisational home” for individual Internet users.*
- *To actively work with the other Supporting Organisations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs) and their respective WGs to ensure that end-user interests are taken into account.*
- *To conduct outreach activities to raise awareness about ICANN activities among end-users.*
- *To serve as an important accountability mechanism for the ICANN organisation as a whole.*¹

These responsibilities emphasise the key internal and external roles that ALAC undertakes as the means by which the interests and concerns of end-users can be channelled into ICANN policies and processes, and as a means of reaching out to global communities providing information about ICANN and its impacts on end-users.

Overall, the ALAC accepts many of the Review’s recommendations to varying degrees, and indeed, a number of them are already current practices. However, in some cases, it is not clear how implementation of proposed recommendations will result in what are seen as desired outcomes.

The Review identified issues that the Reviewers believe should be addressed as part of a reformed At-Large, including the following:

- A perceived focus by At-Large on internal, procedural matters, to the detriment of providing policy advice
- Difficulties for individuals in becoming involved in ALAC
- A lack of understanding of the role of ALAC within ICANN and outside of ICANN
- A perceived ‘unchanging’ ALAC leadership and consequent lack of upward mobility for newer participants
- Difficulty for end-users in participating in ICANN processes²

The ALAC believes that some of these issues can be easily addressed. A prime example is that individual membership is already in place for three out of the five RALOs, and it is ALAC policy that the others will follow suit. But the ALAC believes that the recommendations made by the Reviewers have been too simplistic in that they have not taken full cognisance of the diversity of end-user communities and the

¹ *The Review*, Section 5, p. 16

² *The Review* pp. 4, 15, 19

barriers to participation in ICANN processes for many of our At-Large participants. The ALAC continues to spend much of its time in between meetings, encouraging full participation across the board for all potential participants whose challenges include a multitude of languages, people cultures, connectivity levels, time zones, disability issues, and the extent to which many of our ICANN meetings and activities are conducted in “ICANNese”. The ALAC is not persuaded, despite the attention it has given to these issues over the years, that the changes to ALAC structures proposed within the Review will be changes for the better, i.e. for end-users overall.

The ALAC notes that a number of the Review Team’s perceived issues are not supported by actual data. Although this may clearly indicate a problem with how the ALAC is perceived within and outside of ICANN, one must be careful to ensure that solutions address real problems and not mirages.

The ALAC has considered what the net effect would be if the full set of Review Team Recommendations were implemented. It is the strong belief of the ALAC and the Review Working Party that with no Working Groups (WGs); overloaded ALAC Members serving the dual role of RALO leaders; Rapporteurs with minimal knowledge and experience interfacing with their AC/SO WGs and authoring statements; effectively getting “old-timers” out of the way and minimally visible; and Liaisons unable to do their jobs (or being rejected by their target organization), we would have succeeded in ensuring that At-Large would no longer be of service to ICANN or able to defend the interests of end-users.

In the development of this response, such was the collective concern of the ALAC, that a large body of contributions were gratefully received from across the five regions in a variety of languages and modes of communication (emails, comments on wiki, Google drafts, in phone and teleconference calls, etc.) to ensure that their views and opinions were heard. Wherever possible, these have been incorporated into this summary.

The ALAC appreciates the continued commitment of the Review Team to interact with the Review Working Party (WP) and to include some of the comments already provided by the WP and community into their first draft report.

Nonetheless, the ALAC, after thoroughly reviewing this new document, wishes to offer further input which it believes can enhance and enrich the outcome of this mandated Review and hopefully will lead to an improved At-Large organization.

3. Recommendations

Recommendation 1: At-Large Members from each region should be encouraged, and where possible funded, to participate in Internet governance / policy-related conferences / events (IGF, RIR, ISOC) in their region, and to use these events as opportunities proactively to raise awareness among end- users about the At-Large and the opportunities to engage in ICANN-related activities.

ALAC Response: The ALAC supports this recommendation and notes that this is effectively today’s status quo where RALOs make use of any opportunity that they can to carry out outreach within their vast regions covering multiple countries, cultures and languages. The ALAC and RALOs encourage greater

coordination and collaboration with regional ICANN staff, as well as with other regional organisations, for more focused outreach. An outreach calendar for each RALO was specifically set up for At-Large Structures (ALSes) and regional staff to notify regional/global members of their events. ICANN should ensure that equitable opportunities are available and supported for regional end-users (ALS or individual) to make an impact from within their regions.

However, it must also be noted that the At-Large community has often found access to funding for outreach activities to be challenging. While the Community Regional Outreach Pilot Programme (CROPP) provides funding that specifically targets outreach, this is limited to five slots per region per year (providing funding for airfares and accommodation for four days and three nights, per slot). On the other hand, any mention of “outreach” in At-Large requests for funding through annual budget processes can make requests less likely to get approval, unless other capacity building or engagement elements are added. RALOs take advantage of non-ICANN regional events that offer fellowships and other sponsorships to enable their members to attend, or an ALS may fund their representative(s), or individuals fund themselves in order to fulfil the voluntary roles and contributions they already make on behalf of their regions.

Recommendation 2: At-Large should be more judicious in selecting the amount of advice it seeks to offer, focusing upon quality rather than quantity.

ALAC Response: The ALAC supports this recommendation. It already represents the status quo. Records over the last five years demonstrate this.

Table 1

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
ICANN Public Comments	62	59	53	51	46
ALAC Responses	35	32	28	20	16
% Responded	56%	54%	53%	39%	35%

While ALAC responses involving community input are usually quite comprehensive, a small proportion were simply supportive statements where the ALAC felt a nominal response was advisable but did not warrant any substantive effort. Similarly, advice to the Board composed just a small fraction (fewer than five such statements in the last several years) of the overall documents drafted. The ALAC believes it is far more desirable to influence the policy development processes before issues come to the Board, than to advise the Board after the fact when it may have little latitude to alter the outcome.

It has been the general practice of the ALAC, that when a public comment issue arises, the ALAC will identify a penholder who, often with others, is prepared to take responsibility for initially assessing if

there is a significant user-impact reason for further investigation and community consultation. If this is the case, then the writing team collects and organises data to put together an appropriate advisory statement or comment for consideration and formal endorsement by the ALAC, before the response is returned to the relevant section of ICANN. This is a time-consuming process, inviting members from across At-Large each time, to contribute to the many different subject areas for which ALAC is tasked to research and provide appropriate advice. The ALAC also encourages RALOs and ALSes to comment.

Recommendation 3: At-Large should encourage greater direct participation by At-Large Members (ALMs) in ICANN WGs by adopting our proposed Empowered Membership Model.

