

**Set of question from the Organizational Effectiveness Committee to the At-Large Review Working Party, based on information collated by ICANN organization**

In response to the Final Report issued by ITEMS, the Independent Examiners that conducted the At-Large Review, the At-Large Review Working Party (in conjunction with ALAC) (RWP) prepared the At-Large Review and Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan. Both these documents have been presented to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) and verbatim excerpts are listed, respectively, in columns ① and ② of this document. Column ④ contains an overview of public comments submitted by the ICANN community in response to ITEMS' draft report – a complete summary of which can be found [here](#).

The OEC has asked the ICANN organization to collate this document, which does not reflect the view of the ICANN organization. Rather, the content is to be considered informational, as the document is aimed to provide a better understanding of the differences between the underlying issues and recommendations by ITEMS and the proposed implementation by the RWP.

Specifically, column ③ contains a set of questions from the OEC to the RWP, following on from the information provided in the other columns, as assembled by ICANN organization. Providing answers to these questions will help inform the OEC's decision regarding next steps in the At-Large review process.

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
1.	<p><b>Issue:</b> Quality vs quantity of ALAC advice</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Issue: Reject</b> The ALAC acknowledges that the At-Large website 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.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject</b> The recommendation is the standard practice.</p> <p><b>Proposed implementation steps:</b> -Staff to identify areas of the website needing improvement to be reviewed by At-Large Leadership prior to implementation; -Staff to organize 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.</p>	<p>The issue raised by ITEMS does not seem to be addressed by At-Large.</p> <p>How would the proposed implementation steps address the underlying issue pertaining to ALAC advice, including how ALAC would demonstrate its standard practice of focusing on those issues with greatest impact on the end user community?</p> <p>How does the current standard practice contribute to a transparent process for distinguishing different types of advice that are currently being produced?</p> <p>Specifically, ITEMS notes that although the number of public comment responses have declined (see p. 25 of the <a href="#">final report</a>). Might there be a need to distinguish the different kinds of advice that are produced, especially since, according to ITEMS a large majority of advice produced are responses to public comments, and very few are unsolicited bottom-up advice to the ICANN Board that specifically address the needs/expectations of end-users (see p.24+25 of the <a href="#">final report</a>)?</p> <p>Regarding second half of recommendation: “develop a more</p>	<p>Comments were <b>supportive</b> or <b>tentative</b> towards this recommendation see p.4-6 of the report of public comments: <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a>.</p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
			transparent process for distinguishing between different types of advice”, how does the At-Large website differentiate between different kinds of advice or other kinds of publications, (for example, see: <a href="https://atlarge.icann.org/policy-summary/">https://atlarge.icann.org/policy-summary/</a> )? <a href="#">How would the proposed implementation steps address the underlying issue?</a>	
2	<p><b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect/process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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)</p>	<p><b>Recommendation: ALAC rejects the adoption of the EMM as recommended by the Independent Examiner.</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Proposed implementation steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Continue to build and evolve the individual member model;</li> <li>-Enhance the effectiveness of ALSes by reaching out to their individual members;</li> <li>-Provide the necessary support (mentoring and guidance) for individual members of RALOs, as well as individuals who are</li> </ul>	See EMS recommendation 1-7 at the bottom of this table	Comments were <b>somewhat supportive</b> or <b>neutral</b> towards this recommendation, see pp. 6-10 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a> .

