

ICANN | ALAC
At-Large Advisory Committee

At-Large Review Recommendations
Feasibility Assessment
&
Implementation Plan

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	XX
1. OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS	XX
2. RECOMMENDATIONS FEASIBILITY ASSESSMENT & IMPLEMENTATION PLAN	XX
3. METHODOLOGY	XX
4. TIMELINE	XX
ANNEX 1: BACKGROUND	XX
ANNEX 2: AT-LARGE REVIEW RECOMMENDATION CHARTER	XX

Executive Summary

- The response includes input from both the ALAC and RALOs (and there are some important things in the RALO submission we should include)
- Note the report's confirmation of ALAC role (both policy and outreach)
- Support for the final report
- fully support 8 out of 16 recommendations
- partially support another 5
- reject only 3 - all to do with their proposed structural changes
- Issues raised (most of these in stated issues, but one or two in text)
 - barriers, particularly for individuals, to participate in ALAC
 - Unchanging leadership/core leadership group
 - Concentration of processes/procedures
 - Use of social media
 - Restructuring of meetings (ATLAS/Regional)
 - Outreach
 - Accountability/transparency(metrics)
- Response therefore concentrates on the issues raised by the Review - and response addresses the issues (not necessarily the proposed structural changes)
 - Individual participation - (both introducing individual membership, and support through fellowship, capacity building etc)
 - leadership - (introducing -at least in some areas - mentorship programs etc - indeed, could rename proposed Council of Elders as mentors)
 - Processes and concentration of procedure, not policy. (mention policy Management Process system, webinars, etc)
 - Social media (happening - technology task force, But depends on connectivity available as well)
 - Restructuring of meetings (se RALO response)
 - Outreach ((again, RALO and ALAC response)
 - Accountability and transparency (have started developing metrics - will continue the process)
- Why EMM not the solution - text from both the ALAC and RALO response

1. Overview of Recommendations

2. Recommendations Feasibility Assessment & Implementation Plan

Recommendation 1	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	ALAC should be more selective in the amount of advice it seeks to offer, focusing on those issues which might have the greatest impact upon the end user community, and going for quality rather than quantity. ALAC should develop a more transparent process for distinguishing between different types of advice, and publish that advice on the At-Large website.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Quality vs quantity of ALAC advice produced.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support noting that the recommendation is the standard practice.
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Medium Priority
At-Large Comments	The ALAC already focuses on quality vs quantity and as a rule only issue comments that the ALAC believes are important to ICANN and users. This has been a very conscious policy that has evolved over several years, and is an ongoing project for continuous quality improvement within the ALAC and At-Large. Records over the last five years demonstrate this.

		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. The ALAC acknowledges that its web site does not always fully represent the diverse nature of its various statements. Ensuring that this does, will be important as new volunteers become involved in At-Large. 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. The ALAC also has a longer term project under way to track issues of concern to ICANN and Internet users and provide information on the issue to those responding to public comment issue.						
Possible Dependencies	Availability of Staff resources					
Who Will Implement?	Staff with input from At-Large Leadership.					
Resource Requirements	ICANN Staff in support of the development of taxonomy that categorizes various ALAC Statements, as well as the improvement of the At-Large website					

Budget Effects impact?	Associated staffing costs
Implementation Timeline	Six-nine months
Proposed Implementation Steps	Staff to identify areas of the website needing improvement to be reviewed by At-large Leadership prior to implementation. Staff to organise webinars to explain and discuss policy issues with At-Large members to enhance their understanding of matters that the ALAC is being asked to make comment on.

Recommendation 2	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large should adopt the proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM) with a view to removing the barriers to participation for Internet end-users, and encouraging greater direct participation by At-Large members in At-Large policy advice and related "Outreach and Engagement" processes. (See EMM Recs)
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	At-Large has struggled to reflect/process end user-opinion; barriers to individual participation; perception of unchanging leadership group.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	The ALAC rejects the adoption of the EMM as recommended by the Review. The ALAC also rejects the reality behind the issue of perception of unchanging leadership (see the ALAC response to EMM 5). However, the ALAC does accept the need to further support individual participation in ALAC and RALOs. Note that currently 4 of the 5 RALOs have active Individual Membership, and the 5th is finalising their processes to do the same.
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	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 and subordinate element (adoption of the EMM) suggests a method by which the goal, in the opinion of the reviewers, would be achieved. The ALAC supports the goal of the EMM and notes that work to achieve it is already well underway. The ALAC supports the overall concept of

	individual membership, 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. At the same time, the ALAC is working to ensure that we can encourage ALS and individual members who have an interest to be more engaged and participative in ICANN policy activities. The ALAC does see 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. But the ALAC resolutely rejects the method the Review Team suggested to implement the EMM model, which is not necessary for achieving the goal, and could lead to unintended consequences detrimental to At-Large and to ICANN itself. The ALAC believes that if several aspects of the EMM were implemented, the end effect would be to irreparably damage At-Large's ability to fulfill its mandate in ICANN. Among their recommended changes are the merger of RALO Officer and ALAC Member roles and the elimination of the ALAC's ability to select appropriate Liaisons to other ICANN AC/SOs. There are other 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. No evidence is presented as to why or how the vote-empowered membership will be significantly more attractive to end-users world-wide 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. (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)
--	--