ALAC Response: The ALAC notes that this recommendation includes two related elements. The first and main element sets the goal of more participation by individual At-Large members in ICANN Working Groups. The second, subordinate element suggests a method by which the goal, in the opinion of the reviewers, would be achieved.

The ALAC supports the goal and notes that work to achieve it is already well underway. But it resolutely rejects the suggested method, which is not necessary for achieving the goal, and could lead to unintended consequences detrimental to At-Large and to ICANN itself. However, the ALAC does support the prime intent of the Empowered Membership Model (EMM) - to ensure that all regions can and will accept Individual Members.

The EMM is effectively a generalization of the Individual Members concept that currently exists in three of the five RALOs. The ALAC supports the overall concept, and fully intends to ensure that such members are allowed into all RALOs. To be clear, the ALAC supports enhancing the focus on those individual user members not affiliated with an ALS.

No evidence is presented as to why or how the vote-empowered membership will be significantly more attractive to end-users world-wide³, or why the ongoing potential to vote will encourage people to actively participate in what has been acknowledged as a complex, and time-intensive space. Moreover, many of these users are not fluent in English which is the language used for most of these activities and no proposal is presented on how that might be overcome.

The ALAC has found it difficult to get ALS members to participate in working groups, At-Large or Cross Community, mainly due to the fact that they are all volunteers and do not all share the same commitment of time, or similar levels of expertise or knowledge on the content areas. With the intensified engagement required to get up to speed, the ALAC does not see that the number of people interested in, motivated enough and ready to carry out the voluntary services required within At-Large would be any different between the ALS model and the EMM model. Moreover, “direct” participation by an increased number of individual members, does not guarantee that they can truly represent the

³ It must be noted that in most other parts of the ICANN volunteer community, the potential participants are well acquainted with ICANN. This is certainly true for Registrar, Registries, Internet Service Providers, Intellectual Property Lawyers, etc. This is definitely not the general case with users, even technology-savvy users.

interests of billions of end-users any more effectively than the current model, where ALSes at least provide outreach capacity at local level.

The ALAC sees one potential outlet for the objective of enhanced individual participation in the current Fellowship or NextGen programmes. These programmes are geared specifically to get interested and enthusiastic individuals from across the globe up to speed about the workings of the ICANN ecosystem so they can find their own niche areas of interest for subsequent engagement. These are two already successful programmes from which ICANN itself has started recruiting staff, while other former alumni have not only joined the ICANN Community but have also become members of the ALAC and now, even the ICANN Board.

The ALAC believes that the ALS membership model should remain because it is the At-Large link to grassroots inputs. In their local context, ALSes are recognised as established organisations, in some cases older than ICANN itself, and they play a role in national-level multi-stakeholder cooperation that clearly benefits ICANN and the user community they represent. ALS members also form a prime pool of potential At-Large workers, and ALAC and RALO leaders. Plans are underway to enhance outreach to them and to engage those who are intrigued by ICANN and its work.

There are more elements of the EMM model which the ALAC continues to have difficulty comprehending, not only as to the rationale but also to the value that they would give the At-Large Community, for example, giving Empowered Members the right to vote for their leaders or on other actions, should a vote ever be initiated. As ALAC and RALO decision-making is often by consensus, it is difficult to understand why this voting issue is such a key feature of EMM. Another example is the use of Rapporteurs, and giving them travel slots after a year. For ALAC members selected by their RALOs, it would be typical that a minimum of two years of active participation in one or more working groups would be expected before members were elected to the ALAC and achieved travel slots. This delay is not to penalise new workers, but to give them the time they need to get up to speed. Lastly, the merger of ALAC Membership, RALO Leadership and Liaison positions seems ill advised. All of these issues will be addressed later in this document.

In summary, the ALAC notes that if this recommendation had been limited to the universal acceptance of individual members with an implicit lessened focus on ALSes, this recommendation would very likely have been fully accepted. However, with the accompanying requirement to redefine RALO Leadership, ALAC Membership and Liaison selection; overly detailed specification of exactly how individual membership should be implemented; and what it should be named, we had no choice but to reject it.

Recommendation 4: At-Large Support Staff should be more actively involved in ALM engagement in policy work for the ALAC, drafting position papers and other policy related work.

ALAC Response: The ALAC agrees with this recommendation. Currently, an ICANN At-Large Staff member edits and “cleans up” documents drafted by volunteers and in several cases has created the initial draft based on instructions from community members. Similarly, but on a larger scale, staff are

the main content creators of the planned regular messages outlining policy activity that will be sent to individual and ALS members. This is of course dependent on ICANN management making the appropriate resources available.

Recommendation 5: At-Large should redouble efforts to contribute to meetings between ICANN Senior Staff and Executives, ISOC (and other international I* organisations) to engage in joint strategic planning for cooperative outreach.

ALAC Response: As desirable as such an approach may sound, At-Large is not notified about when and where ICANN Senior Staff and Executives, ISOC (and other international I-STAR organizations) meet, nor is At-Large invited. At a regional level, RALO leaders may hear of regional Hub staff meetings with key I-STAR organisations through the Hub newsletter, but then again this is not a formal invitation. Also, there may be a cost factor which would further reduce the consideration of a volunteer to be able to attend.

However, lack of involvement with the ICANN or Regional Hub executives does not inhibit the initiative of ALAC and RALO leaders as they form their own models of cooperation with other organizations. Most RALOs have MoUs with their Regional Internet Registry, and RALO members participate in activities of regional partners to the extent that sponsorship or other funding allows. The upcoming NARALO General Assembly to be held at an ARIN meeting is just one such example.

Overall there is relatively little funding from ICANN supports these activities.

In brief, At-Large has a great interest in joint activities and would welcome the opportunity to participate and foster joint strategic planning and cooperative outreach amongst I-STAR organisations and other relevant non-governmental or public entities outside of the ICANN bubble where our interests coincide. Such cooperation makes sense.

Recommendation 6: Selection of seat 15 on ICANN Board of Directors. Simplify the selection of the At-Large Director. Candidates to self-nominate. NomCom vets nominees to produce a slate of qualified candidates from which the successful candidate is chosen by random selection.

ALAC Response: The ALAC strongly objects to this recommendation which overall disenfranchises the At-Large Community from selecting its own Board Director. The concept that the “Director nominated by the At-Large Community” (a quote from the ICANN Bylaws) should be even partially selected by the Nominating Committee and then by random selection cannot be taken seriously if ICANN considers the multi-stakeholder bottom-up, consensus-driven decision-making process as the cornerstone of its governance methods. Moreover, this process was arrived at after an extensive bottom-up design process.

