At-Large Review Issues particularly pertinent to Regional At-Large Organisations (RALOs) and At-Large Structures (ALSes)

Regional At-Large Organisations (RALOs) and At-Large Structures (ALSes) welcome the independent review of At-Large, and look forward to improving our effectiveness in representing the end user interests in ICANN through adoption of appropriate recommendations made by the review process.

Further, we agree on several aspects of the analysis carried and some of the recommendations made by the ITEMS Review Team, particularly since we are already carrying out some of the proposed recommendations.

We do have strong reservations on some of the recommendations, particularly those that weaken or subvert the existing structure of At-Large (ALSes and RALOs).

We understand that the thinking that prompted the ITEMS team to focus on individual users appears to be as below:

1. *There are 3.7 billion Internet end users, but the vast majority of them are not interested in names, numbers and protocol parameters (which is ICANN's remit).*

2. *The very few that are indeed interested and able to meaningfully participate (there may be a few thousand in the whole world) need to be encouraged to participate in ICANN as At-Large.*

3. *The existing ALS-based participation is a barrier for these few people, as it adds several layers (ALS member -> ALS leader -> RALO Member -> RALO Leaders -> ALAC) for them to participate. Of course, they can participate as individuals, but then we do not need ALAC at all.*

4. *Therefore, there should be direct, easy channels for these end users to participate as At-Large, which is being provided as Empowered Membership Model (EMM).*

5. *It does not matter if the current ALS-RALO structure is undermined or even dismantled completely, as the current structures are too heavy-weight and too large for the small number of interested end users.*

We would like to point out that parts of the above analysis are flawed, and therefore the conclusions/recommendations based on it are also likely to be flawed.

In particular, we would like to draw your attention to:

1. The number of people who are interested in Internet policy and are able and willing to contribute may be larger than a few thousand. For instance, ICANN develops policy for IDNs, that may be of interest to a large number of end users (given the large diversity of languages and scripts). It would be important to facilitate their participation in any policy that may impact them, and we would need to ensure that they are provided sufficient capacity and information so that they can get involved.

2. Individual users may come and go based on their current interests. However, there is no organizational retention of knowledge when they leave. With the ALS structure, individuals provide information that is retained in the ALS and in the RALO so that it gets built and refined over time.

3. ALSes provide additional capacity, even for individuals. For instance an individual may receive capacity building services, additional human resources (through other volunteers) and thereby get more things done. An individual volunteer is limited by their time and resources.

4. At the surface, it might appear that the present RALO-ALS structure creates layers and barriers. However, most active ALSes promote direct participation for experts in policy, a learning environment for newcomers and a collegial atmosphere for interactions between experts and tnewcomers.

5. ALSes are required to attract newcomers to policy issues, provide them with added capacity through interactions with RALO and other experts, and help them to eventually become experts themselves. Thus, RALOs create, enhance and replenish the pool of policy contributors, while, in contrast, the proposed EMM does not provide any means of creating new experts.

6. The current suggestion of EMMs seems to be based on a few individuals who for whatever reason, are unable or unwilling to operate through the ALS/RALO system. Most RALOs and ALSes provide enabling support for volunteers to contribute, and those that have difficulties in operating through ALSes may opt for direct participation in RALOs as individual members.. It may not be appropriate to base a model on outliers.

7. We are of the opinion that the RALO-ALS structure provides a global forum for participants to collaborate on policy, in the process enhancing diversity (for instance, gender diversity, which is enhanced through collaboration amongst women) and plurality.

While we support greater direct engagement of Internet end users, the EMM model proposed by ITEMS seeks to promote individual end users at the expense of existing ALSes and RALOs, which would destroy the structures and roles that At-Large has built over the last decade.