	Many of these members 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 interests of billions of end-users any more effectively than the current model, whereas ALSes at least provide outreach capacity at local level. 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, due to 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, there was unanimous opposition to the recommendation to adopt the EMM model
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	While ALAC does not support the adoption of the EMM Model, it does support individual membership and encourages all RALOs to ensure that individual membership is incorporated into their general practice and Rules of Procedure. This was a recommendation from the 1st ALAC Review from which the implementation progress seen to date has been initiated.
Prioritization	High
At-Large Comments	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. Individual ALS members also form a prime pool of potential At-Large workers, as well as ALAC and RALO leaders. Plans are underway to enhance outreach to them and to engage those who are intrigued by ICANN and its work. Ultimately, there may be some merit in more uniform rules for Individual Members across regions. But at the moment, it is clear that their needs and views differ greatly, and allowing regions to address their unique characteristics in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws section 12.2(d)(ix)(D) <i>"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."</i>

Possible Dependencies	Completion of the Bylaw changes by the final RALO to allow for entry of individual membership (near completion)
Who Will Implement?	RALOs, ICANN staff
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	1-2 years
Proposed Implementation Steps	• Staff coordinate with each RALO to find any common understanding in their governance documents relating to Individual Members. • Staff prepares final report including an analysis of RALO's governance documents (i.e. rules, procedures and MOU's, etc.) and submit any recommendations to standardize them when applicable. • ALAC to decide which way is the best to move forward with the recommendations as it aspires to greater cross-RALO harmonisation of their membership rules in the future. •

Recommendation 3	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large Support Staff should be more actively involved in supporting the policy work of the ALAC, drafting position papers and other policy related work based on ALAC input. Staff competencies should be adjusted accordingly.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Staff resources are disproportionately concentrated on administrative support. Staff should have greater capacity to support preparation of policy advice.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support in principle, rejecting that staff input is disproportionate.
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable

If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Medium Priority
At-Large Comments	In other parts of ICANN, particularly those which generate large and substantive documents, staff plays a key role in such drafting, but explicitly at the bidding of the volunteer community. Much of ALAC's outputs are far less massive and the need for such support is lessened. 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. This activity is expected to grow, although slowly. At-Large does require additional support for communications with its members within ALSes and RALOs. Staff will continue to be the main content creators of the planned regular messages outlining policy activity that will be sent to individual and ALS members. Although administrative in nature, At-Large also requires additional support for creating records of its meetings and policy discussions are underway to address this. Such staff work is the norm for other ACs and SOs.
Possible Dependencies	Dependent on ICANN management making the appropriate resources available.
Who Will Implement?	Staff with input from At-Large Leadership.
Resource Requirements	ICANN Staff in support of At-Large, ICANN management
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	1. Ensure that staff are available to support volunteers draft and edit statements. 2. As the At-Large communications plan takes form, including additional support for the recording on its meetings and discussions, to ensure that staff resources are available to implement it. 3. Staff continue to support the Policy Wiki pages currently used.

Recommendation 4

Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	The ALT should be dissolved and its decision-making powers fully restored to the ALAC.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Leadership Team (ALT), which is not mandated by ICANN Bylaws, concentrates in the established leadership too many decision-making and other administrative powers which should be spread among the members of the ALAC.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The ALT consists of the ALAC Chair, two Vice-Chairs, and two other ALAC members totaling five ALAC Members, one from each of the five regions. The ALT does not make substantive decisions nor have any powers not already invested in the Chair, both according to the ALAC Rules of Procedure and in actual practice. It is a consultative and advisory body for the Chair and was created to allow the Chair to delegate to those who had indicated a willingness to put additional time into ALAC and to bring in a regional perspective. The ALT does, on a regular basis, make recommendations to the ALAC for its consideration.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	No alternative recommendation is suggested. The ALT is a consultative and advisory body.
Prioritization	Not Applicable
At-Large Comments	Not Applicable
Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	Not Applicable
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable

Proposed Implementation Steps	Not Applicable
-------------------------------	----------------

Recommendation 5	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large should redouble efforts to contribute to meetings between ICANN Senior Staff, ISOC and other Internet Star (I*) organisations to develop a joint strategic approach to cooperative outreach.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Uneven contribution of At-Large to a coordinated ICANN strategy for 'Outreach and Engagement'. Missed opportunities for coordination with other constituencies and ICANN staff.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support. Being implemented across all RALOs as opportunities arise.
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Medium Priority
At-Large Comments	At-Large does not typically participate in any discussions between ICANN Senior Staff, ISOC and I* organizations, but would welcome such an opportunity. At a regional level, RALO leaders may hear of regional Hub staff meetings with key I* organisations through the Hub newsletter, but then again this is not a formal invitation. 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 regional I* organizations. At-Large does regularly work with representatives of these organizations at various levels and intends to continue to do so. 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 NARALO General Assembly held at an ARIN meeting in April 2017 and the inclusion of APRALO as an AP* organisation at the annual APRICOT and APNIC meetings and being invited to chair the AP* meeting in Sri Lanka 2016, are two examples of enhanced partnerships. 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* organisations and other relevant non-governmental or public entities outside of the ICANN bubble where our interests coincide. Such cooperation is encouraged.
Possible Dependencies	Increasing such cooperation will require additional travel support over what is currently available. Up until this time, APRALO for example, has used CROP in order to participate in its AP* activities at APRICOT meetings which is the annual gathering of I* organisations in the Asia Pacific region. APRALO leaders also take an active management role on the APRIGF. Both these events are not only valuable for outreach but also with strengthening bonds with current ALS and individual members of the APRALO community who inevitably attend these large regional events. Because of APRALO's acknowledged regular participation in these events, the RALO has requested that they become incorporated as core activities (funded by the ICANN budget rather than CROP). Otherwise, there is relatively little funding from ICANN that supports these activities at regional level.
Who Will Implement?	Staff with input from At-Large Leadership, ICANN management
Resource Requirements	ICANN funding, travel support
Budget Effects impact?	ICANN funding, travel support
Implementation Timeline	Ongoing
Proposed Implementation Steps	Discussions with Staff and ICANN Management on funding for RALO participation in regional meetings including regional hubs, ISOC and I* organisations.