By transferring this very organic selection process to the NomCom, the At-Large Community would be isolated from the process (and consequently, the Board member), making the appointee just another NomCom appointee, and reducing community ownership. It has been noted that this recommendation

would expand the number of Board Directors that the NomCom would be entitled to select and therefore goes against the recommendation of the Board Governance Committee.

There is no question that the process followed by the At-Large Community (ALAC and RALO Chairs) to select the occupant of Board seat #15 is more complex than the processes used by the Supporting Organisations for their selections. However, it is to ensure a bottom-up process is maintained and is patterned closely on the process used by the NomCom itself to select its own directors. The NomCom already appoints half of the Board, and two-thirds of its voting members are from the ICANN Supporting Organizations and the IETF. Furthermore, turning the designation into an exercise of random selection presumes that all candidates are identical. Random selection is not an acceptable way to select a Board Director from among a slate of candidates, although it can currently be used as a last resort in order to break repeated ties between two final candidates, both of whom have strong support among the electorate.

The other alternative suggested by the Review Team (but not recommended) is to revert to a selection process akin to the 2000 At-Large Board selection process. This is a process explicitly rejected by the bottom-up group that designed the current process and was rejected by the ICANN Board when ICANN was re-designed in 2002. It is not the place of an external At-Large reviewer to override these processes.

Lastly, any Review Team recommendations that are to be implemented will have to be formally approved by the Board. It would be a direct conflict of interest for the Board to instruct At-Large on how to select its Director.

Recommendation 7: At-Large should abandon existing internal Working Groups and discourage their creation in the future, as they are a distraction from the actual policy advice role of At-Large.

ALAC Response: The ALAC strongly objects to this recommendation. Working Groups (WGs), under a variety of names, are the core way that ICANN and its constituent parts discuss issues, address concerns, come to agreement and make decisions. The At-Large community creates WGs for a number of reasons that together form the framework that allows and encourages participation by the At-Large community in the discussion and shaping of policy that can properly reflect the interests of end-users. Hence the existence of these WGs is not trivial and indeed it constitutes the grassroots of participation for end-users within the ICANN policy development process. It is through such WGs that new participants often become active contributors.

The uses of WGs include:

Policy-Related Tasks: These WGs are used to build policy recommendations and advice, merging and melding differing opinions and ensuring that all parties can contribute. The final statements are supported by the ALAC and the RALOs. WGs were critical to the ALAC's ability to very effectively contribute to the New gTLD Process, the IANA Stewardship Transition Plan, and the new Accountability measures. These WGs are generally open to all participants in At-Large.

Process-Related Tasks: These WGs, in general, carry out tasks on behalf of the ALAC; at times making decisions on behalf of the ALAC. Their tasks include providing: advice and decisions on ICANN special budget requests; advice and decisions on CROPP requests; deliberation and advice on outreach; as well as deliberation and development of capacity building programs.

Outreach and Engagement: We have WGs which address needs such as: Tools (such as messaging and conference), Translation, Captioning; Social Media and Accessibility (ensuring that those with disabilities can participate equitably). Several of these have been sufficiently successful that they have been, or are in the process of being, transitioned to ICANN-wide projects (for example, ICANN Academy, Accessibility, Captioning).

The At-Large Community, as for every Supporting Organisation / Advisory Committee (SO/AC), has policy and process activities to address policy and process issues, to improve the effective functioning of their organisation. They constitute the base forum for end-users to voice their thoughts, discuss their concerns in relation to any given policy being discussed at ICANN, and frame agreements and strategies on how to positively impact the policy development process to benefit internet end-users. Open Working Groups are the backbone of At-Large in reaching consensus by providing bottom-up, grassroots input.

There are also WGs internal to RALOs set up to respond to ALAC policy and process in particular regions. RALO WGs are the prime forum for individual members and ALSes to provide input. They highlight awareness of the diversity of regional approaches as well as taps into the skills and interests of individual and ALS members.

In all cases, WGs can be dismantled as their tasks are completed.

It should be noted here that the CCWG-Accountability subgroup on SO/AC Accountability is considering recommending that SO/ACs create an outreach WG to improve the performance of that function - one of the WGs that this recommendation is suggesting being abolished.

Recommendation 8: At-Large should use social media much more effectively to gather end user opinions (Twitter poll/Facebook polls, etc).

ALAC Response: The ALAC strongly supports this recommendation and already has a well-functioning Social Media Working Group that is looking at developing such uses of Social Media (one of the inward-looking WGs that are recommended to be abolished). Further to this recommendation, the ALAC suggests that a pilot advertising program is funded to test the effectiveness of outreach through social networks.

Many At-Large and ALAC members are already highly active in social media under their own handles and communicate in real time via Skype chats. At-Large boasts active Twitter and Facebook pages. The Social Media Working Group has looked at other tools such as Mattermost, Slack, Eno, as well as FLICKR

and YouTube. Maximizing these tools to enhance internal communications as well as end-user participation will continue to be an important ALAC goal.

Despite the interest in some participants using social media, there are other issues to consider. Polling on these platforms is unrepresentative and not actionable. Furthermore, because there are many of our members who are still unfamiliar with social media due to their lack of access, social media is skewed towards certain populations and cannot be presumed to be balanced.

Recommendation 9: At-Large should consider the appointment of a part time Web Community Manager position. This member of the support staff could either be recruited, or a member of the current staff could be specially trained.

The ALAC supports the intent of this recommendation. We note however, that it is beyond the scope of the At-Large volunteer community to take such action.

Recommendation 10: Consider the adoption and use of a Slack-like online communication platform. An instant messaging-cum-team workspace (FOSS) alternative to Skype/Wiki/website/ mailing list.

ALAC Response: The ALAC supports the intent of this recommendation to ensure that we use appropriate communications tools within At-Large. We note however that we are subject to a number of constraints. At-Large cannot unilaterally start using tools that are not supported by ICANN. We cannot depend on volunteer technical support and so must rely on ICANN IT, which adds an additional level of vetting and bureaucracy.

We have community members all around the world, some with very low and/or very expensive bandwidth (and ICANN will not subsidize such access for volunteers). Often ONLY the older tools such as e-mail and Skype chat will function effectively or cost-effectively.

Furthermore, we have community members in locations where their national governments block access to certain services and tools.

Recommendation 11: At-Large should replace 5-yearly global ATLAS meetings with an alternative model of annual regional At-Large Meetings.

