



**AT-LARGE SUMMIT –
WORKING GROUP 1**

**AL.SUM/WG1.01/INF/2
ORIGINAL: English
DATE: 16th February 2009
STATUS: DRAFT**

**COMPILATION OF PREVIOUS STATEMENTS OF
ALAC ON PARTICIPATION**

Introductory Note
By the Staff of ICANN

This document is a compilation of statements made by the ALAC which incorporated elements related to community participation in ICANN.

[End of Introductory Note]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 GENERAL PARTICIPATION	2
1.2 Participation in the GNSO	3
1.3 Participation in GNSO Stakeholder Groups	4
1.4 Participation in ICANN Meetings	4
1.5 Transparency and Participation	6
2.0 GLOBAL OUTREACH	8
3.0 TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION	8
4.0 TRAVEL SUPPORT	9

1.0 GENERAL PARTICIPATION

From: ["At-Large Committee Advisory Statement to the ICANN Board on the Draft Operating Plan FY 2008-2009, May 5, 2008"](#)
[AL.ALAC/BUD.SC/0308/1/2](#) (Page 2 heading "IDN Activities")

“This is a very important area of work for At-Large – and also for all of ICANN. The extra funding should serve to accelerate the implementation of IDNs and enhance consultation with the relevant local language communities. Therefore, we would like to emphasize the importance of the element of communications related to IDNs, including funding, as appropriate and required, to accerate the implementation of the IDNs and enhance consultation with the relevant local language communities.

“Fundamental choices that will affect the many communities that do not rely upon the Latin character set will be made in the next few years. For that reason, we believe ICANN, in partnership with the other stakeholders of course, needs to make a substantial, sustained, greatly increased effort to communicate with these communities – to ensure that the message about the forthcoming choices to be made related to IDNs reaches a far larger pool of potential contributors to the process than is currently aware and participating. This should not simply take the form of translated press releases but really a well-thought-out media campaign which ‘reaches out’ to the public. We know that efforts to do this work exist – we wish to emphasize that this is extremely important. We note that we have asked the At-Large staff to propose funding in the forthcoming FY to revise and expand the available materials related to outreach to the individual Internet user community and this is just one aspect that such an effort must address.”

From: ["At-Large Committee Advisory Statement to the ICANN Board on the Draft Operating Plan FY 2008-2009, May 5, 2008"](#) [AL.ALAC/BUD.SC/0308/1/2](#) (Page 6 under the heading “Broaden Participation”)

“This are is of great importance – not just to our community but to all communities. In particular, whilst the provisions for teleconferences for our community have improved by changing vendors, we do not believe that it makes sense to continue to outsource this core communications function and so we welcome the news that ICANN proposes to purchase a truly fit-for-purpose system to facilitate telephonic interactions. We hope that in doing so choices will be made which truly facilitate equal access and quality for all participants regardless of where they might be.

“In particular, the new system must provide for the technical operations of simultaneous interpretation on teleconferences. This is an absolutely essential function, not something that is ‘nice to have’. Our experience with this has cearly shown that the ability to work, interact and correspond (both face-to-face and remotely) in the language that is most comfortable and easy to work with greatly increases and enhances effective participation.

“We would also like to emphasize how important it is to broadening participation of effective remote participation in meetings, of which telephonic two-way participation is only one element. We believe that the current remote participation modalities for ICANN meetings are not fit for purpose. Our statement in relation to the development of a volunteer travel and expense support policy, in document [AL.ALAC/BUD.SC/0308/1/1](#) accessible at [al alac bud](#)

[sc 0308 1 1](#) also has the elaboration on our views on the subject of remote participation, and meetings.

“In addition to these points, we wish to emphasize that one of the most important elements of participation is ICANN producing documents in standardized formats which are accessible, written in plain language, with excellent summaries, indices, glossaries, and the like. This is a real shortcoming of present document production at ICANN and it is a real barrier to participation.

“We also believe that fostering participation actually requires a regionally sensitive approach and often regionally differentiated materials. In developing countries, radio and audiovisual materials, to mention just two formats, are the best way to reach non-traditional ICANN stakeholders. It is understood that this kind of outreach would not be in the nature of general Internet education but should be related to the mission of ICANN and its mandate. Radio should be made a priority for communications from ICANN.”