Recommendation 6

Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large should adopt a simpler and more transparent electoral procedure for the selection of the At-Large-appointed member of the Board of Directors. Two alternative mechanisms are proposed (Section 10.5.3) both of which would be an improvement over the current process.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Election processes are excessively complex and have been open to allegations of unfairness.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The ALAC strongly objects to this recommendation. Both mechanisms disenfranchise 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 election or 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 ALAC process was arrived at after an extensive bottom-up design process. Under both mechanisms, the NomCom plays a role in developing a shortlist of candidates (nominated or self nominated) . 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 rigorous and complex than the processes used by the Supporting Organisations for their selections. The procedure to select the Director selected by the At-Large Community was designed in a bottom-up method by the community it serves. The procedure will no doubt evolve going forward. It 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, for the second proposed mechanism the selection is turned into an exercise of random selection that 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. 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.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	No alternative recommendation is suggested. The current selection process is adequate.
Prioritization	low
At-Large Comments	The Review also commented on whether At-Large should have two Directors instead of the one it currently has and rejected the idea. ALAC, however, believes that the Board should review the issue of the number of At-Large Directors. The rationale provided by the Review for rejecting a second director for At-Large is largely factually inaccurate. The first At-Large Review recommended two At-Large Directors, a step that the Board, at that time was not willing to take. But the ALAC believes the time has or will come to review that decision. The Review Team rejected this for four reasons. The ALAC notes the reasons with the following comments: <u>1. The ALAC has significant - and sufficient - power with one voting seat.</u> "Sufficient" is clearly a judgement call and not a rational argument. <u>2. The ALAC has more Board voting power than the GAC, the RSSAC or the SSAC.</u> 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. <u>3. An increase would not sit well with other stakeholder groups.</u> 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.
Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	Not Applicable
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	Not Applicable

Recommendation 7	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large should abandon existing internal Working Groups, too many of which are currently focused on process, and a distraction from the actual policy advice role of At-Large. Their creation should in future be avoided. If absolutely necessary, any such group should be strictly task/time limited and policy focused, or its role taken on by volunteer pen holders assisted by policy capable staff.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Excessive amounts of At-Large Community time spent on process and procedure at expense of ALAC's mandated responsibilities to produce policy advice and coordinate outreach and engagement activities. Too many internal working groups are a distraction.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The issue identified under this Recommendation has two components: • abandonment of ALAC internal Working Groups, and • "excessive amounts of At-Large Community time spent on process and procedure at expense of ALAC's mandated responsibilities to produce policy advice and coordinate outreach and engagement activities." The ALAC strongly objects to the first element of the issue identified

	under this recommendation, the elimination of ALAC Working Groups. Working Groups, under a variety of names, are the basic way that ICANN and its constituent parts discuss issues, address concerns, come to agreement and make decisions. The ALAC believes that they are core to its success, both in the formulation of its policy advice as well as in furthering its process development (as suggested by the Review Recommendations on outreach, collaboration tools and social media). 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. The uses of WGs include: <u>Policy-Related Tasks:</u> These WGs are used to build policy recommendations and advice, merging and melding differing opinions and ensuring that all parties can contribute. <u>Process-Related Tasks:</u> These WGs, in general, carry out tasks on behalf of the ALAC; at times making decisions on behalf of the ALAC. <u>Outreach and Engagement:</u> We have WGs that address needs such as testing and recommending various tools for communications, conferencing, translation, captioning, etc. 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 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 ALAC believes that they are core to its success, both in furthering its process development (as suggested by the Review Recommendations on outreach, collaboration tools and social media) as well as in the formulation of its policy advice. 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 tap into the skills and interests of individual and ALS members. In all cases, WGs can be dismantled as their tasks are completed. The ALAC also notes the second component of this issue: an excessive amount of time on policy and procedure. At ICANN meetings, a considerable amount of time is spent with ALAC meeting with other SOs/ACs. While this can be seen as discussion or processes, in fact it is most often discussions focussing on issues that have been identified of importance for end users. Aswell, every monthly ALAC meeting includes a review of all outstanding issues that have been released for public comment. ALAC also notes that, while ALAC and RALO members often participate in ICANN policy WGs, with their attendance recorded by that SO/AC, those attendance statistics are not necessarily also recorded
--	---

	within ALAC.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	
Prioritization	Ongoing existing activities
At-Large Comments	
Possible Dependencies	Continuation of staff support for web issues, particularly updating ALAC policy pages.
Who Will Implement?	Continued ICANN Staff, working with the leadership team of the ALAC
Resource Requirements	Staff support
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	ongoing
Proposed Implementation Steps	Not Applicable

Recommendation 8	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	ALAC should use social media more effectively to engage with end users (e.g. via Twitter / Facebook polls, etc.). These polls should not be binding in any way, but the ALAC could use them as a gauge of end user opinion.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Social media and other Internet-based tools could be used more effectively, and at minimal cost, to continuously survey and channel end-user input into ICANN policy making processes.

Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support, with reservations
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Medium Priority
At-Large Comments	The ALAC supports this recommendation and currently makes use of various platforms and intends to both continue and to enhance such usage. At-Large already has an active, well-functioning Social Media Working Group with just this focus, looking at developing such uses of Social Media. Many At-Large and ALAC members are already highly active in social media under their own handles and communicate in real time via Skype chat. In general, social media already plays a crucial role for ALSes. At-Large boasts active Twitter and Facebook pages. The Social Media Working Group has looked at 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. However, using social media to poll members may not be appropriate. Many of our members may still be unfamiliar with social media due to bandwidth issues and/or cost. Polling on these platforms is therefore neither representative nor actionable. Further, access to some platforms is constrained by governments in some jurisdictions. As well, many of our members are still unfamiliar with social media due to their lack of access, so that social media is skewed towards certain populations and cannot be presumed to be balanced.
Possible Dependencies	None identified
Who Will Implement?	At-Large Social Media Working Group, ICANN Staff with input from At-Large leadership
Resource Requirements	Further to this recommendation, the ALAC suggests that a pilot advertising program be funded to test the effectiveness of outreach through social networks. There may be requirements for additional staff resources.

Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	6-9 months
Proposed Implementation Steps	Work with ICANN staff to develop a Social Media policy. Social Media Working group to develop pilot advertising program to test appropriate uses of different Social Media for ALAC and RALOs

Recommendation 9	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	ALAC should arrange for the designation of one of its support staff as a part-time Web Community Manager who will be responsible, inter alia, for coordinating outreach via social media (Rec 8). These responsibilities could be allocated to an existing member of staff.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Need for increased At-Large Community awareness and staff training regarding the use of social media.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	The ALAC supports the intent of this recommendation
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Low Priority
At-Large Comments	It is the understanding of the ALAC that this is a function already allocated to At-Large support staff, albeit perhaps with a different title. The ALAC supports the designation on At-Large support staff to help enhance its use of Social Media.

	It is unclear to the ALAC why the term "Web Community Manager" is used or the relevance of the title.
Possible Dependencies	The ALAC does note that assignment of staff is not a function that its volunteer community has any control over. It is beyond the scope of the At-Large volunteer community to take such action.
Who Will Implement?	ICANN management
Resource Requirements	ICANN Staff designated as a part-time Web Community Manager
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	Not Applicable

Recommendation 10	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	ALAC should consider the adoption and use of a single Slack-like online communication platform. An instant messaging-cum-team workspace (FOSS) alternative to replace Skype/Wiki/website/mailling list.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	There are a multitude of communications channels used by At Large. This has led to fractured and undocumented communications.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support with reservations The ALAC supports the intent of this recommendation to ensure that we use appropriate communications tools within At-Large. The support of IT-based tools for ICANN typically requires the support of ICANN IT staff and the selection of products and whether they are FOSS or proprietary is not the sole choice of the ALAC.

If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Parts of the At-Large community, particularly those who primarily use mobile access, believe that the continued use of e-mail is essential.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Low Priority
At-Large Comments	The ALAC has a WG which looks at how technology can enhance its effectiveness. Examples are the use of machine translation to address communications in one of its regions with significant language barriers, and the captioning project that has just been integrated into the core ICANN budget and has been very well received by other parts of the ICANN community. We also note that many groups within ALAC already use Skype both for voice and messaging.
Possible Dependencies	We note however that we are subject to a number of constraints. The ALAC notes that it cannot simply adopt a new communications vehicle without the support (both budget and technical) of ICANN IT Services, and 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. The ALAC also notes that in parts of its communities, cost and availability of bandwidth is problematic. 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.
Who Will Implement?	ICANN IT
Resource Requirements	Budget and technical support from ICANN IT
Budget Effects impact?	Not applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not applicable

Proposed Implementation Steps	Not applicable
-------------------------------	----------------

Recommendation 11	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large should replace 5-yearly global ATLAS meetings with an alternative model of rotating annual regional At-Large Meetings, held in conjunction with regular ICANN meetings. Regional meetings should include an Internet Governance School element. Participants should include all qualified ALMs {At-Large Members}.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	While broadly popular, Global ATLAS meetings every 5 years have been difficult to organise and short on effective results. More frequent regional meetings would be more effective in encouraging both policy input and outreach while familiarising more of At Large with workings of ICANN.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The review team recommends that ICANN should no longer hold At-Large-wide gatherings. The ALAC strongly believes that there is a real need to ensure that we not function purely in our regional enclaves. Moreover, the reviewers further recommend that there be five regional meetings every two-three years. That would be an average of two such meetings per year. Such an undertaking would require an inordinate amount of volunteer time and staff resources to organise this increased number of events. Although 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 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 planned since 2010 and have been standard practice since 2012. 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 NARALO GA in April 2017 which was 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 budget directly to the original Westlake review, so the ITEMS team was clearly aware of their existence. Part of the reviewers' 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 as numbers change in coming years and as the relevance of individual users becomes more important, the ALAC will have to adapt, as it does with all other aspects of its existence.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	ICANN has recently agreed to formalize the GA/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 ALAC believes that we should go through at least one full cycle before contemplating major changes.
Prioritization	Low as there is a new process supported with resources yet to have a full cycle of implementation - Ongoing.
At-Large Comments	The current 5 year rotation of five General Assemblies and one Global At-Large Summit has been co-designed and approved by the RALOs. The current system is effective in encouraging the development of a global end-user perspective. These meetings are the only occasions when the identity of a global At-Large is manifested as a single entity. From the preparatory stages through to the actual meeting, as well as the post-meeting implementation, the entire global At-Large works as one. This is very helpful in building personal and organizational relations and in strengthening the At-Large branding, particularly for newcomers. Doing

	away with ATLASEs does not benefit anyone. Indeed, not having a Summit will result in losing the opportunity for RALOs to learn and work together, and will result in regional silos and strictly regional end user perspective. Regional meetings should be increased, but not at the cost of ATLAS.
Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	ICANN (see above)
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	Ongoing existing program, where ICANN Staff and the ALAC review the efficacy of the GA/Summit process after it has gone through a full cycle.