ALAC Response: The ALAC rejects the recommendation to replace the 5-yearly global ATLAS meetings with annual regional At-Large Meetings. The ALAC does not reject the concept of holding regular regional meetings, and in fact has done this for many years. These “General Assemblies” are held in addition to the At-Large Summit (ATLAS) meetings.

General Assemblies (GAs) are gatherings of representatives of ALSes and individual members (if applicable) of a specific region. GAs are generally held once in every five year period at an ICANN meeting within the region or in conjunction with some other regional event. At-Large Summit meetings are gatherings of representatives of all ALSes and individual members world-wide, held roughly every five years at an ICANN meeting. The normal expectation is that in between successive ATLAS meetings,

there will be one GA per region. The ATLAS meetings encourage cross-regional understanding and cooperation which the ALAC believes is crucial to a well-functioning At-Large.

Such GAs have been standard practice since 2012. ICANN has recently agreed to formalize the GS/Summit process and integrate it into its normal planning and budgeting process. The proposal can be found at <http://tinyurl.com/At-Large-GS-Summit>. The exact scheduling of a General Assembly (or ATLAS) depends on many variables: the type of meeting; venue capabilities and cost; other ICANN events planned (such as a GAC high-level ministerial meeting); and the availability of volunteers and staff to plan the event. At times, a GA may be held in parallel with a non-ICANN event, such as the upcoming NARALO GA in April which will be held in conjunction with an ARIN meeting.

Despite the lack of mention of GAs in this recommendation, the Review did include a reference to the regular GAs in the section reviewing the 2008 At-Large Review, incorrectly attributing the newly approved multi-year budgeting directly to the original Westlake review.

Part of the rationale for this recommendation is that with the EMM, the number of participants will grow and the larger number of ATLAS participants will not be practical, presumably from a funding and other resource point of view. The ALAC does not support the EMM, nor does it believe that if implemented, the number of active participants would grow inordinately. However, the core issue is relevant, and should numbers change radically in coming years, the ALAC will have to adapt, as it does with all other aspects of its existence.

Recommendation 12: As part of its strategy for regional outreach and engagement, At-Large should put a high priority on the organisation of regional events. The five RALOs should, as part of their annual outreach strategies, continue to partner with well-established regional events involved in the Internet Governance ecosystem. CROPP and other funding mechanisms should be provided to support the costs of organisation and participation of At-Large members.

ALAC Response: The ALAC supports this recommendation. The use of the word “continue” in the recommendation implies, as is the case, that this is already an ongoing practice and subject to ICANN funding, it will continue and hopefully grow. Recently the CROPP fund (previously catering for three days and two nights) was increased so that it has become four days and three nights. This more closely fits into the type of regional meetings being attended and allows the traveller to more fully participate without having to either miss critical parts of the event or self-fund additional days. Requests for CROPP allow RALO membership to participate in regional IGFs, regional SIGs, and other regional events. Nevertheless, members are also sometimes co-sponsored by other localised funding sources, in order to enable more flexible participation.

Recommendation 13: Working closely with ICANN’s Regional Hubs and regional ISOC headquarters, At-Large should reinforce its global outreach and engagement strategy with a view to encouraging the organisation of Internet Governance Schools in connection with each At-Large regional gathering.

ALAC Response: The ALAC accepts this recommendation with reservations. Specifically, although there is synergy (and overlap) between ISOC and ISOC Chapters that are also ICANN ALSes, it is not an At-Large decision as to how, or if, the Internet Society chooses to work together with a local Chapter. Moreover, although ICANN has provided some support for Schools of Internet Governance, under the new Bylaws, it is not clear whether being more proactive in such endeavours would be in line with the Mission and Scope identified in the ICANN Bylaws.

At-Large should maximize its natural synergies with organizations such as ISOC, not only at the “Regional Hub” Level (actually called Regional Bureaus), but also as locally as possible, i.e. at the Chapter Level. For example the ISOC Latin America and Caribbean Regional Bureau - one of six ISOC Bureaus - sits in the “*Casa del Internet*” in Montevideo, Uruguay, alongside several ICT and telecom organizations.

That being said, the ALAC notes that ICANN has a limited number of regional offices, and while some work very cooperatively with their regional At-Large leaders and community (for example, APRALO and the APAC Hub), others have not shown the same support for At-Large in the way the recommendation presumes.

While the ALAC agrees with the perceived intent of this recommendation, it does note the lack of linkage between ICANN regional hubs, ISOC “regional headquarters” and Schools of Internet Governance.

Recommendation 14: In the interests of transparency, all At-Large travel funding should be published as a “one stop shop” contribution to the At-Large webpage.

ALAC Response: Although the decision to make such information available is out of scope for the ALAC, the ALAC strongly supports full disclosure of all travel costs, with the understanding that a similar policy is applied for the entire organization including the SOs and the Board and ICANN staff. ICANN regularly publishes the travel costs for ICANN meetings and events directly associated with them (excluding the Board and staff), but not for other activities. Staff costs are published only to the extent that they are required for senior executives under US tax law. Recently, in order to discover the costs of the annual GNSO Non-Contracted House Intersessional meetings, a formal Documentary Information Disclosure Policy request had to be filed (<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/didp-20160211-1-rrsg-request-2016-03-14-en>).

While the ALAC does support transparency in travel funding, it also notes that this is not a one-sided relationship. In ICANN parlance, “volunteers” refers to all parts of the ICANN community not paid by ICANN. However, a large part of this community is in fact paid to participate in ICANN on behalf of their employer or by serving their self-interest as part of the domain name ecosystem. At-Large volunteers are in fact volunteers in the true sense of the word. Virtually all of their time at face-to-face meetings

and when participating remotely (conference calls, e-mail, document preparation) is personally donated. The cost to them (such as lost revenue, unpaid leave or vacations not spent with families) far exceeds the actual out-of-pocket costs to ICANN. ICANN rarely factors in these contributions and it must do so to properly present the costs AND benefits of volunteer involvement.

Recommendation 15: At-Large should be involved in the Cross-Community Working Group on new gTLD Auction Proceeds and initiate discussions with the ICANN Board of Directors with a view gaining access to these funds in support of the At-Large Community.

ALAC Response: The ALAC is already involved in the first part of this recommendation to the extent of their full participation in the CCWG Auction Proceeds activity. The Vice-Chair of the CCWG Charter Drafting Team was from the ALAC and the ALAC is one of the Chartering Organizations. As such, the ALAC was required to contribute Members to the CCWG and has named five such Members. Other At-Large members are Participants in the CCWG. The ALAC will be called upon to ratify any recommendations that arise out of the CCWG.

