



At-Large Review Implementation

Development of the
Implementation Plan

Maureen Hilyard



Board resolution – 23 June 2018

Three key expectations

1. ALAC to form an At-Large Review Implementation Working Group.
 - The steps in the plan must have metrics, clear goals and a methodology for implementation
2. A budget had to be developed for each of the steps (if required)
 - The plan was to be phased to complete the easier to achieve items first
 - Budgets for subsequent items could be requested through the normal budget request process
3. The implementation plan had to be completed by December 23.
 - The WG to provide semi-annual reports on progress towards metrics and budgets



Implementation Plan Template from MSSSI

(The Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives (MSSI) team is responsible for facilitating ICANN and community reviews)

At Large Review
Implementation Working Group

At-Large Review Recommendations
Implementation Plan

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	3
1.OVERVIEW OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	4
2.PRIORITIZATION AND DEPENDENCIES.....	5
3. TIMELINE	7

2. Prioritization and Dependencies

Recommendation 1	
Final recommendation as approved by the Board	
Prioritization	
ARIWG comments	
Status of improvement effort / staff lead	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	
Proposed implementation steps:	



16 Implementation Proposals

To proceed immediately

- 1 – rework the policy section of the At-Large website
- 2 – encourage individuals into policy and leadership roles
- 3 – enhance staff services to support the volunteer community
- 4 – clarity on what the ALAC Leadership Team does
- 7 – ensure working groups are properly documented on the web and wiki
- 9 – staff skill development in social media
- 13 - development of a portal to report and reflect on engagement activities and costs
- 16 – collection and collation of performance metrics

To leave for the next budget round/s

- 5 – more coordinated ICANN strategy for outreach and engagement
- 6 – election processes too complex
- 8 – social media and other internet-based tool could be more effectively used
- 10 – too many communications channels used thus fractured communications
- 11 – Benefits of Global ATLAS vs more frequent regional meetings
- 12 – ALAC input into ICANN Outreach suboptimal
- 14 – need for an innovative approach to funding a revitalised At-Large
- 15 – need to reinforce the impact of outreach and engagement activities



Community collaboration

<p>Issue #9</p> <p>Lead: John Laprise</p>	<p>Need for increased At-Large Community awareness and staff training regarding the use of social media.</p>
<p>Final Proposal as approved by the Board</p>	<p>The ALAC will request additional staff skill development in the area of social media, and to work cooperatively with ICANN Communications social media specialists.</p>
<p>Prioritization</p>	<p>2.2.2 (Medium needs; medium risk; #2 priority group)</p>
<p>ARIWG comments</p>	<p>(MH) This task is related to Activity Item #8 about using social media to assist At-Large with its outreach attempts to attract more participants into our policy development areas and how we can do this more effectively</p> <p>(AC) Also linked to Capacity Building Program as a transversal objective to build O&E, besides disseminating information.</p> <p>(AC) It seems that ICANN produces Regional Newsletters, in addition to those prepared by Regions. Could this effort be coordinated to avoid duplication of efforts? See - https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/global-newsletter</p> <p>(NA) From following ICANN communication specialists one can notice that they are unfortunately not social media specialists. There is a need to well-designed capacity building program for staff only on social media engagements.</p> <p>(MM) I reiterate my point about the need for communications experts who don't speak ICANNese and who can package the message in a way that the <u>enduser</u> can relate to it.</p>

Issue 2: Individual participation

ARIWG comments

(Bastiann's team to tidy up and summarize)

(MH) Do we need to review our application forms for ALSes and Individual members to ensure that we have active participants in our At-Large activities? Otherwise we are planning to put an inordinate amount of work in to reach whom we assume are potential participants who aren't actually there. In APRALO we have 20 names of which only about 3 or 4 are active. I never see others at our meetings etc, so why do they join? are they participating in ICANN Learn?

(JC) I think there are several aspects to be considered. 1/ Membership application – we need to do better in asking why orgs and people join a RALO – would this then become a criteria in assessing applications? 2/ Identification of experts and willing & able contributors from within ALSes and individual membership – has the adopted method(s) been successful in each RALOs, why? why not? 3/ Establish clear, member-friendly mechanisms for continued engagement, mechanisms which everybody knows apply – who does what with whom? how is it done? 4/ Then, yes to looking for effective methodologies to coach and onboard new policy volunteers and leaders. All with the understanding that everybody has limited time and energy to devote to At-Large activities.

(JH) We also need to clearly indicate that in an ALS we can have many active people from one ALS. Previously there was hesitancy to give out confluence accounts to more than the main and alternate rep.

(NA for Nadira) I could see two fold of the "Outreach an Engagement", Outreach is one and Engagement is two. Handling the Outreach, RALOs with its community of active ALSes to take part of the outreach within their ALSes members and to their wider community.

(NA) Awareness programs of at-large and ALAC work comes before any community members to start in policy engagements.

(NA) Create a system of shadow mentor to those who wanted to get directly into policy work.

(MM for M. Moll) I agree with Nadira. Outreach and engagement are very different things. And I would also say that sometimes it takes a long time till outreach becomes engagement when speaking of individuals. People go through different life stages and it is only at some points that people can actually fit something like engagement in ICANN into their lives. So, being too restrictive on criteria could actually cut out some potential contributors.