Recommendation 12	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	As part of their annual outreach strategies, RALOs should continue to put a high priority on the organisation of and participation in external events in their region (IGF, RIR ISOC, etc.). CROPP and other funding mechanisms should be provided to support the costs of organisation and participation of At-Large members.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	ALAC input to a coordinated ICANN Outreach sub-optimal.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support. See also ALAC Response to Recommendation 5
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable

If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	High Priority
At-Large Comments	The ALAC supports this recommendation. The use of the word “continue” in the recommendation implies, as is the case, that this strategy is already an ongoing practice and subject to ICANN funding, it will continue and hopefully grow. The CROP (formerly CROPP) is a good start in supporting this activity, as is occasional GSE support of external activities. Recently the CROP 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 traveler to more fully participate without having to either miss critical parts of the event or self-fund additional days. Requests for CROP allow RALO membership to participate in regional IGFs, regional SIGs, and other regional events. Members are also sometimes co-sponsored by other localised funding sources, in order to enable more flexible participation. RALOs particularly support CROP and want to see it expanded to provide more opportunities of engagement with other organizations. This outreach will need to have a particular focus on building policy synergies. At-Large outreach will need to increasingly focus on ensuring an expanded volunteer base that will be able to contribute to policy development. Often, involvement with regional events requires substantial funding, i.e. sponsorship, in order to obtain panel placement and speaking opportunities.
Possible Dependencies	This is a current strategy and is carried out to the extent that volunteer time, staff time, and funding allows (e.g. ICANN funding, localized funding resources). Significant enhancement will require significant funding and staff support
Who Will Implement?	At-Large leadership, ICANN Staff
Resource Requirements	As volunteer time, staff time, and funding allows (e.g. ICANN funding, localized funding resources)
Budget Effects impact?	Possible additional funding through CROP or GSE
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable

Proposed Implementation Steps	
-------------------------------	--

Recommendation 13	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	In the interests of transparency, a clear indication of all opportunities for At-Large travel funding support and the beneficiaries thereof, should be published promptly and in one place on the At-Large webpage.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Need more systematic RALO participation in regional events
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support in principle
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	High Priority
At-Large Comments	The ALAC agrees that opportunities for travel and outreach should be well documented and easy to locate, as should reports (both the recipients and more substantive reports of outcomes). However, the programs themselves are managed by various parts of ICANN and often published on their respective parts of the ICANN web. Having information replicated on the At-Large site is likely to cause information to become dated or out-of-sync. However, the ALAC strongly supports

	making such information easy to locate. The ALAC supports full disclosure of who receives such support and the monetary value of that support, but would object strongly if this were limited to just the At-Large. A similar policy must be applied for the entire organization including the SOs, review teams, the Board and ICANN staff. 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 represent the costs AND benefits of volunteer involvement.
Possible Dependencies	The decision to make such information available is out of scope for the ALAC. 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).
Who Will Implement?	ICANN Staff
Resource Requirements	Staff resources and technical, development support to publish travel funding information online in a coherent manner across ICANN
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable

Proposed Implementation Steps	
-------------------------------	--

Recommendation 14	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	The ALAC should, via the appropriate WG, request access to a share of the gTLD Auction Proceeds. Requested funds should be earmarked to support end user and broad civil society engagement in ICANN. Such a mechanism could replace or complement the existing operational expense incurred by ICANN to support the At-Large Community.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Need for an innovative approach to funding a revitalised At-Large.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject. The ALAC notes that neither the CCWG-Auction Proceeds nor the ICANN Board currently has the discretion to unilaterally allocate auction funds.
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The ALAC strongly supports actions to guarantee continued and enhanced funding of At-Large. However, the ALAC is well aware that the gTLD Auction Proceeds were committed to be used for community programs and not ICANN operational funding. Moreover the ALAC is also well aware that the current CCWG looking at Auction Proceeds is not in the business of allocating such funds to recipients, but is designing the process under which application for such funds will be made. 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 members participate in the CCWG with the explicit intent of planning to later request funding for the At-Large Community, they are expected to declare that intent 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.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	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. ALAC does not support the use the auction funds to support At-Large travels and activities
Prioritization	Not Applicable
Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	Not Applicable
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable

Proposed Implementation Steps	
-------------------------------	--

Recommendation 15	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	Using the same qualification system as for policy rapporteurs, ALAC should select 5 rapporteurs to contribute to ICANN's plans for a demand driven multi sectoral approach to outreach, and learn from the work of the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement group. Rapporteurs would serve for one year (3 meetings) to encourage turnover and more genuine grass roots input.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Need to reinforce impact of outreach and engagement activities.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject with qualification
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The ALAC is rejecting the concept of policy rapporteurs as defined in the Review. It is unclear exactly what the "Outreach Rapporteurs" would do at the ICANN meetings they attend.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	The ALAC does note however that there are at times opportunities at ICANN meetings for outreach activities and does believe that volunteer travel to such meetings should be available if applicable.
Prioritization	
At-Large Comments	The ALAC notes that ICANN does undertake extensive outreach related to its three annual meetings, through the Fellowship and NextGen programs and through explicit support of other outreach efforts. It also supports explicit outreach events sponsored by AC/SO and constituent

	organizations. The ALAC agrees with all of these activities. The ALAC has also initiated its indigenous peoples outreach programs which involve travel to ICANN meetings. The At-Large General Assembly and ATLAS programs, also include a component of outreach in that many such attendees are relatively new to ICANN.
Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	Not Applicable
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	

Recommendation 16	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	ALAC should 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 in the performance of the At-Large Community.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	Absence of consistent performance metrics.
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support with qualification As the ALAC is explicitly rejecting the EMM model, there is no plan to monitor its performance. However, the ALAC does support the continuation of its metrics programme, to track performance and improvement of the At-Large Community.