The CCWG will be deciding on the methodology and structure associated with disbursing funds, which will only happen after the CCWG completes its work. However, the CCWG is NOT the place to request funds for specific projects or activities. One of the issues that will be discussed is whether ICANN and its constituent bodies could ultimately apply for any of the funds. If any At-Large people participate in the CCWG with the explicit intent of planning to later request funding for the At-Large Community, we would have to explicitly declare that and as such would not be able to equitably participate in discussions related to this core issue.

Once the CCWG completes its deliberations, and presuming the Chartering Organizations largely ratify the outcomes, the Board will then consider the recommendations. It is envisioned that if the Board approves, some sort of organization will be created or contracted with to consider projects and do the actual disbursement.

Moreover, although one can envision all manner of good projects that could be funded, it is not clear that actually funding operational expenses of At-Large is among them, and in fact there is already considerable opposition to doing this, both within At-Large and the rest of ICANN. So to be clear, the ALAC does not support the recommendation in relation to having access to the auction proceeds funds to support the operational expenses of the ALAC. Some ALAC and At-Large members have supported using auction funds for targeted and project-oriented uses within ICANN and At-Large. Whether that will end up being allowed remains to be seen.

The ALAC notes that the ICANN Board currently has no discretion to unilaterally allocate auction funds.

Recommendation 16: Adopt a set of metrics that are consistent for the entire At-Large Community to measure the implementation and impact of the EMM and track the continuous improvement of the At-Large Community.

ALAC Response: As noted elsewhere, the ALAC does not support implementation of the EMM. However, the ALAC does support the establishment of metrics to track performance and improvement of the At-Large Community. In fact, we have a Metrics WG (one of the groups recommended to be abolished) that has been tasked precisely with that responsibility. It is currently on hold pending the completion of the ALS and RALO Criteria and Expectations Task Force. Although consistency is important, there are also significant differences between the regions and any discussion of metrics needs to factor that in.

4. Recommendation Made Through Omission

Maintain the single voting Board member by At-Large.

ALAC Response: The report presents a number of pro and con arguments for an additional At-Large Director. The arguments against such a move were:

1. The ALAC has significant - and sufficient - power with one voting seat. “Sufficient” is clearly a judgement call and not a rational argument.
2. The ALAC has more Board voting power than the GAC, the RSSAC or the SSAC. The Bylaws forbid government representatives from sitting as voting Board members, so the GAC is not even a question. The RSSAC and SSAC have made it clear through their decision not to participate in the Empowered Community that they wish to stay purely advisory. We note that the other ACs have always been in a different position relative to the ALAC in that they have only non-voting Liaisons to the NomCom while the ALAC has always had decisional responsibility on the NomCom.
3. An increase would not sit well with other stakeholder groups. This is intuitively obvious and not a reason to not take action. Those same groups did not want the ALAC or the GAC to participate in the Empowered Community, preserving all power for themselves.
4. At-Large has 5 of the 15 voting delegates on the NomCom. The GNSO has 7 of the 15 delegates on the NomCom (2 more than the ALAC) but still has 2 voting Directors.

5. Comments on EMM Implementation Guidelines

Implementation # 1: Adopt the Empowered Membership Model (EMM) as proposed to bring a greater number of end users directly into ICANN policy making processes, and or engaged in At- Large outreach activities (Section 11).

Implementation # 2: Engage more end users directly in ICANN Working Groups by adopting the Empowered Membership Model described in this document (See Section 11).

Implementation # 3: Adopt the Empowered Membership Model described in this document to engage more end users directly in ICANN work. (Section 11).

ALAC Response: It is unclear what the mechanism will be by which users will become informed of the EMM, and what it is that will motivate them to begin spending significant time and effort to participate in ICANN policy issues (including learning the vernacular, getting up to speed on the issues in question and expending significant time on a regular basis).

The presence of a personal vote seems to be a critical part of this, since it is that which largely differentiates the EMM from the individual unaffiliated members that three of the five RALOs have, and the other two are committed to allow. But this vote is only allotted after demonstration of active participation. It is unclear who will judge such participation and how this will be done. Such metrics have been an issue that At-Large has been grappling with for years and is not a minor implementation issue. If a possible vote is the critical issue in motivating people to engage, then one has to question their overall commitment. Moreover, since some RALOs rarely if ever have votes, one has to question whether the EMM would work if voting is a critical issue.

Implementation # 4: In the Empowered Membership Model individual users will be encouraged to participate in At-Large. Within this context there should be scope for further cooperation with the NCSG (Section 12).

ALAC Response: It is not clear what the connection is between the EMM and participation in At-Large and cooperation with NCSG. The ALAC is always interested in cooperating with other parts of ICANN and does so regularly with most other groups. The ICANN58 joint outreach session of the European At-Large Organisation (EURALO) with NCUC was a total success. Plans are to repeat this collaboration at ICANN59. The joint session brought about a lot of understanding for both At-Large and NCUC and helped newcomers realise the differences in approach and structure of both organisations.

Implementation # 5: Any individual from any region should be allowed to become an “At-Large Member” (ALM). The ALM is what the Empowered Membership Model identifies as the atomic element of the new At-Large model (Section 11).

ALAC Response: This is the status quo for three of the five regions and will eventually be the case for all regions, regardless of implementation of the EMM. Some regions have raised the need to place some

restrictions to ensure that users support the principles of At-Large and do not use the At-Large persona to campaign for anti-user issues (something that HAS happened in the past).

Implementation # 6: Adopt the Empowered Membership Model which changes the function of RALOs so that they are primarily an outreach and mentoring mechanism for engaging new entrants (Section 11)

ALAC Response: Outreach is already a core focus for RALOs today, not only for engaging new entrants but also for capacity building within the RALO (inreach). Mentoring has developed from this, for example, in APRALO where capacity building has focused on involvement by leadership volunteers in Workstream 2 policy issues which were highlighted in a survey last year to identify interest areas for potential involvement by APRALO members. The ALAC would support more ALS members being engaged in policy development.

Implementation # 7: As part of the Empowered Membership Model, elected RALO representatives become ALAC Members who not only deliberate on advice to the Board but also serve as mentors to newcomers to At-Large. (Section 11)

ALAC Response: Workload is already a major issue within At-Large and particularly for RALO leaders and ALAC Members. Although a small number of people put a vast number of hours into At-Large and ICANN matters, asking all such volunteers to do so is problematic. Moreover, if outreach is a prime focus of RALOS as implied by Implementation 6, these are not the optimal people to place on the ALAC and then debate policy issues.

Implementation # 8: The ALAC Members should have a maximum of (2) terms, each of a 2-year duration. (see Section 11).