We propose measures through this document that would provide enhanced participation of end users *while at the same time preserving and enhancing the current RALO-ALS structure*, (thus a Win-Win proposition rather than the Win-Lose option in the EMM) through the following measures:

1. *Sensitizing ALSes* to the need for promoting interested individuals
2. *Designing a fast-track mechanism* for identifying interested individuals and depending on their capabilities, to add them to appropriate policy structures
3. *Providing outreach for domain name policy* at the ALS level with the specific intent of encouraging individuals
4. *Harmonizing individual membership rules* at the RALO level, noting that different RALOs follow their own distinct approaches
5. *Creating a mechanism at the Regional (RALO) level* to directly reach out to individuals (for instance in regional events and outreach programmes), particularly those from underserved areas, or those that are, for any reason, unable to provide inputs through ALSes.

We feel that the above steps, taken with the explicit intention of removing any real or perceived barriers in the participation of individuals in At-Large Policy, would help to enhance the quality and magnitude of individual members.

With these general comments, we provide below our opinion on the proposed recommendations.

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

The RALOs support this recommendation. However, there are some details that may help better understand where RALOs stand.

The difficulty is the term to "participate". Conferences tend to provide panel discussion opportunities to sponsors and preference for the 'official and credible' ICANN staff. A member of the audience is like a single tree in the forest with minimum opportunity to make an impact. First effort has to come from ICANN that automatically provides these opportunities on equal footing. The ALAC and RALOs need to coordinate and collaborate on this topic with ICANN Staff departments. Outreach needs to be focussed – specifically targeting people who can do policy work in ICANN. Our community needs to make sure that funded members need to have

an impact, e.g. speaking in panels and workshops related to our mission.

Collaborative work with regional & global partners as well as outreach on ICANN At-Large are both useful. In some cases, a delegation that is focused on its outreach (where possible) may be more effective than a single representative.

At-Large Members from each region are already encouraged to participate in Internet governance/policy related conferences/events (Internet Governance Forum (IGF), Regional Internet Registries (RIR), Internet Society (ISOC)) in their region as opportunities to raise awareness among end users about the At-Large and to proactively engage in focused ICANN-related activities. Where possible they are funded for their participation by ICANN.

Under the current model, ALSs are already doing this, with and without ICANN support. Some organizations coordinate with public and private organizations. Their members are normally invited as exhibitors at various local, regional and international events.

To this end, the RALOs have built and maintained a relevant calendar of regional events. Additionally, participation through writing op-eds and contributing on lists/chats etc. should be encouraged.

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

RALOs and ALSes would like to know to what extent an amount of advice is considered "too few" or "too many".

 High quality and professional comments requires an in depth knowledge beyond the scope and dedication of most of our members. The workload required of At-Large volunteers is continually of concern, so that it is important to identify and channel member expertise into areas where their knowledge and skills can help to build a strengthened focus for At-Large on specific technical topics. This would also bring quality participation into At-Large working groups and discussions.

Our long term project of a Policy Management Process System (PMPS)[1] seeks to address the serious problem of information overload by involving only those members who have an interest in a topic, tracking issues, providing all relevant information to volunteers when a public consultation takes place, including linking to tracking and history, and providing them with the ability to enhance their participation using better methods than email or WIKI. This is a complex

---

[1] A proposal of the Outreach and Engagement Sub-Committee that is currently submitted to ICANN for its evaluation and funding. This proposal was designed by the At-Large Community during its face to face ATLAS II meeting in London (June 2014) and been developed by the At-Large Technology Task Force.

task that would actually be of benefit to all sorts of Multistakeholder governance systems – not just the At-Large Community. But this is likely to still be some years away.

In the meantime, overall, RALOs need to project the positions of their ALSes and individuals members on behalf of the larger end user community as and when required. With the diversity of viewpoints and interests, a quantitative cap cannot be put on such advice (assuming, of course, that it is relevant).

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

RALOs agree that wide participation should continue to be encouraged. However, RALOs would like to clarify that there is a huge amount of work being already done to this end. Nevertheless, engagement in volunteer work is difficult to achieve. That has led the At-Large community to continuously work in creative ways to interact with end users in different fora and not only in ICANN meetings. An example of this work may be seen at local Internet Governance initiatives like European Dialogue on Internet Governance (EuroDIG), Latin American and Caribbean Internet Governance Forum (LACIGF), Asia Pacific Regional Internet Conference on Operating Technologies (APRICOT), the global IGF and other Internet related events.

