

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review

Recommendation 1. At-Large members from every region should be encouraged to participate in conferences and events that are related to Internet Governance and policy (IGF, RIR, ISOC), and proactively use these as opportunities to raise awareness among end users regarding At-Large and the opportunities to participate in ICANN-related activities.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review This is a good recommendation. We fully agree. The ALSes are following these instructions with the current model, with or without ICANN's support. They are organizations that coordinate with public and private organizations. Their members are usually invited as speakers to several local, regional and international events.

Recommendation 2. At-Large should be more judicious in selecting the amount of advice it offers, focusing on quality rather than quantity.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review We would like to know the extent of what they consider to be little or too much advice. The Recommendation might be misread. From the text we can interpret that ITEMS was referring to ALAC and not At-Large.

Recommendation 3. At-Large should encourage greater direct participation by At-Large Members (ALM) in ICANN Working Groups (WGs) by adopting our Empowered Membership Model.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review The call to encourage greater participation in the At-Large community is necessary. This gives us the opportunity to discuss the ways to achieve that. On the part of the Empowered Membership Model, we consider that it is not consistent with the bottom-up collective construction model. We also consider important that our volunteers have enough time to actively participate and commit to it. The Empowered Membership Model is imprecise in showing how it would solve the challenge of achieving greater engagement.

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

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review This recommendation would strengthen staff support to the active ALSes in the region to enhance their engagement in ICANN's policy development process.

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

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review It is a good recommendation that would help strengthen the work being carried out at LACRALO. For example, we are still waiting to sign a MoU with LACNIC. Many things have been done with GSE, but we must increase cooperation.

Recommendation 6. Selection of seat 15 in the ICANN Board of Directors. Simplify the selection of the At-Large Director. Candidates able to self-nominate. The NomCom prepares nominees to produce a list of qualified candidates from which the successful candidate is chosen by random selection.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review A random election among the self-nominated candidates is not considered as a valid option. Changing the selector would not simplify the election process. We also know that they must be knowledgeable and have experience with end users, obtained within our

organizations (ALS, RALO, AT-LARGE). This proposal would be taking away the only opportunity that At-Large has to elect their sole representative on the Board.

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.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review Again, it seems that ALAC is being confused with At-Large. The Working Groups are an opportunity to engage in the bottom-up system of ICANN's ecosystem. We have members in ALAC, ICANN and cross-community groups. In their meetings, events, and courses with end users, ALSes bring ICANN's knowledge to them and receive the necessary feedback. If the internal groups do not work anymore, who will provide this necessary feedback?

Recommendation 8. At-Large should use social media much more effectively to obtain feedback from end users (such as Twitter / Facebook polls, etc.).

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review This is a good recommendation. There is a Social Media Working Group dedicated to enhancing outreach during ICANN's General Meetings and more.

Recommendation 9. At-Large should consider appointing a part-time Web Community Manager. This supporting staff member could be hired, or a current staff member could receive special training.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review We believe this recommendation refers to ALAC, not RALOs, because we do not have a budget for any position.

Recommendation 10. Consider the adoption and use of a Slack-like online communication platform. A work team instant messaging workspace (FOSS) alternative to Skype, Wiki, website, and mailing lists.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review This is a good recommendation. We will send it to our Technology Task Force to make the comparisons with the applications under study at the moment.

Recommendation 11. At-Large should replace the 5-year global ATLAS meetings with an alternative model of annual regional At-Large meetings.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review ALAC and RALOs have invested many hours to coordinate different ICANN meetings. A timeline has been produced and it has been accepted. We consider the face-to-face ATLAS meetings to be necessary because of the work experience in cross-regional groups. These have more linguistic, geographical and gender diversity.

Recommendation 12. As part of its strategy for regional outreach and engagement, At-Large should continue to put a high priority on the organization of regional events. The five RALOs should continue, as part of their annual outreach strategies, 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 organization and participation of At-Large members.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review It is a good recommendation to ensure the presence of more ALSes in regional development spaces. We have been doing this within our RALO for many years, with and without ICANN's support. Next week we will send a summary of these activities.

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 organization of Internet Governance Schools in connection with each At-Large regional meeting.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review It is a good recommendation to increase the participation of volunteers in the informed decisions that are necessary for policy development.

Recommendation 14. In the interest of transparency, all At-Large travel fundings should be published in one place on the At-Large webpage.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review It is a good recommendation of best practices that is currently carried out with the publication in the dashboard corresponding to travel allocations.

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 in order to gain access to these funds in support of the At-Large Community.

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review This is a good recommendation. LACRALO already has members in the Cross-Community Working Group on new gTLD Auction. But this Working Group will not define how these funds will be invested, but rather how the procedures will be. Certainly, when the group is formed to have access to the funds, we will participate.

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

LACRALO Working Group - At-Large Review This is a good recommendation. Metrics are always necessary. In LACRALO they are almost ready. But if the EMM is implemented, we cannot be responsible for preparing the metrics of a model that we do not know, both in terms of its functionality and its dimension. It is not the same to generate metrics for 50 ALSes than for 50 individuals, or hundreds or thousands or hundreds of thousands of individuals. It also poses a challenge for the number of staff that is required for its implementation.