ALAC Response: In the entire history of the modern ALAC (after the Interim ALAC was appointed by the Board), there have been 65 RALO and NomCom appointed ALAC members and only five of them have served for more than two consecutive terms (and two of those only exceeded the two-term point after the last AGM).

Taking this into account, term limits would not have had much impact in the past, and it is unclear if having such limits would have fixed problems, or created them. That being said, term limits may well be reasonable, but it is less clear that two terms is optimal. One RALO currently has a shorter limit, and others may feel that in critical times, the limit should be able to be overridden.

Implementation # 14 [later renumbered to # 9]: The proposed Empowered Membership Model (Section 11) conflates many of these roles and consequently frees up travel slots for new voices. For example the 5 RALOS are now part of the 15 ALAC Member list and 5 Liaison roles are also taken by NomCom appointed ALAC Members, leaving 2 for the Council of Elders and up to 10 slots for Rapporteurs for CCWGs and regular WGs (to be decided openly and transparently).

ALAC Response: The ALAC does not support this Implementation Guideline. Specific issues will be more fully addressed in section 7 of this document.

To implement such a radical and untested change, against the judgement of those who have been working in this arena for years, is at best risky, and at worst exceedingly dangerous.

During discussions in Copenhagen, a Review Team member mentioned that the CCWG-Accountability Empowered Community measures were also untested. The difference is that these were developed by the entire ICANN community over an extended period of time and approved by all of the chartering ACs and SOs.

6. Methodology

Reliance on Comments

The ALAC believes that the reviewers have placed greater focus on certain comments that have been made, and cited these as “facts”. Unfortunately, many of these “facts” are incorrect. For example,

“More candidates? I can only think of a handful of people associated with At-Large Leadership over the ten plus years I’ve followed ICANN.” (NCSG Participant)

There is no doubt that the commenter could only think of a half dozen or so, but the actual statistics give a somewhat different picture. In the last ten years (2007-2016), there have been:

- 5 ALAC Chairs [2 Chairs served for short terms due to circumstances beyond their control and the transition from the Interim ALAC]
- 17 people in ALAC Leadership positions (Chairs, Vice-Chairs, etc.)
- 23 RALO Chairs (or equivalent)
- 41 people in RALO Leadership positions

During this same period, the GAC has had 3 Chairs, ccNSO 3, SSAC 2 and GNSO 6.

Lack of connection between Conclusions and Recommendations

Many (but not all) of the conclusions reached in analysing At-Large are correct. This is not particularly surprising because the ALAC and its leaders have spent significant time understanding what is working and what is not working in At-Large (part of the inward focus for which we are criticized) and we were very open with the Review Team when they started their work. However, as noted in the comments to

the Recommendations and Implementations, in many cases, there is little connection between the problem identified and the solution.

Survey has design problems and the interpretation of results is problematic

Parts of the survey were poorly designed and ITEMS' interpretation of their results are questionable.

As an example, one of the questions asked: *In your opinion which of the following statements most accurately describes the role played by the At-Large Community within ICANN?* There were a number of options, but respondents could pick only one. Among them (in condensed form):

- ALSes and individuals who act in their own interest: This is a basically accurate statement. Each ALS is an organization that exists largely for purposes other than ICANN and looks at issues from its own perspective. The same is true for individual members. In theory, if we can gather enough of these individual positions, together they do indeed represent the needs of the global end-user.
- The At-Large Community is made up of ALSes and individual members that engage in ICANN activities on behalf of end-users: This is effectively the definition of At-Large.
- ALSes and individuals can effectively engage in ICANN policy processes: This is a true statement, unless you interpret it as they cannot due to the steep learning curve and time commitment involved.
- At-Large allows end-users to engage in ICANN processes on an equal and non-discriminatory fashion: This is true in theory but quite false in practice due to constraints of time, knowledge and funding.

Some of the choices were correct to varying degrees, and some could be the selected answer but for completely different reasons than the Review Team presumed. It is not surprising that answers were all over the place and were subject to varying interpretations by the Review Team.

Although we are told that there were 242 surveys completed, all of the rest of the statistics presented are percentages of specific groups, but with no information of the group sizes.

In a similar vein, reports such as this typically list the people interviewed and their affiliation. This report is totally silent on this with the exception of several Tweets that are displayed verbatim, and like other Tweets we are familiar with recently, not accurate.

Focus on events at the time of the Review

It is perhaps natural that the Review Team focused on what they saw at the various events they attended, maybe not completely realising that the previous two years in ICANN were very atypical, and the focus of much of the organisation has been on the IANA Stewardship Transition and ICANN Accountability. At-Large and the ALAC, like the rest of the ICANN community, invested VERY heavily in these processes, to the clear detriment of many other activities. The Review Team arrived at the tail end of this and seems to believe that what they saw was the norm. In reality, much of the “regular”

policy work of ICANN has largely been on hold for close to two years, and the work of At-Large along with it. There is virtually no mention in the report of the significant accomplishments of At-Large during these efforts.

Misunderstanding of Current Process

In reviewing this document, it might be noted that a significant number of the Recommendations partially or completely describes what is already current practice - the status quo. This seems to indicate that the Review Team seemingly was not listening to its At-Large participants, or that they did not fully grasp what was actually occurring and chose not to verify their impressions with Staff or At-Large leaders prior to publication.

7. Non-Recommendation Suggestions

The report includes a number of very specific suggestions that do not surface as formal recommendations, but are referenced in the Implementation Guidelines. They warrant comment because in the minds of many within At-Large, they are extremely misguided and demonstrate a lack of understanding of our environment.

Conflation of RALO Leaders and ALAC Members

The concept that RALO leaders should at the same time be the RALO appointed ALAC Members presumes that:

- Both jobs can be readily handled at a reasonable volunteer workload
- The skills and interests of both are similar enough to be of interest and within capabilities of sufficient volunteers

Based on volunteer management experience within At-Large for many years, neither of these is likely to be true on a regular basis, and presuming it to be the case will inevitably lead to significant failure to deliver.

ALM “activity” certification

The EMM model presumes that we (an undefined we) will be able to recognize when people have been “active” for N (3, 6 or 12, the number has varied throughout the report and subsequent interactions with the Review Team) months, and also presumes that we will monitor them to ensure that their activity levels are maintained. It was pointed out to the Review Team that this was not a minor “implementation detail”.

Recognizing that people are truly active (and not just dialing into meetings and never saying anything, or using mailing lists but never sending out anything other than “+1” indicating support or birthday wishes) is a really difficult problem that At-Large has been grappling with for years. If the EMM were to actually be successful, the number of such people to monitor could be significant. Who would do this monitoring, and on what basis is completely unclear.