1.2 Participation in the GNSO

From: ["ALAC Statement to the Board of ICANN on the Structure of the GNSO Council, 18 August 2008"](#)

GNSO Evolution After Restructuring

“We also may differ from some of the current constituencies on how the GNSO should evolve after the new structure is implemented. As noted in the BGC report, the process for forming new constituencies has been in the By-Laws as long as the GNSO has existed. But it has never happened, presumably due to the (real or perceived) heavy burden of “self-forming” and then ongoing management. Within the new structure, it may be even more difficult, due to a potential for the existing constituencies to believe that they can represent all viewpoints, thus eliminating the need for new constituencies.

“In the case of the NCSG, the problem is particularly severe. As had been pointed out by the NCUC, “in the world of non commercial internet users and registrants, the level of specific interest in matters that come under the remit of ICANN and specifically the GNSO is only a small part of their general community and constituency areas of concern and interest.” This has certainly been the case within At-Large. Most At-Large Structures (ALSs) existed prior to being involved with ICANN. They became an ALS because there was reasonable overlap with their original mandate and that of ICANN At-Large. But ICANN is not their only or even their prime reason for existing, and in some cases, ICANN falls low on their priority list of things to devote time to.

“Expecting a group to self-form and become a new GNSO constituency is expecting a lot. If it is to happen at all, there are several things that must facilitate this:- ICANN (and the stakeholder groups) will have to make it as easy as possible to create and operate new constituencies. The requirements they must meet must be reasonable and applied with consistency.

“These new entities must feel comfortable that they will be able to participate in the Policy Development Process as discretely identifiable bodies, at a level comparable to (and not subservient to) the long-established players (of course factoring in size). “Without that guarantee, there is little reason for them to make the considerable effort needed to enter into GNSO processes.

The new addition level of hierarchy moving from GNSO→Constituency to GNSO→Stakeholder Group→Constituency (or as per the consensus proposal GNSO→House→Stakeholder Group→Constituency) must be managed to minimize the need for additional complexity and additional volunteer effort. Thin layers will be, in our opinion, absolutely mandatory.

“If the above can be accomplished within the new Non-commercial Stakeholders Group, the non-commercial rebirth envisioned in section 5.3 of the BGC report may actually happen.”

1.3 Participation in GNSO Stakeholder Groups

[From: "ALAC Statement on Stakeholder Group Openness, 24 September 2008"](#)

Stakeholder Group Openness

“The ALAC notes with pleasure that at its meeting of August 28, 2008, the Board clarified and reaffirmed the requirement that Constituencies within the restructured GNSO meet and continue to meet principles of representativeness, openness, transparency and fairness.

“Given that within the restructured GNSO, a principal entity will be the Stakeholders Group, and that it is at this level that Council seats will be allocated amongst its Constituencies, it is critical that the mechanism for such allocation be completely transparent.

“Accordingly, the ALAC recommends that when the Bylaws are amended to include references to Stakeholder Groups, that they too are obliged to adhere to similar principles of representativeness, openness, transparency and fairness.

1.4 Participation in ICANN Meetings

[From: "ALAC Communication to the Board on ICANN Meeting Participation and Organisation, 11 December 2008"](#)

“I write to you today at the request of the At-Large Advisory Committee to convey the disappointment that they and the wider At-Large community have with the way in which the public forum in Cairo was organised in particular, and to express our concern with other elements of the Cairo meeting in general.

Perhaps it is most descriptive to give the Board some sense of the mood and reaction to this part of the Cairo meeting, if I quote one commentator - “For a public forum to be organised in a way that lurches from unacceptable change to unacceptable change during the meeting itself in a way that allows grandees sufficient time to make speeches, yet disenfranchises the community by providing almost no time whatever for its concerns to be aired speaks to a fundamental lack of understanding of the purpose of ICANN’s meetings on the part of those responsible.”