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
		members of ALSes, to allow them to directly contribute to policy processes by capacity building.		
3	<p>Issue: Staff resources are disproportionately concentrated on administrative support.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Issue: Reject</b> While the ALAC SUPPORTS IN PRINCIPLE this recommendation, we REJECT the statement that staff involvement is disproportionately concentrated on administrative support.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Partially agree</b></p> <p><b>Proposed implementation steps:</b> -Ensure that staff have the appropriate skills and are available to support volunteers to draft and edit statements; -As the At-Large communications plan takes form, ensure that staff resources are available to implement it; -Ensure that staff are available to provide useful meeting reports and summaries; -Enable staff to better leverage social media and other communication channels to disseminate policy information, in order to stimulate community participation</p>	<p>How are the various listed tasks performed by staff related to policy-support work, rather than administrative work?</p> <p>Might suitable tracking and measurement of staff resources dedicated to policy vs. administrative work provide the ALAC with a way of monitoring that staff resources are appropriately leveraged? And could this serve as a basis for requesting additional staff resources, if needed?</p> <p>The <a href="#">final report</a> (pp. 31,32) states that only 1.5 FTE are dedicated to policy support work. This information was obtained from ICANN organization. Is this number still correct?</p> <p>Overall, the <a href="#">final report</a> notes (p.32) that At-Large is supported by 5.5 FTE (as of 1 October 2017, At-Large support staff is 6.0 FTE). Is that number current? What would be a useful way to evaluate whether this current level is sufficient?</p>	<p>Comments were <b>neutral</b> towards this recommendation, see p.11 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a>.</p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
4	<p><b>Issue:</b> Leadership Team (LT), which is not mandated by the 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.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The At-Large Leadership Team (ALT) should be dissolved and its decision-making powers fully resolved to the ALAC</p>	<p><b>Issue: Reject</b> It is a consultative and advisory body for the Chair and was created to allow the Chair to delegate tasks to those who indicated a willingness to put additional time into ALAC and to bring in a regional perspective. The ALT, on a regular basis, makes recommendations to the ALAC for its consideration.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject</b> No alternative recommendation is suggested. The ALT is a consultative and advisory body.</p> <p><b>Proposed Implementation steps:</b> Not applicable</p>	<p>Can you elaborate on how the ALT adds value to the ALAC and why it is not a barrier to the entry of newcomers, as stated in the Final Report (see p. 41)?</p> <p>Can you please elaborate on how the functions performed by ALT, ALAC, and ALAC Chair are distinct from each other? If this information is not currently available on the At-Large website, would it be helpful for newcomers and others not fully familiar with the At-Large operations?</p> <p>Might it be useful to to measure and track the rotation of members in leadership positions in the future?</p>	<p>Recommendation was not part of the Draft Report and thus not subject to public comment.</p>
5	<p><b>Issue:</b> Uneven distribution of At-Large to a coordinated ICANN strategy for 'Outreach and Engagement'. Missed opportunities for coordination with other constituencies and ICANN staff</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> At-Large should redouble efforts to contribute to meetings between ICANN Senior Staff, ISOC, and other I* organizations to develop a joint strategic approach to cooperative outreach</p>	<p><b>Issue: Neutral</b> ALAC notes that it is already implemented across all RALOs "as opportunities arise".</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Neutral (already implemented)</b></p> <p><b>Proposed implementation steps:</b> Discussions with Staff and ICANN Management on funding for RALO participation in regional meetings including regional hubs, The Internet Society and I* organizations.</p>	<p>The relationship between ISOC and At-Large is not addressed in the At-Large response. Might it be useful to provide an overview or historical documentation of joint ISOC/At-Large outreach efforts?</p> <p>What were the outcomes of joint ISOC/At-Large outreach? Are there any plans for documenting these activities in the future and if not, would this be feasible?</p> <p>The proposed implementation steps address funding; it may be helpful to define what engagement activities would be ideal targets for At-Large, what goals</p>	<p>Public comments were <b>opposed</b> to this recommendation, echoing the sentiment that 'ICANN and its Advisory Committees should respect ICANN's limited scope and mission, and minimize any official interaction with other global bodies.' See pp.11-14 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org">https://www.icann.org</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf)