Rapporteurs

It is unclear exactly what the Rapporteur is expected to do, but regardless, the assumption that after a 3, 6 or 12-month period, a person new to the ICANN system will fully grasp the complexities of some of the issues we address as well as the user-related issues underestimates the learning curve and complexity. Similarly, it overestimates the relatively few people who will be able to regularly keep up and then represent At-Large. Moreover, random selection of the rapporteur if there are multiple candidates is far less than optimal.

It is unclear who would act in this capacity for the first year of a WG. Although some WGs last well over a year and at times over two years, efforts are continually underway to have targeted WGs take far less than the process associated with Rapporteurs would allow.

The Review Team believes that we need multiple people on each WG, a position the ALAC supports. However, it is a mystery how the wisdom of all of these people will be funnelled into the Rapporteur so that this one person can represent the entire input from the WG members to the ALAC and RALOs.

The report also seems to presume that all ALAC comments and advice are in respect to WG activities. Many, perhaps even most, are not directly related to a WG, and the report offers no guidance as to how these would be addressed.

The report calls for selected Rapporteurs to be sent to ICANN meetings for a year, although it is not necessarily true that WGs even meet during ICANN meetings, and if they do, it is typically just for a few hours. Currently, this reporting role is done by the WG Chair by remote participation, if funding is not available to get that person to a meeting. Although the concept of “rapporteurs” is not appropriate, having travel slots in addition to those currently assigned for the ALAC and Regional leaders for those who are very active in WGs or other activities has much merit.

Lastly, the ALAC notes that the term Rapporteur is already used with specific meaning within ICANN and we should not risk confusion by adoption of the same term with a different intent.

Liaisons

The first draft simply said that NomCom appointees will take on Liaison roles. The comments submitted made it clear that this could not work. Liaisons are critical to the relationship between the ALAC and other AC/SOs, and their special skills, knowledge and background are essential. In several cases, the other organization has to agree to accept the particular person as Liaison.

The only change made in the report following our comments was that the ALAC should supply the NomCom with a list of criteria they should use in their selection. This presumed that such “criteria” could be quantified and that there would be abundant applicants with suitable knowledge (including knowledge of the ALAC and other AC/SO) and skills. We note that the requirement for such prior knowledge of ICANN and its constituent bodies is potentially at odds with the NomCom responsibility of getting “new blood” into ICANN. It also ignored the issue that the other AC/SO may have criteria that they use to judge acceptability.

Based on concrete past examples, it is clear that a poor Liaison is not only ineffective but can be dangerous to the relationship between the ALAC and the other ICANN body.

Council of Elders

While the ALAC recognises the usefulness and purpose of this recommendation, the ALAC believes that the constraints around the membership of this Council, especially in relation to the rigid set of rules around how long a person could serve, how often they could travel, and the presumption that they would be endlessly available regardless of these rules, is (for some of the current “elders” around At-Large) rather laughable.

8. Analysis of Prior Review Recommendations

Part of the mandate of the Review Team was to report on the “Effectiveness of implementation of prior review recommendations”.

The first At-Large review was originally carried out by an external consultant. Once the review was delivered, the ICANN Board committee responsible for reviews at the time chartered the “ALAC Review Working Group” which:

According to the Charter, the ALAC Review WG has been formed to help ensure that the evaluator's final report (independent review) contains the data and information needed to conduct the work of the BGC and the WG, and (primarily) to advise the BGC on whether any change is needed for At-Large. The WG will consider the Independent Reviewer's final report, Board input, and comments from stakeholders and the public, and will:

- *Advise the BGC whether, in general, the ALAC has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure; and*
- *If so, consult broadly and advise the BGC whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness -- and recommend to the BGC a comprehensive proposal to improve the involvement of the individual Internet user community in ICANN.*

The ALAC Review WG ultimately created a set of recommendations which the ALAC implemented and it is that set of recommendations that the Review Team was supposed to evaluate.

The Review Team put significant effort into comparing the external evaluator’s recommendations to that of the ICANN WG and it was quite concerned that ICANN had decided to not follow some of the external evaluator’s recommendations. They seemed to believe that the changes in the recommendations were due to an At-Large effort to ignore recommendations that it did not like. It was apparently not understood that the ALAC Review WG had no current At-Large people on it, and only one former At-Large member (and former Liaison to the Board).

How ICANN developed its Recommendations to be implemented by the ALAC for the first review was a matter internal to ICANN and was a decision of the ICANN Board. It should not be an issue that the present Review Team needed to look at or question.

9. Travel Issues

Many of the restructuring recommendations seem to be driven largely by a desire to free up travel slots so that they could be used by Rapporteurs.

There is no doubt that a number of extra travel slots could be useful to allow those who make significant contributions to attend ICANN meetings. To date, that has only been possible when regular travellers cannot attend a meeting.

The ALAC believes that merging RALO leadership with ALAC Membership and Liaisons with NomCom appointments would both have extremely detrimental effects and are not a reasonable or rational exchange for the questionable benefit of having 10-12 rapporteurs attend meetings.

The ALAC does agree that having the ability to bring a limited number (perhaps 5) of non-RALO/ALAC leaders and Liaisons to ICANN meetings could be extremely beneficial, but believes that other methods must be found for doing so.

Given that some other AC/SO travel allocations have rapidly increased over the last seven years (the period for which statistics are available), while the At-Large allocation has remained nearly unchanged, perhaps there are alternatives to the Review Team proposal. The following table shows the number of Full Support Equivalent (FSE) travellers⁴ that have been funded by ICANN for the AC/SOs over the last eight fiscal years (the ASO is fully funded by the Regional Internet Registries).

⁴ ICANN funds a specific number of travellers per AC/SO per meeting. The support for a traveller may be divided between multiple people (for instance one receiving just airfare and one receiving hotel and per diem)

Table 2
Annual FSE Travel Slots Per AC/SO

	At-Large	GNSO	ccNSO	SSAC	GAC	RSSAC
FY09	72	42	30	0	2	0
FY10	73	51	35	0	15	0
FY11	75	57	36	0	14	0
FY12	81	61	36	14	36	0
FY13	74	114	33	29	51	0
FY14	76	127	37	27	67	1
FY15	77	134	32	37	64	6
FY16	79	143	34	38	86	12

In most years, the numbers are slightly inflated from the actual approved traveller because incoming members often attend the Annual General Meeting but are separately funded. The number of incoming members varies from year to year. These were omitted from the FY16 counts, but are present in other years.