If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Low Priority - Ongoing programme
At-Large Comments	The ALAC already defines a set of metrics for performance for ALAC Members. The ALAC also has an activity to develop metrics for other volunteers and community members, including the establishment of criteria for ALS performance. Establishing metrics for RALO leadership is potentially more problematic as it is not clear that the ALAC has the authority to act in this area. Although consistency is important, there are also significant differences between the regions and any discussion of metrics needs to factor that in. ALAC also notes that the metrics that could indicate participation in policy discussions may not be collected within ALAC. Attendance by ALAC and RALO members in ICANN meetings is carefully gathered by the relevant AC/SO, but not necessarily incorporated into ALAC and RALO statistics during their attendance on cross-community ICANN WGs. Because ALAC participation in policy development has been highlighted as a gap by the review team, it is important that some method of recording cross-community participation is included into ALAC logs. While At-Large has a Metrics WG that has been tasked with these developing metrics related to the above responsibilities, their activity was largely put on hold during the IANA Stewardship and CCWG-Accountability efforts.
Possible Dependencies	The Metrics WG is currently on hold pending the completion of the ALS and RALO Criteria and Expectations Task Force.
Who Will Implement?	ALAC SubCommittee on Metrics, RALOs
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Continue and develop existing Metrics Programme

Proposed Implementation Steps	Not Applicable
-------------------------------	----------------

EMM 1	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large should remove the current criteria for At-Large membership, notably the requirement to join an ALS in order to become an active policy contributor to the At-Large Community. All internet end-users with an interest in ICANN's policy development function or outreach should be able to become involved in the activities of At-Large in the same way.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support with qualification. As with all EMM-related recommendations, acceptance is in relation to the intent and not the EMM-specific implementation.
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The ALAC strongly supports the ability of users to participate in At-Large without the need for joining or forming an ALS. Three of the five regional organisations already have such an ability as a status quo, with the other two RALOs working towards incorporation of individual members through changes to their By-laws. With regard to the wording of the recommendation, it implies that the ONLY mechanism for At-Large Membership is through the the ALS, a statement that the ITEMS team understood was incorrect for several RALOs. Looking at the EMM model proposed, 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).
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	
Prioritization	High Priority as Ongoing activity of ALAC and RALOs
At-Large Comments	The ALAC is committed to fully utilizing the contributions of At-Large Members not affiliated with an ALS. Moreover, discussions are starting on how to ensure that such members have equitable access to travel opportunities such as GAs and ATLAS. For the regions that already have individual unaffiliated members, they already have access to other ICANN travel opportunities.
Possible Dependencies	Although it is desirable to have the rules and process as uniform as possible across regions, the ALAC is aware of the cultural and other differences and understands that complete uniformity may not be possible.
Who Will Implement?	At-Large leadership, RALOs, ICANN Staff
Resource Requirements	Volunteer time to develop procedure for individual membership applications, staff resources for processing those applications
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	6 - 9 months
Proposed Implementation Steps	Finalisation of existing work for last two RALOs to formally accept Individual Members

EMM 2	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	ALAC should define a set of metrics for assessing the level of active engagement of "policy advice" or "outreach and engagement" ALMs. Active ALMs should be provided with funding to attend regional meetings including AGMs, Internet Governance Schools, and the rotating regional

	ATLAS meeting when it occurs in their region.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Support in principle.
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Not Applicable
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Medium Priority
At-Large Comments	This recommendation includes two elements: metrics for assessing member engagement and funding for members to attend regional meetings. The development and implementation of metrics both for ALAC itself and the RALOs is addressed under Recommendation 16. The issue of travel funding for ALS and ALAC members is discussed in Recommendations 13 and 15 above. Although based on experience, such metrics are neither easy nor foolproof, but the ALAC agrees that being able to measure such performance is desirable. 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. For FY18, the ALAC has received permission to bring two such people, active in ICANN policy activities, to each ICANN meeting.
Possible Dependencies	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. The ALAC is not in a position to guarantee travel funding to all active At-Large contributors, although we will continue to have this as a target. Moreover, the ALAC is aware of the limitations that ICANN has in massively funding activities outside of its core mission.
Who Will Implement?	At-Large leadership, ICANN Staff
Resource Requirements	Travel funding
Budget Effects impact?	
Implementation Timeline	See response to Recommendation 16 on Metrics
Proposed Implementation Steps	See response to Recommendation 16 on metrics

