



ALSes Survey
June 2010

2010 At Large Structure (ALS) Survey Analysis

Preliminary results



Introduction


Goals of the 2010 ALS Survey :

- have current contact information for ALSes and their ICANN At Large representatives.
- learning more about ALSes and the ICANN related policy issues that interest them.
- learn more about the communication tools ALSes use so that ALSes can better engage with At-Large and vice-versa.

ALS Survey 2010 Timeline

March	Decision to conduct ALS Survey taken by ALAC at ICANN Nairobi meeting
April 22	Draft of ALS survey questions published for comments
April 29	ALAC approves 2nd draft of the ALS survey
May 6	Call for volunteers for the ALS Survey Analysis Team
May 7	Survey emailed to 122 ALSes to complete using BigPulse in three languages (English, French, Spanish)

ALS Survey 2010 Timeline



Date	% of ALSes that responded	# of ALSes	Comments
7 May	0 %	0	Survey emailed to all 122 ALSes
13 May	15.57%	19	
18 May	27.87%	34	Original deadline for survey ; extended until May 23
19 May	37.70%	46	
20 May	45.08%	55	
23 May	59.02 %	72	Survey closed

ALS Survey 2010 Timeline

ALS Survey Analysis Team had three Teleconferences on :

- 27 May
- 3 June
- 10 June

ALS Survey Analysis Working Group members

- Didier Kasole (AFRALO)
- Tijani Ben Jemaa (AFRALO)
- Pavan Budhrani (APRALO)
- Wolf Ludwig (EURALO)
- Dev Anand Teelucksingh (LACRALO)
- Sylvia Herlein Leite (LACRALO)
- Darlene Thompson (NARALO)

ALS Survey Analysis

Relevant links to documents

- [ALS Survey 2010 Workspace](#) On this page, you will find links to :
 - The 14 [ALS Survey Analysis Questions](#) in the survey
 - a redacted Google Spreadsheet of the survey results. This Google Spreadsheet was produced by the ALS survey team to better analyse the results of the survey.
 - Summary of the results generated from the aforementioned Google Spreadsheet



**ALSes
Survey**
June 2010

ALS Survey Analysis Presentation

It was decided by the ALS Survey Analysis Team that the regional results of the ALS survey will be presented by the regional representatives, followed by a global perspective of the survey results by the chair.




**ALSes
Survey**
June 2010

ALS Survey Analysis Global Perspective

At Large

Q1 - Name and Contacts of ALS Representatives

Q1 - Name & Contacts of ALS representatives




Primary Contact	98.61%
Secondary Contact	66.67%
Tertiary Contact	25%

- All ALSes have a primary contact
- 2/3 of ALSes have secondary contact
- 1/4 of ALSes have a tertiary contact

At Large


Q1 - Name and Contacts of ALS Representatives



- ALSes in NA and EU regions had no tertiary contact
- Many ALSes in LAC and AF region appear to have all three contacts

At Large

Q2 - ALSes with websites




- Nearly 80% of all ALSes have websites
- Less ALSes in AF and AP regions have websites than the other regions

At Large

Q3 - Level of Representation of ALS

Q3 - Level of representation of ALS by RALO



	% of all ALSes
National	69.44%
Regional	13.89%
State	2.78%
Local	4.17%

- Majority of ALSes are national
- Few ALSes are state or local

At Large


Q4 - # of individual & organizational members in ALS

- Wide range of numbers :
 - Individual members from 22 members to 100,000
 - Organizational members from 12 to 243
- Several answers were invalid

At Large

Q5 - Communications tools used by ALSes


Q5 - What communication tools does an ALS use?



- E mail mailing lists are the most popular communication tool, followed by use of Skype and blogs.
- Although not as popular as email, Facebook & Twitter are being used
- Other tools used
 - Instant Messaging
 - Postal Mail
 - Telephone
 - Fax
 - SMS
 - Press releases through media


At Large

Q5 - Communications tools used by ALSes



At Large

Q6 - Does your ALS hold regular meetings with its members?




Roughly 75% of ALSes hold regular meetings

At Large

Q6a - How often does your ALS meet?

Q6a - If yes, how often does your ALS meet with its members?




- Most ALSes meet every 2-3 months
- Other :
 - minimum once a year with possible ad-hoc meetings
 - twice a week

At Large

Q6a - How often does your ALS meet?


Q6a - if yes, how often does your ALS meet with its members?



At Large

Q6b - Type of meetings your ALS has with its members?

Q6b - Type of meetings your ALS has with its members?




- ALSes have several different types of meetings with its members ; F2F meetings being the most popular
- Among others :
 - seminars, conferences, workshops (which are F2F)
 - instant messaging

At Large


Q6b - Type of meetings your ALS has with its members?