Note that the table excludes extraordinary travel including At-Large General Assemblies and Summits, and Intersessional meetings that have become common in the GNSO. For At-Large the average over seven years for these additional travellers has been 32 FSE per year, and for the GNSO over the last two years has been 37 FSE per year.

10. Volunteer Turnover

The Review Team received many comments alluding to a lack of volunteer turnover, stagnant leadership, and people “clinging to power”. There is no question that such perceptions exist in the community.

Volunteer statistics tell a quite different story. They demonstrate that over the 14 years of the ALAC history, and the 10 years since the current ALAC plus RALOs have existed, there has been very abundant turnover.

To repeat and expand on the statistics reported earlier in this document, over the life of the ALAC,

- 126 people served on the ALAC or RALO leadership
- 20 people in ALAC Leadership positions
- 7 ALAC Chairs
- 41 people in RALO Leadership positions
- 23 RALO Chairs (or equivalent)

Table 4 shows all ALAC Members for the period 2007-2016 who were in office for each ICANN meeting. The cell contents show who appointed the Member (the Board for early members of the Interim ALAC, the NomCom or a RALO – Empty rows are for ALAC members whose terms ended prior to RALOs being created in 2006-7)

It is clear that there is a regular progression of new ALAC members. The only RALOs with term limits for ALAC Members are LACRALO (1 term, 2 years) and NARALO (2 terms, 4 years), but it is clear that very relatively few ALAC member exceed stay beyond two terms.

Table 5 combines service on the ALAC, as a RALO leader (Chair, Vice-Chair or Secretariat), Liaison to another AC/SO or service as a NomCom Delegate since the start of the Interim ALAC in 2003. This chart too shows a constant stream of new people entering into these leadership positions. Many stay just for a single terms, some for a more extended period, and a few for relatively long periods. Often, a person starts in a more junior role and progresses through other roles. This is exactly what one would hope for and expect. Those who have a great interest step into advanced roles, and some people stay around to ensure continuity and experience. In some years just a few new people come on board, and in others the number is quite large – twelve new people in leadership roles in 2014

Table 3
ALAC Members - 2007-2016
Sorted by Region

Given	Name Surname	Region	2007			2008			2009			2010			2011			2012			2013			2014			2015			2016		
			28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57
Pierre	Dandjinou	AF	Brd																													
Clement	Dzidonu	AF	Brd																													
Sunday	Folayan	AF																														
Alice	Mungua	AF	NC	NC	NC																											
Fatimata	Sege Sylla	AF				NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC																					
Hawa	Diakite	AF		AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF																		
Mohamed	El Bashir	AF		AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF																	
Dave	Kissoondoyal	AF										NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC															
Tijani	Ben Jemaa	AF														AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF		
Titi	Akinsamni	AF														NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC		
Yaovi	Atohoun	AF														AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF		
Beren	Gillen	AF																							NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC		
Hadja	Ouattara	AF																						AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF	AF		
Wafa	Dahmani	AF																											NC	NC	NC	
Seun	Ojedeji	AF																											AF	AF	AF	
Hong	Xue	AP	Brd																													
Izumi	Aizu	AP	Brd	AP	AP	AP	AP																									
Tommy	Matsumoto	AP																														
Siavash	Shahshahani	AP	NC	NC	NC																											
Thu Hue	Nguyen	AP				NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC																					
Cheryl	Langdon-Orr	AP		AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP																	
V.C.	Vivekanandan	AP										AP	AP	AP	AP																	
James	Seng	AP											NC	NC	NC																	
Edmon	Chung	AP												AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP		
Rinalia	Abdul Rahim	AP														NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC		
Salanieta	Tamanik aiwaimar	AP														AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP		
Holly	Raiche	AP																						AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	
Rafid	Fatani	AP																						NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC		
Maureen	Hilyard	AP																					AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP	AP		
Kailli	Kan	AP																											NC	NC	NC	
Thomas	Roessler	EU																														
Vittorio	Bertola	EU	Brd																													
Roberto	Gaetano	EU																														
Annette	Muehlberg	EU	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC																							
Veronica	Cretu	EU		EU	EU	EU																										
Sebastien	Bachollet	EU		EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU														EU	EU	EU	
Adam	Peake	EU																														
Patrick	Vande Walle	EU					EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU																	
Jean-Jacque	Subrenat	EU												NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC		
Olivier	Crepin-Leblond	EU												EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU		
Sandra	Hoferichter	EU												EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU	EU		
Jimmy	Shulz	EU																											NC	NC	NC	
Andrei	Kolesnikof	EU																											NC	NC	NC	
Erick	Iarte Ahon	LAC																														
Sebastian	Ricciardi	LAC																														
Tadau	Takahashi	LAC																														
Jacqueline	Morris	LAC	NC	NC	NC																											
Jose Ovidio	Salguero	LAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC		
Carlos	Aquirre	LAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC		
Vanda	Scartezini	LAC				NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC																		LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC		
Sylvia Herleir	Leite	LAC											LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC		
Carlton	Samuels	LAC											NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC		
Sergio Selinz	Porto	LAC												LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC	LACLACLAC		
Natalia	Enciso	LAC																														
Dev Anand	Teelucksingh	LAC																														
Fatima	Cambronero	LAC																														
Leon	Sanchez	LAC																														
Harold	Aroos	LAC																														
Alberto	Soto	LAC																														
Esther	Dyson	NA																														
Wendy	Seltzer	NA	Brd	Brd																												
Kenneth	Hamma	NA																														
Jean	Polly	NA																														
John	Levine	NA	Brd	Brd																												
Alan	Greenberg	NA	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC																	
Robert	Guerra	NA				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																	
Beau	Brendler	NA				NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA																	
Gareth	Shearman	NA																														
Marc	Pottenberg	NA												NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Evan	Leibovitch	NA												NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
Ganesh	Kumar	NA												NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC	NC		
Eduardo	Diaz	NA																														
Glenn	McKnight	NA																														
Timoth	Denton	NA																														
Garth	Bruen	NA																														
Javier	Rua	NA																														

Table 5 shows the distribution of how long people stay. Note that the specific meetings referred to in “Number of Meetings” are not necessarily contiguous. As can be seen in Table 4, some people serve for a while then come back into another leadership position some years later.

There is a clear peak at two years. Rather than showing that many people stay far too long, this chart shows that a real problem is that too many people leave after two years. The entry for 7-9 meetings should be much higher. This sharp drop-off is symptomatic of the difficulty in really being an effective and contributing member of the community.

Table 5
Total At-Large Appointments – 2007-2017