In short, the RALOs agree that it is necessary to foster greater participation but we don't agree that the adoption of the EMM will automatically solve this problem as there is no substantive evidence that the sole adoption of said model will likely increase individual participation. To impose such a radical and risky change on the RALOs and ALAC with a moderately long implementation time and without any certainty that it will succeed does not seem prudent.

RALOs agree in principle about the need for enhanced participation. The At-Large Community - including individuals and organizations, usually participates in WGs subject to their limitations and constraints. Despite At-Large encouragement for members to join Policy Development Process Working Groups (PDP WGs) and other cross community working groups, the uptake among newcomers is low mainly due to significant entry barriers caused by their limited knowledge of the topic. There are possibly measures that may help in enhancing such participation (including capacity building) but the EMM is certainly not a required factor for this.

This recommendation is trying to improve something with the wrong solution, resulting in exactly the opposite result. A direct membership model would significantly hinder the ability for the ALAC to develop bylaw mandated advice as it would make it far more difficult to coordinate views that could lead to a consolidated piece of advice on a given topic.

The call to foster greater participation in the At-Large community is necessary. It gives RALOs the opportunity to discuss ways to achieve this. However, when it comes to the Empowered Membership

Model we consider that it is not consistent with the collective construction model from the bottom-up. We also consider it important that our volunteers have sufficient time to actively participate and commit. The Empowered Membership Model is imprecise in showing how it would solve the challenge of greater participation.

Taking each EMM implementation guideline in turn:

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

RALOs and ALSes welcome the idea of bringing more end users into ICANN's policy making process, but they do not believe that the EMM is the right solution. However with an intensified engagement process that is sensitive to the needs of individual members, and an increase in the number of people interested in and ready to carry voluntary services within At-Large, the existing ALS model and the EMM model are virtually no different.

First, "direct" participation by end users is not a necessary requirement for At-Large to function.

Second, more of such "direct" participation does not guarantee a commensurate qualitative enhancement in participation. There is no way 3.6 billion end users can be directly represented in At-Large or RALOs by increasing the number of individual members. At-Large represents end user interests, and there is no indication that such an indirect representation has been ineffective.

Third, while we fully agree that individual membership should be encouraged together with ALSes, we think that ALSes well established in their countries are the guarantee that At-Large is really reflecting the interests of end users, as they are able to perform outreach, coordination and sourcing of input at a local level.

Ultimately turning At-Large into an individual member (only) organization may convert it into an organization whose members use the At-Large to campaign for vested issues. This also will reduce diversity since individuals in the developing countries are not as connected and as informed as those of the global north.

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

The response for this Implementation recommendation is identical to that for Implementation #1.

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

The response for this Implementation recommendation is identical to that for Implementation #1.

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

Sadly, this implementation recommendation is ignorant of how people work within and across the ICANN ecosystem. People have specific interests that compel them to seek out individuals who share the same interests. Ie. DNS for Women, Technology for Humanity etc

RALOs welcome cooperation with the Non Commercial Stakeholder Group (NCSG). This is already happening in the civil society engagement and many At-Large members are also members of the NCSG. There is no need to change to the EMM to accomplish this goal. RALOs have been co-operating with Non- Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC) and other parts of ICANN in the past (such outreach activities during ICANN58), and this should continue.

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

RALOs strive to have unaffiliated individuals to become At-Large members. NARALO, EURALO, and APRALO are already open to direct membership by individuals. AFRALO and LACRALO are in the process of incorporating this in their bylaws. Through the ALS Criteria and Expectations Task Force, ALAC and RALOs are working on increasing the ability of ALS members to engage in the At-Large/ICANN policy work.