Implementation Steps (drafts)

Expected budget implications	HR/HU: Suggests request of 1 FTE to focus on ALS/Individuals and engagement.
Proposed implementation steps:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. (HM) ALAC internal review about the role of the staff in policy making in the past 2. (JC) Identify what policy support activities ALAC / At-Large needs first 3. (HM) Consider having one of the staff dedicated to policy issues 4. (JC) Consider knowledge of staff in actual issues of policy considered by At-Large to enable them to be effective points of reference for queries, past positions, webinars 5. Consider further use of staff as proofreaders for non-native English speakers 6. Consider use of staff as translators for non-english participants in advice development 7. Consider further use of staff to present issues on webinars 8. JC) Consider capacity of staff in being the librarian for At-Large's policy repository 9. (JC) Consider capacity of staff in monitoring, distilling and applying commentary contributions by At-Large community members collected through various tools / channels, as well as usage of tools for facilitating such contributions 10. (JC) Performance review

Issue 3: Staff support

Proposed implementation steps:

(JC) I sort of alluded to proposed steps in [ARIWG](#) comments box.

(JC) I think there are several aspects to be considered.

1/ Membership application – we need to do better in asking why orgs and people join a RALO – would this then become a criteria in assessing applications?

2/ Identification of experts and willing & able contributors from within ALSes and individual membership – has the adopted method(s) been successful in each RALOs, why? why not?

3/ Establish clear, member-friendly mechanisms for continued engagement, mechanisms which everybody knows apply – who does what with whom? how is it done?

4/ Then, yes to looking for effective methodologies to coach and onboard new policy volunteers and leaders. All with the understanding that everybody has limited time and energy to devote to At-Large activities.

MH: Collect data on end users.

CLO: Peer-to-peer support / mentorship activity.

AG: post link from prior report highlighting prior focus on these steps.

Consider adding action items from Development Session in Barcelona:

A policy brief is to be prepared before each ICANN Public Meeting with the aim of identifying the key policy items (paragraph /up to one page) and At-Large message on these issues.

Global content to be prepared for newsletters (and placed in RALO newsletters. Work toward a global newsletter to be produced quarterly focused on policy issues for end users and be translated into FR/ES.

Monthly brief podcasts/videos to be produced on policy by CPWG co-chairs. Posted on At-Large Youtube and ICANN Learn.

Issue 1:
Policy



Metrics

Metrics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Number of attendees of each capacity building webinar (live and recorded versions) ▪ Number of I* events attended by At-Large leaders and members per year ▪ Number of joint outreach activities held with other ICANN stakeholder groups
----------------	---

Metrics	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number of advice drafts that result from this process (as opposed to the current process of random volunteers) 2. Number of attempts to get feedback of the larger community 3. Quantity of respondents to attempts to seek feedback 4. Number of at-large community participants in policy/advice development 5. Number of non-fluent English speakers engaged in policy/advice development
----------------	---

Continuous Improvement(s)

(JC) Review of solution post implementation to establish the effectiveness and fairness in achievement of the objective, as well as majority support of the At-Large community for the same.

(MH) some metrics which have been suggested but still yet to be discussed

- recorded attendance of regional as well as general At-Large meetings and involvements,
- evidence of active participation in and meaningful contribution to these meetings
- evidence of specific advocacy of at-large approved policy recommendations
- evidence of active participation and meaningful contribution to policy or other statements that At-Large is requested to participate in
- evidence of active engagement in the distribution of information about ICANN and its activities at local, national or regional level
- evidence of mentorship support given to colleagues, or the development of resources, to build further knowledge and understanding of the work of ICANN within the regions

(JC) I would suggest bulleted items under point 3 be identified performance metrics while we consider that methodology or combination of performance metrics should be used for assessment. Some At-Large folks are not in the position to meet all metrics so a fair methodology is needed for scoring.

(MM) I don't know about "evidence of specific advocacy of at-large approved recommendations.. I would rather say evidence of explanation of such recommendations.



Forward planning – continuous improvement

Example Issue 1 –
Policy development

Continuous Improvement (s)

1. Continue and expand the development of webinars to educate the at-large community on the policy considerations of the ICANN community
2. Draw a bright line distinction between individual and at-large policy advice
3. Ensure that at-large representatives to WGs and PDPs are aware of and clear on those distinctions when speaking for the at-large
4. Reimagine the process of advice prioritization by
 - a. Focusing on the perspective of the typical end user (as defined by activities not specific groups of end users)
 - b. Being disciplined NOT to develop advice when there is no unique "end user" perspective to bring to the discussion (like an amicus brief)
 - c. Using the newly formed policy working group (CPWG) as an initial filter and in turn make recommendations to the community on prioritization
 - d. Seek feedback from regional leaders on prioritization advice
5. Reimagine the process of advice/policy development by
 - a. Using the CPWG to formulate an initial perspective on a particular ICANN policy area
 - b. Use the regional leaders to socialize and receive feedback on that perspective
 - c. only THEN identify a pen holder to draft advice from THAT perspective
 - d. finally, submit that draft for open comment by the at-large community
6. Reimagine the participation of non-English speakers in at-large policy/advice development by
 - a. Continue to develop "issue briefs" in multiple languages to assist in education of non-English speakers
 - b. Employ simultaneous translation on CPWG calls
 - c. Continue and expand staff use as proofreaders for non-English fluent drafters before drafts are made public
 - d. Employee translators for drafts drafted in a language other than English



Final Implementation development process

1. Prioritising the items to be examined so that At-Large can concentrate initially on the more easily completed tasks.

2. Encouraging comments on each of the prioritised items from the ALAC and the At-Large community.

3. Organising the collaboratively compiled comments into Implementation Steps, Budget Implications and Metrics

4. Finalising the Implementation templates with the additional administration information required by the Board

5. Completing the At-Large Review Implementation Plan - including a proposed plan for the other 8 implementation items.

↓
**Cheryl
Langdon-Orr**