In more general terms what I have heard is that, ‘the public forum is not a time for canned speeches – it is a time for the ICANN community of volunteers to air their concerns to the Board, the Staff, and one another, with sufficient time for those concerns to be heard and to be addressed and discussed.’ (Paraphrased from several people’s statements at or after Cairo meeting). The At-Large Community is most concerned that those organising the meetings fail to understand this fundamental principle and we trust that this concerns you and the rest of the

Board as much as it does us. The At-Large community joins those others who have written to you in expecting the Board taking decisive action to ensure that the debacle we experienced in Cairo never reoccurs.

This is especially important given the fact that the Public Forum in Paris was mismanaged. The idea that a snap 'survey', conducted at the last minute, should govern the organisation of that public forum is ludicrous and the fact that only a handful of people responded (given the short timeframe little else can be expected) should have ensured that the idea of allowing such a small sample of the community to dictate the organisation of something as important as the public forum would be abandoned. Unfortunately it seems that basic common sense eluded the people responsible on that occasion just as it did again in Cairo.

ICANN's constituents are volunteers – a point that seems lost upon those who are in charge of organising its meetings. We don't fly across the world – at our own expense, for many of those not fortunate enough to receive travel support - to listen to canned speeches, or to watch our few opportunities for genuine public interaction with the Board and other communities vanish almost in front of our eyes based upon the poor judgment of those responsible.

Further, the provisions for remote participation in ICANN meetings which is vital for the involvement of our At-Large Community is far from satisfactory and have been so for years, and those responsible seem to be allowed to endlessly continue to get away with not fixing the problem. Our community asks (again paraphrased) 'Why do the repeated calls for remote participation that works get ignored, and why does the Board continue to allow this obvious failure to remain unaddressed?'

To be clear, issues such as the following are unacceptable:

Main meeting agendas with mistakes (including meeting records on the public schedule showing the same meetings taking place at the same time, going uncorrected for days;

Very poor quality chat interfaces attached to meetings which are unmonitored by staff so that these chat sessions are not acknowledged or their input aired to the main meeting;

Lack of telephonic participation options for meetings that work reliably. After six meetings of technically hopeless telephonic participation facilities for At-Large's meetings, in Cairo we didn't even bother to try. http://atlarge-lists.icann.org/pipermail/at-large_atlarge-lists.icann.org/2008q4/004925.html

Receiving very large documents in English-only on the eve of a meeting's start, and then expecting attendees to comment and participate in sessions related to these texts. The New GTLDs documents are just the latest example of this problem. This is a totally unreasonable burden on volunteers and reinforces an imbalance between those who make money from registration – who will read things no matter when they are released because their business depends on them – and everyone else. If substantive documents cannot be made available at least two weeks before a meeting – in multiple language versions – don't bother arranging sessions to talk about them at the meeting and don't start consultations on them until well after the meeting is over.

ICANN spends a lot of registrant-derived funds on its meetings and on participation mechanisms. They should be run to a far more professional standard than they currently are. It also should be approaching the entire idea of participation in a far more significant and serious way than has been done in the past. We hope that the board-level discussions on

participation provide a venue for that discussion, but we wish to make it clear that a lot of talk is not what's required. The community needs and deserves for its participation to be taken seriously and for those responsible in ICANN to be held to account for the (currently completely inadequate and often unprofessional) job they do with respect to meetings and participation enhancement systems. We expect that the board will take action to remind those responsible of their obligations and call them to account for their performance.

We would like to suggest the creation of an organization meeting committee with one participant from each SO/AC helping on building a better (more useful) meeting.

There is also a point of personal concern I wish to raise as Chair of the ALAC, the matter of the reasons for the 'compressed time' remaining for the public forum in Cairo... It has been reported back to me from 'the rumour mill' to be in some way related to the new activity of the Joint AC and SO parts of the planned and advertised Cairo Agenda... To designate this as ridiculous and erroneous is the very least I can say, and indeed to say it is destructive and malicious is more accurate. I urge the Board to ensure this rumour is countermanded strongly and effectively as soon as is possible.

Finally and most importantly on a positive note, the ALAC notes and wishes to recognise the efforts being made by the Board to remedy and improve public participation with its newly established Public Participation Committee of the Board (PPBC). Perhaps this is an ideal opportunity for the Chair and others from this committee to join us in a single topic discussion that we could arrange for one of our regular (at least) monthly briefing calls. This would also allow Kieren to be involved, as is quite proper and indeed is something he offered both in Cairo (in conversation with me) and since via email "I will be more than happy to go through everything from my side and to talk them through what happened and why, what changes are afoot and so on." (Dec 9 th 2008).