RALOs operate in different social and cultural environment. For northern part of the world atomic elements might be active individuals with "ready to go" experience. While in other environments, being a member of organization (ALS) is an instrumental, and the only, way to be engaged with community. EMM is not universal.

Experience has shown that Unaffiliated membership cannot replace the ALS membership but

provide an access point for individual participation. If the EMM is implemented it does not guarantee to produce an active and engaged community

For example, APRALO admits individual members, and has been doing so for a while already. The number of individual members has been quite small. The presence of individual members help RALOs to get direct feedback from the grassroots, but so far the quantity of such feedback has been negligible, and its quality uncertain. Whether individual members will form a countervailing influence compared to ALSes is an open question, and it is likely that the community of individual members will take time to get strengthened.

A recent APRALO ALS representative writes:

"I am a new member of APRALO. I really feel myself lost here, too much information flooding and I am not sure where to start from. While we should focus on encouraging individuals to join ALM we should also have some induction plan for new members. Small training/mentorship and a clear simple tasks to start their contribution journey here will help."

This type of testimony is common across all RALOs and that is where the focus should go, instead of pitting a mixed individual/ALS model against promotion of a direct individual membership.

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

This is a significant change to what the ALAC does, and is against the mandate of the ALAC as an advisory committee. RALOs bring up the bottom-up input to the ALAC from the ALSes. Removing RALOs' advice input functions will break the bottom-up multistakeholder model. This also requires a complete rewriting of all MoUs between ICANN and the RALOs which state the two functions of the RALOs: Outreach and Policy.

This recommendation seeks to limit the role and stature of RALOs, which are presently integral components of the ICANN At-Large Ecosystem. Limiting RALOs to outreach/mentoring will reduce the capacity of the At-Large to sustainably provide consensus policy advice over the longer term. This risks making At Large fragmented and reduces cohesion (on account of a multitude of opinions/positions of individuals).

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

This recommendation has been rejected outright by all RALOs.

This recommendation seems to assume the work of the ALAC is to solely deliver advice to the Board whilst the ALAC does not only deal with policy but also monitors ICANN wide activities that may impact end user interest.

In a volunteer organization, it is unrealistic to expect volunteers to handle both policy and outreach activities. Over many years of direct experience, we have found that volunteers have different interests and very few that have interest and skills to do both policy and outreach. The classic analysis of leadership style includes directorship, administration, mentorship and motivator. All these leadership styles are rarely present in one person.

Managing the RALOs requires significant work regarding outreach and capacity building. Policy work requires significant skills and time to follow with ICANN policy activities / threads. Combining the two creates unreasonable overloading of work on the RALO representative which would lead to a lack of recruitment of good leaders. This has the potential to deliver mediocre service in both RALO leadership and RALO roles.

The division of responsibilities between pure policy (ALAC members), capacity building/organizational and community development/admin (RALO leadership) has been created by design, so that the policy process can go on unhindered and unimpeded by day-to-day problems of RALOs.

It should be kept that way.

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

In principle, RALOs support term limits for all key At-Large roles including ALAC representatives, WG Chairs, and RALO Leadership.

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

From a RALO perspective, this recommendation would strengthen staff accompaniment to the ALSes active in the region to enhance their participation in the ICANN policy making process.

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

strategic planning for cooperative outreach.

RALOs support this recommendation. However, the following caveat must be understood: discussions between senior ICANN staff and other organizations does not at always imply any role or involvement for At-Large.

- There has already been collaboration, especially with the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement (GSE) department.
- ICANN Staff can certainly meet with ISOC and other I* organizations; there has already been work underway.
- There have already been MoUs between RALOs and Regional Internet Registries (RIRs). Through the MoUs, there are activities and sponsorship opportunities, e.g. NARALO General Assembly (GA) in ARIN
- We welcome the redoubling of efforts and look forward to receiving more allocated staff resources to focus on this effort.
- ALSes promote I* events all over the world, being a part of them. At-large will channel the information inflow/outflow by the calendar.