EMM 3.1	
Independent Examiner’s Final Recommendation	ALAC should update its Rules of Procedure to include a new procedure regarding the role and function of Rapporteurs. Rapporteurs will initially be appointed for 1 year. Renewable once for Policy input rapporteurs. Outreach Rapporteurs will serve for one year only to improve throughput. Calls for expressions of interest from qualified ALMs should

	be issued 6 months before their year of service.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject with qualification
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The ALAC does not believe that the concept of a Rapporteur as described in the review is practical nor would it have the desired results. The recommendation does not take into account the difficulty and time-commitment in getting up to speed on a topic, nor the large loss of discarding that knowledge due to a year being up. 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. The ALAC does believe that the concept of designated rapporteurs, or perhaps liaisons to policy WGs does have merit. 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, there is no direction as to how the wisdom of all of these people will be funneled into the Rapporteur so that this one person can represent the entire input from the WG members to the ALAC and RALOs (in the absence of ALAC WGs which were to be dissolved). 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.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	The ALAC notes that there are at times opportunities at ICANN meetings for outreach activities and does believe that volunteer travel to such meetings should be available if applicable. When conditions exist, this is already a standard ALAC practice. The ALAC also supports the concept of SELECTED attendance at ICANN meetings of active At-Large members and a pilot program for such attendees has been approved for FY18.
Prioritization	Medium
At-Large Comments	It is unclear exactly why a special category of ALAC member - a rapporteur - needs to be created. From the ITEMS discussion of rapporteur, their task is very straight forward - report to ALAC on the progress of the ICANN Working Group. The challenge for anyone with that task is the complexity of many of issues being addressed by ICANN Working Groups, and the steep learning curve any ALAC member needs to understand the often complex issues raised, from the perspective of Internet users. The proposal also does not recognise the demands on volunteer time to keep on top of the issues and debates as they unfold. Given the challenges in participating in ICANN Working Groups, random selection of someone charged with reporting on the Working Group is entirely inappropriate. A far more sensible and practical solution is to require, through the development of appropriate metrics, regular reporting requirements on ALAC members who are members (not just observers) of an ICANN Working Group. Travel arrangements could then be made for those ALAC members who and members of an ICANN Working Group, and who meet reporting requirements, to attend ICANN WG meetings that they might otherwise not attend.
Possible Dependencies	Development of reporting metrics for ALAC members who are members of an ICANN WG
Who Will Implement?	ALAC
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable

Implementation Timeline	6 - 9 months
Proposed Implementation Steps	Dependent on steps and timeline for the development of metrics

EMM 3.2	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	Using the same qualification system as for policy rapporteurs, ALAC should select 5 rapporteurs to contribute to ICANN's plans for a demand driven multi sectoral approach to outreach, and learn from the work of the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement group. Rapporteurs would serve for one year (3 meetings) to encourage turnover and more genuine grass roots input (Recommendation # 15).
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject with qualification. This is an exact duplicate of Recommendation 15
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	See Recommendation 15.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	
Prioritization	Not Applicable
At-Large Comments	Not Applicable

Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	Not Applicable
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	

EMM 4	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large should update its Rules of Procedure to include a new procedure regarding the appointment of RALO leaders and their corresponding responsibilities on the ALAC. ICANN Bylaws should also be updated accordingly.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The ALAC does not believe that ICANN or At-Large would be well served by having RALO-selected ALAC Members do double duty as both ALAC members and RALO leadership. It is sufficiently difficult to get most volunteers to commit to the level of work associated with either of these positions. Asking them to do double duty is not reasonable. 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, these are not the optimal people to place on the ALAC and then debate policy issues.

	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 and minimize the fall-back mechanism in place to currently address such failures.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Not Applicable
At-Large Comments	Not Applicable
Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	Not Applicable
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	

EMM 5

Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	At-Large should update its Rules of Procedure to include a new procedure regarding the functioning and membership of the {proposed Council of Elders} CoE.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject, but accept the concept of acknowledging those who have contributed but no current appointments.
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	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 (according to some of the current "elders" around At-Large) rather laughable. Danger of having to induct all people leaving office even if not warranted.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	The ALAC does not believe there is a widespread problem of people staying in positions longer than is healthy. When such a problem does exist, it should be dealt with, but volunteers dealing with volunteers and with appointments being made by their peers on occasion makes this problematic. Having a rule such as that recommended would address this, but would have far worse repercussions than the problem it is trying to address. Now that we have hard statistics (generated as part of the ALAC response to the draft Review Reports) they will be kept up to date and just having them should address part of the (minimal) problem. The ALAC will look at ways to recognize past leaders.
Prioritization	Low Priority
At-Large Comments	The Recommendation was driven by the belief that there is insufficient turnover and "new blood" among At-Large and particularly ALAC volunteers and that people are "clinging to power". This belief appears to have largely been driven by comments received from other AC/SO members, ICANN Staff, and some At-Large participants. There is no question that such perceptions exist in the community. The documented history does not support these allegations. 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, ALAC 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. 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 their stay beyond two terms. The ITEMS Team went further and said there should be term limits for serving in ANY capacity as an ALAC Member, Liaison or NomCom delegate, and presumably the new "rapporteur" positions they were advocating. That is, after 4 years, a person must completely leave any volunteer position. This is a requirement unlike that in any other part of ICANN, where continuity is valued and people often move from one role to another, making good use of their knowledge, experience and contacts. The Review Team received many comments alluding to a lack of volunteer turnover and there was one identified statement saying that the ALAC today was composed of the same people as it did 7-10 years ago. Actual 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. 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) A constant stream of new people enter 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. It is clear that there is a regular progression of new ALAC members. Some people serve for a while then come back into another leadership position some years later. There is a clear peak at two years of service in all roles combined. Rather than showing that many people stay far too long, 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. <Charts and graphs available.> To be linked to from here.
Possible Dependencies	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 preposterous.