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
			<p>At-Large would set for such engagements and how it would measure whether the activity is impactful. Might such documentation be useful for requesting (additional) funding?</p> <p>Would it be helpful to leverage methodology for engagement metrics used by ICANN’s GSE team?</p>	<p><a href="/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>
6	<p><b>Issue:</b> Election processes are excessively complex and have been open to allegations of unfairness</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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, both of which would be an improvement over the current process.</p>	<p><b>Issue: Reject</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject</b></p>	<p>At-Large states that its process is ‘more complex and rigorous than the processes used by the Supporting Organizations for their selections’. Might it be useful to provide details on the benefits and purpose of the current, complex At-Large selection process?</p> <p>At-Large states that the selection process ‘will evolve going forward’ – what plans have been made for this and how are these documented?</p> <p>The At-Large states that ‘the [Board Candidate Evaluation Committee] BCEC did not have, and is not allowed to have, any current ALAC members. However, ALAC appointed liaisons are allowed on the BCEC. It appears that the <a href="#">ALAC membership site</a> does not provide a clear differentiation between ALAC members and ALAC-appointed liaisons – could the optics of the website be improved, to</p>	<p>The recommendation in the Draft Report was more prescriptive and did not provide two alternatives and it did <b>not receive support</b>. See pp.14-16 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
		<p>The Review also commented on whether At-Large should have two Directors instead of the one it currently has and rejected the idea. The ALAC, however, believes that the Board should not review the issue of the number of At-Large Directors.</p> <p><b>Proposed recommendation steps:</b> Not applicable</p>	<p>avoid confusion between ALAC members and ALAC liaisons?</p> <p>At-Large states that the development of the selection process is ‘well-documented and readily available.’ Would it be possible to provide a link to this documentation?</p> <p>The <a href="#">final report</a> points out on p.45 that ‘the BMSPC was also seated with three members of the current ALAC and five RALO leaders’. Could At-Large provide an indication whether that is true or offer explanations of why this is not a concern in its view?</p> <p>Could the At-Large provide a more detailed justification for rejecting the notion that the Board should review the issue of number of At-Large Directors to the Board, particularly, as this would also affect the Board’s capacity to approve (not just reject) an increase of At-Large Directors?</p>	
7	<p><b>Issue:</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Issue: Reject</b></p> <p>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 the ALAC’s mandated</p>	<p>How many working groups, committees, subcommittees, and other groups are currently in existence? The ALAC <a href="#">working group website</a> lists 18 working groups and one cross-community working group. The <a href="#">working group website</a> also has 34 sub-pages that seem to point to other committees or working groups (in the left-hand navigation bar). How does ALAC</p>	<p>The recommendation was <b>not supported</b> during the public comment period: See pp.17-19 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> At-Large should disband existing internal Working Groups, too many of which are currently focused on process, and a distraction from the actual policy advice role of the At-Large. Their creation in the future should be avoided. If absolutely necessary, any such group should be strictly task/time limited and policy focused, or its role taken on by volunteer penholders assisted by policy capable staff</p>	<p>responsibilities to produce policy advice and coordinate outreach and engagement activities.”</p> <p>The ALAC strongly objects to the first element of the issue identified under this recommendation, the elimination of ALAC Working Groups.</p> <p>The ALAC also notes the second component of this issue: an excessive amount of time is supposedly spent on process and procedure. At ICANN meetings, ALAC spends a considerable amount of time meeting with other SOs/ACs.</p> <p>While this may be seen as discussion on processes, in fact it is most often discussions focusing on issues that have been identified of importance for end-users.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Rejected</b></p> <p><b>Proposed implementation steps:</b> not applicable</p>	<p>evaluate the usefulness of these groups? Might the community benefit from updates/clarifications on the web site?</p> <p>At-Large states that ‘new participants [within At-Large] often become active contributors’ via Working Groups. Would the new participants benefit from a clear path outlined on the website, along with relevant examples/testimonials?</p> <p>At-Large states that WGs are dismantled as their tasks are completed. Is there documentation to show the criteria applicable for closing WGs? Do you have data to show what the average lifespan of an internal At-Large WG is? If it is not being measured, how can it be in the future?</p> <p>ALAC states that ‘at ICANN meetings, ALAC spends a considerable amount of time meeting with other SO/ACs [...] focusing on issues that have been identified of importance for end-users. How are the issues discussed in these meetings shared with the At-Large community? Would the end-users find information on relevant issues useful and would such transparency help engage more active participation?</p>	<p><a href="https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&amp;preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf">atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a>.</p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).