RALOs have already established good relations with I* and other regional organizations apart from ICANN GSE Hubs. For instance, NARALO has signed an MoU with the American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN) and will hold their upcoming General Assembly in conjunction with an ARIN meeting; APRALO works closely with its regional partners (APNIC, ISOC, APTLD, DotAsia, APrIGF), has MoUs with several of these. as well as being active participants in Asia Pacific School on Internet Governance (APSIG) and Asia Pacific Regional Internet Governance Forum (APrIGF) programmes and activities; LACRALO is in the process of signing an MoU with LACNIC. AFRALO signed the first MoU with a RIR (AFRINIC), a few years ago and they occasionally hold their meetings during AFRINIC public policy meetings.. Another MoU with AFRINIC is underway. EURALO is a founding partner of EuroDIG and negotiations are taking place to sign a MoU with RIPE.

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

In addition to the above, discussions between ICANN At-Large Staff and ISOC Chapter Support Staff have yielded the following ladder of proposals, which are currently under consideration:

1. Scheduling of a common Webinar - Introduction to At-Large and ISOC (this would include speakers from At-Large and ISOC and ALSes/Chapters).

2. At-Large Capacity Building Webinars – At-Large staff to send ISOC Chapter Support invitations to be sent to Chapters, so ISOC Chapters could participate more effectively

in ICANN policy.

3. IETF – fellowships - for the At-Large community to be given regular details of IETF fellowship offerings, for At-Large people who are interested in Technical Issues.

4. Collaboration of At-Large and ISOC. This could include joint outreach activities during ICANN Meetings such as a common table. In some cases, this could include a joint reception - something which took place informally in Helsinki, where the GEMS Jam social event, a EURALO coordinated activity, followed the ISOC Chapters meeting. It is worth noting that for ICANN58 Copenhagen, ISOC Staff and EURALO coordinated events so as to avoid having the ISOC reception clash with At-Large Activities.

5. CROPP Program / ISOC fellowship travel funding – the need for a reciprocal coordination. This process, would focus on improvements to CROPP program but also ISOC travel fellowships, as well as coordination between the two.

6. Coordinated reporting in Internet Governance, for instance at the ITU Plenipotentiary conferences - including a joint debrief and/or joint webinar.

7. Cross-pollination of the online learning platforms including an online course on ISOC about ICANN, but most particularly, about the ALAC, At-Large, RALOs, etc.

8. Formation of a Leadership Team for closer collaboration - this could include one ALAC representative that has the mandate to keep regularly in touch with ISOC Chapters leadership, or go as far as forming a small committee that could coordinate activities, in lieu of the current very informal system where several interested people who are also ISOC members perform this "liaison" ad-hoc - with sometimes duplicated results.

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

The At-Large Board seat is the responsibility of the whole At-Large, and the current process

highlights the degree of ownership that At-Large has over the seat. By transferring this very organic selection process to the NomCom, the At-Large community will be disenfranchised and isolated from the process (and consequently, the Board Member), making the appointee just another NomCom appointee. This is not a desirable state. It doesn't add anything to the process, but reduces the community ownership. It also removes the possibility/certainty that issues important to At-Large are raised at the Board level. Finally, it is unclear if this recommendation is relevant to the At-Large Review.

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.

The At-Large community, as every Support Organisation/Advisory Committee (SO/AC), has policy and process activities that must be addressed for the effective functioning of their organization. At-Large Working Groups are instrumental to At-Large as an organization in order to address its policy and process issues. Open Working Groups are the backbone of At-Large in reaching consensus by providing bottom-up, grassroots input. We have policy oriented WGs, as well as process and organization building oriented WGs. There are also WGs internal to RALOs set up to respond to ALAC policy and process. RALO WGs are the primary mechanism for individual members and ALSes to develop and provide input.

The RALOs and ALSes therefore reject this recommendation. The lack of any questions in the survey illustrates the lack of understanding of the role and contribution of the Working Groups. Working Groups cross cut the RALOs providing an awareness of regional diversity of approaches and taps into the skills and interest in membership to contribute. Not everyone is a policy wonk.