To this end the ALAC ExCom would be more than happy to plan such a call (as it will be most timely before our At-Large Summit in Mexico) in the week starting January 12 th 2009 and will ask our staff to see what can be arranged, set up a doodle for best times and dates, and of course liaise with Kieren on this matter. If the new PPBC desires to be involved in this activity (or some future alternate) then this would be most welcome, and the PPBC Chair need only let us know their availability or plans.

Our community recognizes and appreciates that genuine efforts are being made to improve meetings and remote participation, for future meetings and indeed that new line up in the Meetings Team along with Paul Levins and of course Kieren will with the input of the PPBC make significant changes, but our At-Large Community and specifically those who are not on site at ICANN Meetings but rely in remote participation methods and archived materials to interact have made it clear to our Committee that our concerns need to formally registered."

1.5 Transparency and Participation

[From: ALAC Advisory to Board on Draft IDN Fast Track Implementation Plan, 3 February 2009](#)

The At-Large community is inspired that the long-awaited fast-track IDN ccTLDs will finally be implemented in a foreseeable future. ALAC has been very active in each step of fast-track policy development independently or within the cross-constituency IDNC. With respect to the newly released Implementation Plan, we have the following comments:

I. Expedition and Transparency

“The salient purpose of the fast-track implementation is to meet the pressing needs of the IDN users communities. For this purpose, we do hope the process shall be sufficiently fast and transparent. From the published Plan, we cannot see a very clear implementation time line. Based on the ICANN Strategic Plan (2009-2012) published on 20 October 2008 and discussion on the Public Forum on 3 November 2008, it seems that the fast-track process will not be done at the root level until mid-2009. It is still unclear when the application round will be launched. The user communities hope that such critical information can be available as soon as possible.

II. Consumer Protection and Market Competition

“The Implementation Plan does not specify whether IDN ccTLD registries are required to take any preventive or transitional measures to protect the legitimate interests of the existing individual registrants under the relevant ccTLDs. Since individual registrants are most probably not as resourceful as the business sector, they would not be able to afford the expensive legal advice or litigation. The IDN registries' preventive or transitional measures would be essential for them. Market competition can make the prices more reasonable and service quality better. The user communities welcome strengthening competition in the IDN ccTLD registration market provided that the IANA process is properly followed and stability and security are ensured in the relevant name space.

III. Compliance of Community Services

“The ccTLD Community has been emphasizing that serving the local Internet community is an important feature that makes the ccTLDs different from gTLDs. The user community notes from the Implementation Plan that the support from the relevant script community for the IDN table is required for evaluation among the other documentation of endorsement. The IANA Procedure for Delegation or Redelegation of ccTLDs also clearly requires that a relevant ccTLD delegation or redelegation request show how it will serve the local interest in the country. In the case of an IDN ccTLD, the local interest would be more specific.

“Apparently, the ccTLDs need the support of the local user community for the fast-track application and implementation. And, vice versa. It is in the mutual interest of both the IDN ccTLD registry community and the local IDN user community to keep a very close, cooperative and supportive relationship. Presently, some ccTLD registries have already been supportive to the local user organizations in various ways. The outstanding examples are healthy interaction and collaboration between the ccTLDs (such as .br and .au) and local ALSes on policy consultations and community services. The launch of IDN ccTLDs opens up new opportunities for both communities. If we take translation as an example, we can see the great potential coming up. IDN ccTLDs demonstrate the registries have the relevant capacity to provide services in local scripts. Then, it would be reasonable for the local user community to rely on the registries to translate the ICANN policies and other documents into the local languages.