	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
8	<p><b>Issue:</b> Social media and other Internet-based tools could be used more effectively, and at a minimal cost, to continuously survey and channel end-user input into ICANN policy making processes</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> ALAC should use social media more effectively to engage 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</p>	<p><b>Issue:</b> <b>Reject (already in use)</b></p> <p>The ALAC supports the intent of this recommendation and currently makes use of various platforms and intends to both continue and enhance such usage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation supports intent</b></p> <p><b>Proposed implementation steps:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work with ICANN staff to develop a Social Media policy;</li> <li>• Social Media Working group to develop a pilot advertising program to test appropriate uses of different Social Media for ALAC and RALOs, and to assess the effectiveness of certain applications in developing sub-regions</li> </ul>	<p>While the recommendation suggests that social media should be used to measure and gauge end-user engagement, the At-Large response only addresses the fact that At-Large uses social media to push out content to end users.</p> <p>At-Large mentions that it ‘makes use of various platforms and intends to both continue and enhance such usage.’ How does ALAC measure and optimize usage?</p> <p>At-Large states: At-Large ‘boasts active Twitter and Facebook pages’. How are these used to gauge end-user input?</p> <p>ALAC has looked at ‘Mattermost, Slack, Eno, as well as FLICKR and YouTube’ to ‘enhance internal communications as well as end-user participation will continue to be an important ALAC goal’. How does ALAC evaluate these various tools? Has ALAC considered the usefulness of small pilots to test innovative approaches to engagement and participation?</p> <p>The ALAC social media working group has ‘shown early indications that using social media to poll members may not be appropriate’. Could you provide details on the methodology used to make that determination? Where can the records for</p>	<p>This recommendation was <b>supported</b> during the public comment, see pp. 19-21 of the report of public comments</p> <p><a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
			<p>the work and recommendations of the social media working group be found?</p> <p>At-Large states ‘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, bandwidth and cost issues, so that social media is skewed towards certain populations and cannot be presumed to be balanced. Polling [...] is therefore neither representative nor actionable’. When was the last time this assessment was updated? Might it be useful to develop a phased approach to leveraging social media effectively, given the rapid advances and adoption?</p>	
9	<p><b>Issue:</b> Need for increased At-Large Community awareness and staff training regarding the use of social media</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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 staff</p>	<p><b>Issues: somewhat supported</b></p> <p>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 of At-Large support staff to help enhance its use of Social Media.</p>	<p>At-Large response does not address the connection between Recommendations 8 and 9. Does the At-Large propose to gain knowledge and training to increase the use of social media to gauge end-user engagement? If not, why not? If yes, how might this be done?</p>	<p>This recommendation is <b>supported</b> by the public comments, see pp.21-22 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
		<p><b>Recommendation: somewhat supported</b></p> <p><b>Proposed implementation Steps:</b> not applicable</p>		
10	<p><b>Issue:</b> There are a multitude of communications channels used by At-Large. This has led to fractured and undocumented communications</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> ALAC should consider the adoption of a single Slack-like online communication platform. An instant-messaging-cum-team workspace (FOSS) alternative to Skype/Wiki/website/ mailing lists</p>	<p><b>Issue: somewhat supported</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: somewhat supported</b></p> <p>The ALAC SUPPORTS THE INTENT of this recommendation to ensure that we use appropriate communications tools within At-Large. However, we note that the support of IT-based tools for ICANN typically requires the support of ICANN IT staff and that the selection of products and whether they are FOSS or proprietary is not the sole choice of the ALAC.</p> <p><b>Proposed implementation Steps:</b> not applicable</p>	<p>The response does not seem to address ‘fractured and undocumented communication’ issue identified by ITEMS. How does the At-Large evaluate preferred communication methods of its end-users? What consideration has been given to evolving preferences of younger end-users? Would the At-Large benefit from relevant consumer preferences research? Would it be beneficial to gather structured input from the regions on what their end-user preferences might be? What other innovative solutions might be relevant?</p>	<p>Community feedback was largely <b>tentative</b>, pointing to concerns of ‘moving away from widely adopted communications platforms [within ICANN]. See, pp.21-22 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
11	<p><b>Issue:</b> While broadly popular, Global ATLAS meetings every 5 years have been difficult to organize and short on effective results. More frequently regional meetings would be more effective in encouraging both policy input and outreach while familiarizing more of At-Large with workings of ICANN</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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 At-Large Members.</p>	<p><b>Issue: Reject</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: Reject</b> 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 organize this increased number of events.</p> <p><b>Proposed implementation Steps:</b> not applicable</p>	<p>What is the At-Large’s view on the financial viability and substantive effectiveness of ATLAS meetings given the steadily increasing number of At-Large members and ALSs (see page 57 of ITEMS Final Report)? If there are any concerns, how could they be addressed? How does ALAC measure effectiveness of financial support? What methods would you consider useful in the future to measure effectiveness of financial support, and to evaluate impact and outcomes? What ways does the At-Large see to make ATLAS meetings more results-oriented? Are there any alternative suggestions to maximize existing resources, both financial and human?</p>	<p>Public comment was <b>neutral</b> or <b>supportive</b> of this recommendation, see pp.22-25 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>
12	<p><b>Issue:</b> ALAC input to a coordinated ICANN Outreach sub-optimal</p>	<p><b>Issue: Accept</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation: Accept</b></p>	<p>At-Large accepts the issue and the recommendation.</p>	<p>Public comment was <b>supportive</b> of this recommendation, see pp.25-27 of the report</p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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 organization and participation of At-Large members.</p>	<p>The ALAC supports this recommendation.</p> <p>The CROP (formerly CROPP) is a good start in supporting this activity, as is occasional GSE support of external activities.</p> <p>Recently the CROP fund (previously catering for three days and two nights) was increased so that it has become four days and three nights.</p> <p>RALOs particularly support CROP and want to see it expanded to provide more opportunities of engagement with other organizations.</p> <p>Often, involvement with regional events requires substantial funding, i.e. sponsorship, in order to participate in panels and other speaking opportunities. The ALAC proposes that when these opportunities arise due to the efforts of RALO leaders to gain recognition of the RALO as a member of a regional I* organization in its own right, that formal participation should be funded by ICANN, leaving CROP to</p>	<p>To facilitate implementation: what metrics are in place to measure and track annual CROPP funding? How could the At-Large provide measurement to gauge advice outputs or other substantial work that results from CROPP funding?</p>	<p>of public comments  <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
		<p>be used to expand outreach into more underserved areas</p> <p><b>Proposed Implementation Steps:</b> not applicable</p>		
13	<p><b>Issue:</b> Need more systematic RALO participation in regional events</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Issue:</b> <b>Accepted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> <b>Rejected</b> (unless applied to all of ICANN, not just At-Large)</p> <p>The ALAC agrees that opportunities for travel and outreach, and subsequent report requirements, should be well documented and easy to locate. However, the programs themselves are managed by various parts of ICANN and are often published on their respective parts of the ICANN web. The ALAC strongly supports the coordination of such information and making it more easily accessible for all</p> <p><b>Proposed implementation steps:</b> Staff, with review by At-Large Leadership, will create information pages identifying volunteer funding opportunities and reports of past</p>	<p>While the issue addresses the need for systematic RALO participation in regional events, the recommendation is focused on travel funding. What is the correlation?</p> <p>Since At-Large accepts the issue, what steps and actions would you take to improve participation in regional events? And how can the efforts and outcomes be tracked and measured in a transparent way moving forward?</p> <p>Specifically, how can RALO participation in regional events be improved and how can its impact in terms of At-Large advice and other substantive output be measured?</p>	<p>Recommendation is <b>supported</b> during the public forum, see pp.28-29 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
14	<p><b>Issue:</b> Need for an innovative approach to funding a revitalized At-Large</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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.</p>	<p><b>Issue:</b> Partially Support</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Reject</p> <p>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.</p> <p><b>Proposed implementation Steps:</b> not applicable</p>	<p>While At-Large partially supports the issue, it is not clear what alternative proposals it has to fund a revitalized At-Large. What are current levels of funding? What correlation is there between funding and output and how is it documented? If it not documented yet, how could it be going forward? Are the current and past beneficiaries of funding published? If additional funds are needed, how would their use and their impact be measured in a transparent way?</p>	<p>The recommendation in the Draft Report was different from the one in in the Final Report, public comment <b>opposed</b> the recommendation of the Draft Report, see pp.29-32 of the report of public comments <a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-atlarge-review-draft-report-10apr17-en.pdf</a></p>
15	<p><b>Issue:</b> Need to reinforce impact of outreach and engagement activities</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Issue:</b> Reject</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> Reject</p> <p>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</p>	<p>Why does At-Large reject the issue noted by ITEMS that there is a need to reinforce impact of outreach and engagement activities? Does At-Large believe that the current level of effort produces sufficient impact? Could improvements be made to achieve more impact and to demonstrate achievements to the At-Large community?</p>	<p>Recommendation was not part of the Draft Report and thus not subject to public comment.</p>