The working groups are an opportunity to participate in the bottom-up ICANN ecosystem. We have members in ALAC, ICANN and inter-community groups. ALSes in their meetings, events, courses with end users, bring ICANN's knowledge to them and receive the necessary feedback. If the internal working groups no longer exist, who will provide this necessary feedback?

In conclusion, this recommendation does not appear to have any merit. ALAC WGs are useful for specific purposes, and should be dismantled when they turn irrelevant, but doing away with them is uncalled for and it is worth noting that other organisations in ICANN, including the ICANN Board have been encouraged to use working groups.

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

RALOs support this recommendation, and would like to point out that measures are already being developed to further improve the use of social media.

RALOs and the ALAC have been using social media extensively to encourage At-Large members to provide comments via wiki and other established channels. The response has been poor. However, social media, especially Twitter, is not an effective tool for people to provide thoughtful and substantive input on policy.

We have a Social Media Working Group that includes the use of effective tools such as Mattermost, Slack, Eno. Skype and the standard Twitter and Facebook. Some people communicate that they like these tools while others prefer a simple phone call to keep the community connected Other ignored tools are the use of FLICKR and YouTube. The documentation of At-Large meetings by volunteers have shared with creative commons licence thousands of photos and videos of the community membership which is far in excess to the paid ICANN photographers and videographers. These photos have been used by staff and other organizations ie. ISOC and Diplo in their online blogs and publications.

To summarise, RALOs strongly support the enhanced use of social media such as Twitter. ALAC, At-Large / RALOs should encourage social media discussion and interaction with the individual Internet users out there. But the results are not as easy to achieve as the reviewers might think and there certainly is no social media silver bullet short of actually spending money to buy "Trending" – as done by all big Internet communicators. We do not advocate that.

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

RALOs welcome this recommendation.

A Web community manager should also work with the RALO's on their community newsletters ie. Constant Contact. However, it must be noted that currently, this is not at the discretion of At-Large. What staff to deploy is purely a staff decision.

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

This discussion has taken place for many years in the At-Large Community.

The At-Large Community, via the At-Large Technology Taskforce (http://bitly.com/Technology-Taskforce) have been aware of, and have tested and used group chat applications like Slack since 2014. At the ICANN58 March 2017 meeting, the Technology Taskforce reported on how At-Large should use group chat applications after reviewing several types of group chat applications (http://bitly.com/TTF-reports).

We believe that the current system works reasonably well. However, we acknowledge that there is always room for improvement. Our Technology Task Force (TTF) has been actively looking for new systems: https://community.icann.org/x/CxInAw and https://community.icann.org/x/QaM0Aw. Besides the technical limitations of access in some countries requiring low bandwidth solutions, we need to be aware of benefits and costs of implementing a new communication system. There is also the additional challenge to break people's habit to switch to different software and for this software to be available and comfortably usable on different hardware platforms. In order to be compatible to communicate with members of other parts of the ICANN Community, we should continue using Skype/Wiki/web/mailing list, instead of adopting a new tool. There is uneven popularity of online tools at global perspective. But the number of social networks and messengers is observable. Major events and news must be casted to these platforms as RALOs activity in coordinated manner.

All RALOs support improved communication, less redundancy, and cutting down on voluminous amounts of information.

Again, it feels like the right location to mention the plans for the Policy Management Process System (PMPS) which will interface with social media tools to bring an intuitive, productive, welcoming and helpful environment for end users to take part in all aspects of Policy work.

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

RALOs see significant value in the current 5-yearly ATLAS meetings, and hence do not support this recommendation.

Many hours of ALAC and RALO work have been invested in coordinating the various ICANN meetings. A timeline has been generated and it has been accepted. We consider the Face to Face At-Large Summit (ATLAS) meetings to be necessary because of the experience of working in Inter-regional groups: these have more linguistic, geographical and gender diversity.

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. Right from the preparations, through 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 RALOs learning and working 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.