“Enhancement of public participation is one of the goals of the ICANN's Strategic Plan and mandate of the new Public Participation Committee. However, the ICANN centralized funding model for public participation is becoming a bottleneck. In contrast, the localized distributive funding model through IDN ccTLDs would improve efficiency through linking up ICANN with its different constituencies and ensure the sustainability of the resources. With respect to ICANN, the clauses on community services should be incorporated and

enforced in the IDN ccTLD delegation agreements. Also, ICANN should take the IDN ccTLD's community services or contribution as a valid contribution to ICANN as stated in the Implementation Plan so that all the stakeholders would have an incentive to develop the system. We also hope that the community-based gTLDs could take the similar path to consolidate the connection with the user community.”

2.0 GLOBAL OUTREACH

From: [“At-Large Committee Advisory Statement to the ICANN Board on the Draft Operating Plan FY 2008-2009, May 5, 2008”](#)
[AL.ALAC/BUD.SC/0308/1/2](#)
(Page 4 under the heading “Global Outreach”)

“This is a particularly important area to us. The various communities in ICANN are not representative of the worldwide Internet-using community. Whilst we appreciate the initial provision of a substantial increase in funds allocated to Global “Outreach – we will look forward to seeing more detail about precisely what this consists of when the draft budget is posted. However, we note that on page 23 of the Draft Framework, under Global Outreach, there is a major area of work listed as “Implement business engagement outreach’. If this is intended to be outreach only to business communities, this is, in our opinion, clearly far too narrow – outreach efforts and recruitment efforts must be even-handed, global – and to all communities and potential participant communities, not just ‘business’. We draw the attention of the board to the many comments about the importance of dramatically increasing the outreach and recruitment of ALL stakeholders that was a common theme of the respondents to the JPA review recently; from this we propose that there is broad support for greatly increased work by ICANN in these respects.

“We welcome the continued support for participation by our community from ICANN. Without it the Internet end-user’s voice will simply not be adequately represented. Facilitation of community participation (and specifically that of volunteers) in ICANN is an extremely important issue and one important aspect of this is covered in greater depth in our statement to you in relation to the development of a volunteer travel and expense support policy, transmitted separately.”

3.0 TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION

From: [“At-Large Committee Advisory Statement to the ICANN Board on the Draft Operating Plan FY 2008-2009, May 5, 2008”](#)
[AL.ALAC/BUD.SC/0308/1/2](#)
(Page 5 under the heading “Transcription and Translation”)

“Our community has been calling for ICANN to become a truly multilingual organization for years now. We appreciate and applaud the increased budget commitment, draft translation framework, and other moves in this direction but we wish to remind you that ICANN has a very, very long way to go to reach the mission that the translation program proposes.

“In our opinion, this area of work is of absolutely central importance to the organization’s credibility, as we do not believe that any consultation or policy development process conducted entirely in English is globally legitimate. This is especially true with subjects like IDNs that – incredibly – continue to be largely English-only, with multilingual documents

provided only in some cases, often far later than the original English versions, and only as an afterthought.

“Ensuring that the work of ICANN becomes truly multilingual is a core, critical objective. It must not be sidelined, or de-emphasized by other objectives like new gTLDs. As it becomes more multilingual, ICANN should continue to work closely with other international organizations such as UNESCO. The BBC is also a good source of inspiration for effective multilingual communications which ICANN should look at.”

4.0 TRAVEL SUPPORT

From: ["At-Large Advisory Committee Statement to the ICANN Board on the Public Consultation Related to Development of a Travel Policy, May 5, 2008" AL.ALAC/BUD.SC/0308/1/1](#)

Improvements Seen in Existing Travel Support

“We have seen considerable changes to the way in which travel support is administered over the past few years. When support began, it was largely based upon a reimbursement system, where community members would have to pay up-front for all expenses, and then reclaim them back – often with very significant delays. Now, airfares are bought for us, and we interact directly with the American Express travel agents to choose arrangements that work for us. We receive per-diems based upon an amount determined by ICANN based upon the local cost of living, instead of reimbursement based upon actual expenses. Whilst this system has not been perfect, we do believe that it is continually improving.

Per Diem Payment Arrangements

“We wish to emphasise that the process by which per-diems are paid needs to take into account that there are countries where it is impractical, or impossible, to receive incoming international wire transfers. We believe there should always be a way to receive cash at a meeting to cope with this situation. Additionally, there are participants who find it difficult to wait to receive per diems until after the meeting as this requires participants to go out-of-pocket and not all participants have the financial wherewithal to be able to do this. Per Diems should also be calculated or set by reference to some internationally recognized system, which is rechecked periodically and currency fluctuation need to be taken into account.