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
	Engagement group. Rapporteurs would serve for one year (3 meetings) to encourage turnover and more genuine grass roots input.	<p>outreach efforts. It also supports explicit outreach events sponsored by AC/SO and constituent organizations. The ALAC agrees with all of these activities</p> <p>The ALAC has also initiated an outreach program for its indigenous peoples which will involve travel to ICANN meetings. The At-Large General Assembly and ATLAS programs also include a component of outreach in that many attendees are relatively new to ICANN</p> <p><b>Proposed implementation steps:</b> not applicable</p>	How are At-Large outreach efforts during past ICANN meetings documented and how is their impact measured? If no documentation and/or measurement exists, how could this be achieved going forward? Would the At-Large benefit from an impact assessment of all outreach efforts? If not why not? If yes, how could this be achieved?	
16	<p><b>Issue:</b> Absence of consistent performance metrics</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Issue:</b> <b>Support partially</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> <b>Reject</b></p> <p>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</p>	<p>While At-Large partially accepts the issue of absence of consistent performance metrics, how does it propose to address the need to develop and implement meaningful performance measures?</p> <p>The At-Large mentions ‘an activity to develop metrics for other volunteers and community members, including the establishment of criteria for ALS performance’. Is this already taking place? Could documentation be provided on the outcome and recommendations of the Metrics WG?</p>	While the adoption of the EMM received some tentative support, and some objections, the need for metrics to evaluate and track performance received <b>support</b> .