Who Will Implement?	At-Large leadership, ICANN Staff
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	

EMM 6	
Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	ALAC Rules of Procedure should be updated with addition of a new procedure regarding the appointment by the NomCom of 5 ALAC members who will also act as Liaisons.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	The importance of the Liaison positions and the importance of selecting a qualified person who meets the target group's criteria (if any); the difficulty of having the NomCom find such qualified people; the potential for harm rather than good; and the issue of asking new ALAC members to do double duty in light of experience with many previous NomCom appointees all indicate that this is a non-starter. 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.
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	
Prioritization	
At-Large Comments	The current ALAC Chair has gone on record saying that if implementing this recommendation was mandated, he would recommend abolishing all Liaison positions to other AC/SOs rather than risking the damage that poor Liaison selections could cause.
Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	Not Applicable
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	

EMM 7

Independent Examiner's Final Recommendation	ALAC Rules of Procedure should be updated with the addition of new procedure regarding the use of random selection for the appointment of key At-Large leadership positions.
Issue Identified by the Independent Examiner	
Does ALAC Support Recommendation?	Reject
If Not, Please Provide Reasoning.	Although random selection may be used as a last resort among clearly qualified and acceptable people at times, it is a poor mechanism with which to make the vast majority of leaders. Reference to IETF misunderstands how the IETF uses random selection (for its NomCom, not leadership positions, and even then candidates must meet a stronger criteria than just volunteering).
If ALAC Does Not Support Recommendation, Does It Suggest an Alternative Recommendation? If so, please provide a suggested alternative Recommendation.	Not Applicable
Prioritization	Not Applicable
At-Large Comments	Not Applicable
Possible Dependencies	Not Applicable
Who Will Implement?	Not Applicable
Resource Requirements	Not Applicable
Budget Effects impact?	Not Applicable
Implementation Timeline	Not Applicable
Proposed Implementation Steps	

3. Methodology

ICANN has developed project plan charter templates for implementing recommendations. These were originally developed for the ATRT 2 implementation, but can easily be applied to the implementation of the At-Large Review recommendations. This format follows best practices under project management principles and guidelines and is a standard practice that ICANN is using across all implementations.

This charter signifies consensus on the vision, scope, authority and overall deliverables of the project.

The template includes the following details:

- | Recommendation Team;
- | Background;
- | Scope, assumptions, and deliverables;
- | Solution analysis: options and proposed solution;
- | Key dependencies;
- | Risk identification; and
- | Key performance indicators.

In addition, ICANN organization will use template to gather information from ICANN organization and the community, as appropriate, concerning the status of each step in the implementation process. Upon completion of all steps the At-Large Review Working Group will acknowledge whether the recommendation is considered to be implemented, or whether additional steps are required for completion.

4. Timeline

In accordance with the ICANN Board request that the implementation plan should contain a realistic timeline, this document includes a suggested general timeline as well as sample GANTT charts showing possible start and end dates for implementation. The suggested timelines can be adjusted as more details become available during implementation.

ANNEX 1: Background

Provide background information on the At-Large Review, including timeline of when Review was initiated, scope of review, the role of Review Working Party, who is responsible for developing an implementation plan, next steps, etc.

ANNEX 2: At-Large Review Recommendation

DOCUMENT PURPOSE: The At-Large Review Recommendation Charter recognizes the existence of a project and supports the decision to further refine the project solution. This charter signifies consensus on the vision, scope, authority and overall deliverables of the project.

PROJECT PURPOSE: The purpose of this project is to implement At-Large Review Recommendation(s) #XX.

Note – multiple projects may be needed to implement one recommendation. If this case, state this explicitly in the “project purpose” above. E.g. Three distinct projects will be completed in order to implement the full scope of this recommendation. This is first of the three with the other two being; XXXX and XXXXX. This note should be deleted from the final project charter.

RECOMMENDATION IDENTIFICATION

RECOMMENDATION TEAM		
Recommendation Name	Recommendation Number	Date
Project Sponsor	Project Owner	
Project Manager	Cross Functional Departments Involved	

RECOMMENDATION BACKGROUND
Recommendation Background – historical information that relates to this project

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT	
Part One – Which ICANN Objective does this meet	
Alignment with Strategic Objectives	
Goal	

Portfolio	
Project/Recommendation	

SCOPE DESCRIPTION CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PRODUCT OR SERVICE THAT THE PROJECT IS TO OPERATIONALIZE

Scope Statement – What work needs to be completed during the project
Recommendation #XX, as directed by the Board (link to Board Resolution). Recommendation states: Summarize the spirit of the recommendation as interpreted by the team. Indicate why this approach was chosen. List the scope of the work to be completed during this project in order to implement this recommendation
Out of Scope – Implied project work that will not be part of the project
Assumptions – What assumptions have been made regarding the implementation of the project
Deliverables – What will be delivered at the end of the project

OPTION ANALYSIS - THE ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS THAT WERE CONSIDERED
List all approaches considered and why they were not chosen
PROPOSED SOLUTION – “TO BE” SITUATION; THE SOLUTION TO THE BUSINESS NEED
List what it looks like when this project moves from implementation to operationalization List the triggers that will move this recommendation to operationalization

KEY DEPENDENCIES – KEY DEPENDENCIES NEEDED TO MEET PROJECT OBJECTIVES

RISK IDENTIFICATION – FACTORS THAT MAY HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON THE PROJECT

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS – WHAT TO MEASURE BEFORE AND AFTER OPERATIONALIZATION

NECESSARY TO PROCEED
Next Phase Activities/Resources

APPROVERS			
Name	Title	Approval Status	Date

REVIEWERS		
Name	Title	Date Sent

REVISION HISTORY			
Date	Version	Description	Author

Attachments, as applicable:

| None