Level of Travel Support Depends Upon Many Factors

“We believe that before the ICANN community will be able to determine what the right level of travel support should be, the community will first need to look at two other issues: Remote Participation Options. The ability of participants to participate in a meaningful way remotely has an enormous impact upon the number of people who must travel to face-to-face meetings. We wish to once again emphasise that remote participation at ICANN meetings is, frankly, completely broken. Even basic operations like providing telephonic remote access don't work regularly – and this is no surprise, since ICANN is been uniquely able to engage a continuous stream of completely inadequate vendors to provide audiovisual services for every meeting that is held. Having high-quality in-room audiovisual services is a prerequisite to making remote access work. Quality remote access is a prerequisite for allowing meaningful contribution by remote participants. If meaningful two-way remote participation – which should include video, as well as audio, in real time – were available this could change the conversation about how many people need to physically travel to a meeting – and also allow

far more input and participation than will ever be possible in any other way. It is inexcusable that, meeting after meeting, even the most basic remote participation does not work and a list of excuses is made instead of fixing the problem.

“Structure of ICANN Meetings: It is clear that there is a necessity for face-to-face meetings at the international level. The question to be asked is: would more regional meetings intercessionally provide an opportunity for more cost-effective involvement by a greater stakeholder pool, and at the same time prove to be an important means of distilling the different regional approaches to issues which could then be brought to closure at international meetings? We believe that this model should at least be attempted. As a community that is organised on a regional model we see a lot of merit to working with regional groups of other stakeholders on a horizontal basis, and then taking the results of that dialogue to the international level. It seems to us that this might result in global policy being developed which more comprehensively took regional differences of view, and provided regionally different implementation modalities for certain policy options where appropriate. This model may also allow more face-to-face interaction than is possible with international meetings alone. It seems to us that since more regional meetings are being held by ICANN – though unfortunately often only focussing on certain groups like contracted parties – these should be held on a balanced basis for all stakeholder groups. In short – if regional meetings are going to be held for registrars and registries, as they are today, then they should be expanded to become accessible to all ICANN communities.

“Location of ICANN Meetings. It is a simple fact that the cost of some meeting venues is exorbitant. A perfect example was New Delhi. ICANN will simply not receive the best participation from any stakeholder group if it holds meetings in locations where the only reasonable hotel options cost USD500 per night. ICANN should host meetings in the various regions – but it should choose locations that are affordable. It is not congruent with ICANN’s stated goal of being open, inclusive, and transparent to hold meetings in venues where even wealthy governments’ representatives’ per-diems do not cover the cost of attending the meeting. We believe that ICANN should not host International Meetings in any city where a good three-star-hotel room, in locations convenient to the conference venue, cannot be had for EUR100-150 or less.

“Timing for Purchase of Travel Arrangements. The At-Large community is always ready to arrange travel long before ICANN’s internal processes allow travel to be booked. We believe that travel arrangements should be made many months in advance in order to save on the cost of those arrangements as everyone knows that airfare gets cheaper the farther out from when you travel the tickets are purchased.

“Accommodation of volunteers ALAC member and representative from ALS's are often placed in lower quality hotels remote from the main conference hotel/venue means isolation from the main events and less opportunity for At Large to contribute, leading from point 4 above our willingness to commit to attend meetings very early in the planning process means that it should be possible to block book rooms for volunteers when the meeting is arranged, and to be given priority to stay in the main conference hotel at ICANN arranged rates.

“We do wish to emphasise that whichever meeting model is used, face-to-face meeting attendance is crucial, and considering human nature, it always will be.

“It is essential that whatever system is settled upon must take into account these two fundamental philosophies:

Different communities participating in ICANN have different needs for support, because their participation is differently financed. There is no magic “one size fits all” solution. For those who receive support the rules should be the same. For example, one community should not fly business class whilst another does not.

“We therefore propose the following:

“For international meetings, all members of Bylaw-recognised bodies should receive travel and expense support. What we mean is that the members of the GNSO Council, the At-Large Advisory Committee, the SSAC, etc. should receive ICANN funding for airfares, hotel, and a reasonable per-diem.