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).



	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
		<p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p><b>Proposed Implementation Steps:</b> not applicable</p>		
EM M1	<p><b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group (see Rec 2)</p> <p><b>EMM Recommendation 1:</b> 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</p>	<p><b>Partially support</b></p> <p>The ALAC strongly supports the ability of users to participate in At-Large without the need for joining or forming an ALS.</p> <p>As noted in the ALAC response to Recommendation 2, section 12.2(d)(ix)(D) of the ICANN Bylaws, explicitly allowing regions to tailor processes to meet regional needs</p>	<p>ALAC states: "Three of the five regional organizations already have such an ability with the other two RALOs working towards incorporation of individual members into their own rules (one is expected to be completed in the same timeframe as this document is submitted)." Are there links to documentation of existing processes available? Is there a timeline when the remaining RALOs will allow for individual memberships? What guidelines are in place to assure similar processes are in place across the five RALOs? If these do not exist, how can they be developed?</p>	

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
EM M2	<p><b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group (see Rec 2).</p> <p><b>EMM Recommendation 2:</b> ALAC should define a set of metrics for assessing the level of active engagement of “policy advice” or “outreach and engagement” for 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</p>	Partially support	<p>At-Large agrees that being able to measure the level of active engagement of “policy advice” or “outreach and engagement” for ALMs is desirable. How will this be tracked and measured in the future? What metrics will be used? How and where will this be published?</p> <p>ALAC states: “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 travelers cannot attend a meeting.”</p> <p>How is ‘useful’ defined in this context? What metrics can be applied to provide clear causal links between travel slots and At-Large advice and/or other substantive output being produced during meetings?</p> <p>Finally, what is the difference between ‘regular travelers’ and ‘those that make significant contributions’? What purpose do ‘regular travelers’ – as defined by At-Large – serve?</p>	
EM M3	<p><b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group (see Rec 2).</p>	Reject	n/a	

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
	<b>EMM Recommendation 3.1:</b> 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			
EM M4	<b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group (see Rec 2).  <b>EMM Recommendation 3.2:</b> 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).	<b>Reject</b>	See Recommendation 15	
EM M5	<b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group (see Rec 2).	<b>Reject</b>	n/a	

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
--	--	--	--	--

	<b>EMM Recommendation 4:</b> 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.			
EM M6	<b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group (see Rec 2).  <b>EMM Recommendation 5:</b> 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.	<b>Reject</b>		
EM M7	<b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group (see Rec 2).  <b>EMM Recommendation 6:</b> 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	<b>Reject</b>	n/a	
EM M8	<b>Issue:</b> At-Large has struggled to reflect process end-user opinion; barriers to individual participants; perception of unchanging leadership group (see Rec 2).	<b>Reject</b>	n/a	

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).

	① ITEMS Recommendations and Underlying Issues Identified <sup>1</sup>	② At-Large/ALAC Response <sup>2</sup>	③ Unaddressed Issues or unclear justification in the At-Large/ALAC response	④ Community feedback (other than At-Large/ALAC during public comment)
	<b>EMM Recommendation 6:</b> ALAC Rules of Procedure should be updated with the addition of new procedures regarding the use of random selection for the appointment of key At-Large leadership positions			

<sup>1</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the ITEMS Final Report: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/atlarge-review-final-02may17-en.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> The data noted in this column are extracts from the At-Large Review Recommendations Feasibility Assessment and Implementation Plan Report: [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility\\_Final-Revised\\_20170919.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=69280572&preview=/69280572/71598316/At-Large%20Review%20Feasibility_Final-Revised_20170919.pdf).