We don't need to have either or solutions. Once every five years when everyone joins together is important and an annual local meeting is also a good idea. We suggest to do both. In addition to this, At-Large local community meetings operated and coordinated through RALOs and cooperation with I* activities is a good tool for engagement. It doesn't contradict with the idea of summit.

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

RALOs welcome this recommendation. RALOs support CROPP 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, ie. sponsorship, in order to obtain panel placement and speaking opportunities. We lack the financial support and influence, we are also in competition with ICANN staff which are the first choice. We need to be piggy-backed with ICANN staff at these events. Sponsorship of event, booth space etc. requires serious financial analysis to achieve the desired results. ICANN rarely funds At-Large for these events. Perhaps GSE funds the event itself, but rarely to send volunteers to them.

But in some RALOs, circumstances and external sponsorship has allowed for such activities to take place without ICANN support.

Across all regions, in practice, unless there is financial support for participation in meetings, this cannot be implemented - unless ALS(es) run the project with existing regional ICANN activities with appropriately increased regional budgets.

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

RALOs would support this on the premise that IG schools are in line with the ICANN mission and mandate.

IG School initiatives such as the Southern School of Internet Governance, African School of IG, and the 1st Indian School of IG, have had numerous At Large members providing their volunteer time and personal expenses for presentations and panels. In line with the recommendation, we suggest that ICANN support these efforts.

IG schools have also enhanced inter- and intra-community engagement. For example, inSIG received significant support in terms of resource persons from other ICANN entities (including the Board, ALAC/At-Large and NCUC) with both the present EURALO and NARALO Chairs participating as resource persons. Wherever possible, we will continue to organize SIGs at ICANN meetings, but financial support is a major constraint.

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

There is already an ICANN dashboard for travel support to ICANN meetings for all supported travellers across the SO/ACs. Travel to other Events is not available publicly.

RALOs agree to this level of transparency, but also expect similar transparency from other parts of ICANN. It would also be insightful to release details of the disclosure of any contract work of any member.

Recommendation 15:

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

RALOs cannot lay claim on the auction proceeds, as there is a CCWG working on this.

RALOs already have members in the Cross-Community Working Group on new gTLD Auction. But this WG will not define how these funds will be invested; it will focus on how the procedures for funding allocation will be structured. Surely when the Cross Community Working Group agrees to have access to the funds, RALOs will participate.

RALOs will respect the decisions made in the CCWG. CCWG will design the proposal(s) on how to use the auction proceeds. ALAC representatives and At-Large participants are taking part in the CCWG discussions and work.

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

RALOs are in general agreement with the need for metrics to measure all activities .

Metrics are important for the continuous improvement of performance for all entities in At-Large, viz., ALAC members, RALO leaders, ALS representatives and individual members. When it comes to the RALOs, ALSes, and individuals, we support the development of a set of metrics that will show the strategic development of the regions in line with the mission of At-Large as well as the impact of regional policy advice to the ALAC.

For example, in LACRALO they are practically ready. But if the EMM is implemented, we cannot be responsible for making the metrics of a model that we do not know, both its functionality and its dimension. It is not the same to generate metrics for 50 ALS, than for 50 individuals, or hundreds or thousands or hundreds of thousands of individuals. It also represents a challenge for the amount of staff that is required for its implementation.

The collection of the agreed metrics must therefore be automated as much as possible. But it has to be remembered that over reliance on metrics can be an issue.

The problem with this recommendation is the lack of any tracking tools by staff to measure results. The tracking of policy statements and comments is an important metric asked by senior staff.

In general, metrics for operations/activities/participation are welcome. The EMM concept is new,

and if implemented partially/wholly as recommended, appropriate metrics would need to be evolved and maintained.

Finally, we would like to express our deep concern about the future of the At-Large community if this report is accepted and implemented as is. At-Large should remain the home of real and verifiable end users defending no other interest than the public interest. We hope that the suggestions made through this document will be considered by the Review Team for suitably amending their proposals.