“For regional meetings, all members of Bylaw-recognised bodies from that region should receive travel and expense support on the same basis and to the same extent as at International Meetings. ALS are often also involved in relevant regional organizations e.g. NIC's, NOG's & TLD and regional meetings with events that are contiguous with activities/ meetings of these organisations would also be advantageous and cost effective.

“Members of communities who are: active in ICANN, and local to the meeting in question, and; who will otherwise likely be unable to attend the meeting,

“Should receive travel support for at least a representative number of participants in respect of airfare, hotel, and a reasonable per-diem. For example, At-Large, non-commercial users, and the like should be able to send a representative number of participants from the region to a regional meeting, or to the international meeting held in their region (which is presently the case for At-Large, but not for the NCUC). Conversely, groups such as registrars and registries, who have a commercial interest in attending the meeting and have companies funding them should not receive funding. This is simply a recognition that if ICANN wants to hear the voices of the public interest, this cannot be adequately ensured without some form of travel support as the expense of meeting attendance without support will be simply beyond the means of the vast proportion of participants from these groups.

“When determining eligibility for travel support for participants in the third category, priority should go to those eligible participants who are active in the main issues that will be discussed at the meeting. ICANN, through a bottom-up process, would need to decide what the major areas of work will be at forthcoming meetings in order to make operationalisation of this proposal practical – but in our view, this in itself would be an improvement, as it would allow greater intercessional focus on the issues which are known to be the main ones at the next ICANN meeting.

Some provision should be made to allow those from developing countries in particular, but from communities who would not otherwise be eligible for travel support in general, to be able to attend with travel support. The existing fellowship provides this possibility now for some, but not all, stakeholder groups. We believe this programme is helpful, should be continued, and should be made available to participants from all ICANN stakeholder groups.

Rules and Procedures Associated with Travel Support

“As previously mentioned, we believe that the rules associated with travel support should be applicable to all. We propose the following as those most relevant, though of course the Staff of ICANN should ‘flesh out’ a more complete administrative process for community review at the appropriate time; this list is not meant to be exhaustive:

“In general, those receiving travel support should fly by an upgradeable economy class of fare, so that they can upgrade with their own miles if they choose.

“Travel should be by Premium Economy or Business Class (and here it would be preferable to look at comfort metrics such as seat pitch rather than class**) when:

“The flight is more than x hours in length, Where x= an agreed time based on best practice for working travel {a quick review of online sources of such Travel policies in various organisations show times ranging from 5 - 10 hours being used with a median of 7 hours} ICANN should investigate what constitutes best practice here so that not only are the costs of travel but true productivity i.e. the ability of travellers to work in an effective and productive manner as soon as they arrive at venues {or as soon as practical after} being considered. or;

“There’s a valid medical reason, or;

The traveller is very tall or large – perhaps over 1.90m in height, for example.

“The UN per-diem rates, exclusive of the lodging portion since ICANN would be paying for lodging, should be used as the standard for determining the appropriate level of per-diem. Presently, per-diem rates appear not to be based on any recognised system – this should be changed, so that arbitrariness is avoided.

“Hotel charges paid by ICANN should include the cost of Internet access, if it is not complimentary. This is very important – members of the volunteer community often need to do work during their time ‘off’ during ICANN meetings. They should not have to go out of pocket in order to pay to do work, when they are already using holiday or personal time to work on ICANN issues far from home. The amounts involved are often relatively small for some people – but not for others, especially those who come from developing countries.

“**Regardless of 'Class' seats (particularly when they are booked at a time advanced enough from the travel date to take advantage of heavy discounts) would mean in most cases flying people cheaper and in better comfort / conditions for less than the currently booked Economy Y & B (full fare) seats or even the less often managed M, H, or N (standard fare) cost. Further Business class seats (unless under exceptional circumstances) should be booked for the I & Z (discounted fares) not the J, C & D class full fares (the last two indicate no upgrade is possible) whenever possible.

“In closing, we thank the board in advance for its consideration of our views. We look forward to a response to our concerns and recommendations in due course.”