Q6b - type of meetings your ALS has with its members?



At Large


Q7 - Working Languages of your ALS



- English, French and Spanish were the top working languages of ALSes
- Other languages included
 - Tamil, Italian, Romanian, Luxembourgish, Dutch, Inuktitut

At Large

Q7 - Working Languages of your ALS




- Typically 3 or more languages used by ALSes within a RALO

At Large

Q8a -What Issues are your ALS members interested in?

% of all ALSes



Top Three Issues

- Internet related Engagement & Outreach
- new gTLDs
- Security, Stability & Resiliency


but all issues had significant interest.

Other matters :

- Internet Governance
- Computer crime
- Consumer rights
- Internet access/digital divide
- ccTLDs

At Large

Q8a -What Issues are your ALS members interested in?



- Key Issues for ALSes vary from region to region

At Large

Q9 - What type of WG activity do you prefer?


Standing WG focusing on larger Issue areas & meeting regularly	6.94%
Ad-Hoc WGs focusing on specific issue when they arise	15.28%
Either, depending on topic and required commitment	69.44%

Nearly 70% of ALSes expressed a clear preference for

"Either type of WG activity depending on topic and required commitments"

At Large

Q11 - Scale of 1 to 5, how well is At-Large integrated in overall ICANN policy structure?




- Around 20% of ALSes feel At-Large is an isolated & self-serving constituency
- Around 30% of ALSes More ALSes feel At-Large is integrated and a vital part of ICANN
- 42% of ALSes are "in between" ; they view At-Large as not being an isolated constituency but is not well integrated.

1 - At Large is an isolated & self-serving constituency
5 - At Large is well integrated & vital part of ICANN

At Large

Q12 - Scale of 1 to 5, how well is your ALS integrated in the overall ALAC/RALO/ALS policy structure?




- 22% of ALSes feel isolated and apart from ICANN, At-Large & ALAC
- 36% of ALSes feel their ALSes are integrated and a vital part of ICANN
- 32% of ALSes are "in between" ; not completely isolated but not well integrated.

1 - your ALS is rather isolated & apart from ICANN,At-Large & ALAC

5 - your ALS is well integrated & vital part of ICANN

At Large

Q13 - What are the most important limitations to ALS participation?



Only a small number of ALSes felt there were no important limitations to participation.

Other limitations :

- Policy Documents not available in their language
- lack of Financial support / Travel support for f2f meetings

At Large

Q14a - Which recommendation(s) does your ALS consider the most important to increasing its own participation in ICANN?

R4 : ALS education & engagement	36.11%
R12 : Input from consumer representatives	26.39%
R13 : Policy advice mechanisms to be strengthened	25%
R7 : Choice of communication and collaborative tools	23.61%
R9 : Translation and interpretation processes	23.61%
R10 : ALAC/At-Large is home of individual internet users	15.28%
R5 : Strategic and operational plans	13.89%
R2 : At-Large selected board member	12.50%
R1 : ICANN bylaws to reflect ALAC's continuing purpose	11.11%
R3 : ALS-RALO-ALAC structure to remain	11.11%
R6 : Accurate cost models	11.11%
R8 : Public comment period	6.94%
R11 : Board statement recognizing R10	6.94%
Other	31.94%

Other :

- ICANN outreach efforts
- ICANN support
- translation

At Large

Q14b - Which, if any, recommendation(s) would your ALS like to help the ALAC implement?

R4 : ALS education & engagement	19.44%
R12 : Input from consumer representatives	15.28%
R1 : ICANN bylaws to reflect ALAC's continuing purpose	6.94%
R7 : Choice of communication and collaborative tools	6.94%
R3 : ALS-RALO-ALAC structure to remain	5.56%
R5 : Strategic and operational plans	5.56%
R10 : ALAC/At-Large is home of individual internet users	5.56%
R11 : Board statement recognizing R10	5.56%
R13 : Policy advice mechanisms to be strengthened	5.56%
R6 : Accurate cost models	4.17%
R8 : Public comment period	4.17%
R9 : Translation and interpretation processes	4.17%
R2 : At-Large selected board member	2.78%
Other	25.00%

Many ALSes left this blank

Other :

- Outreach

Final observations

- Only 72 ALSes out of a possible 122 ALSes responded to the survey.
 - Should attempt again to reach out to those 50 ALSes that didn't respond ;
 - A few ALSes did attempt to complete the survey after the second deadline.
- Need to contact ALSes that did respond to the survey and clarify missing details
 - For example, those that listed Skype but didn't provide a their Skype ID
 - 6 ALSes didn't answer any of the survey questions except for the contact information
- Are there more questions to ask ALSes?



ALSes
Survey
June 2010

On behalf of the ALS Survey Team,
Thank You!

