



AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ALAC Follow-up Statement on the Technical Liaison Group Bylaws Revisions

Introduction

Dev Anand Teelucksingh, ALAC member from the Latin American and Caribbean Islands Regional At-Large Organization (LACRALO) and ALAC Leadership Team member, composed an initial draft of this Statement after discussion of the topic within At-Large and on the Mailing Lists.

On 28 February 2014, this Statement was posted on the "[At-Large Follow-up Technical Liaison Group Bylaws Revisions Workspace](#)."

On that same day, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Chair of the ALAC, requested ICANN Policy Staff in support of the ALAC to send a Call for Comments on the Recommendations to all At-Large members via the [ALAC-Announce Mailing List](#).

On 07 March 2014, a version incorporating the comments received was posted on the aforementioned workspace and the Chair requested that Staff open an ALAC ratification vote on the proposed Statement.

On 14 March 2014, Staff confirmed that the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 13 votes in favor, 0 votes against, and 0 abstentions. You may review the result independently under: <https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=3702T55jcM95HUZWYcNPXaNN>.

Summary

1. The ALAC is responding to the ICANN Board resolution regarding "[Technical Liaison Group Bylaws Revisions](#)" and its accompanying [rationale](#) dated 7 February 2014. The ALAC had submitted a Statement on the Proposed Bylaws Changes Regarding the [Technical Liaison Group](#) on 16 December 2013.
2. The ALAC has two concerns: 1) The removal of the Technical Liaison Group (TLG) delegate to the Nominating Committee (NomCom); and 2) the rationale of removing volunteer positions to save ICANN money.
3. Removing the TLG delegate from the Nominating Committee (NomCom) weakens the coverage and undermines the inclusion of the Internet community in ICANN's governance processes. Having a person of technical expertise (such as the TLG delegate) on the NomCom aids the NomCom to: 1) recruit persons with technical expertise for positions in ICANN's structures; 2) Evaluate candidates' technical expertise being considered by the NomCom for positions in ICANN's structures; and 3) select the best candidates for positions in ICANN's structures.
4. The ALAC is very disappointed with the ICANN Board's rationale that the removal of the TLG Liaison to the ICANN Board and the TLG delegate to the NomCom "is anticipated to have a positive fiscal impact on ICANN" and "will provide a financial savings to ICANN". It contradicts the rationale given by the ICANN Board in its [September 28 2013 Board resolution](#) which stated, "This action is not anticipated to have a fiscal impact on ICANN." It disparages the volunteers, not only those that have served on the TLG as liaisons to the Board or as delegates to the NomCom, but the multi-stakeholder volunteers (especially those not financed by industry players) in ICANN.

The original version of this document is the English text available at <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence>. Where a difference of interpretation exists or is perceived to exist between a non-English edition of this document and the original text, the original shall prevail.

ALAC Follow-up Statement on the Technical Liaison Group Bylaws Revisions

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is responding to the ICANN Board resolution regarding "[Technical Liaison Group Bylaws Revisions](#)" and its accompanying [rationale](#) dated 7 February 2014. The ALAC had submitted a Statement on the Proposed Bylaws Changes Regarding the [Technical Liaison Group](#) on 16 December 2013.

The ALAC has two concerns:

1) Removal of the Technical Liaison Group (TLG) delegate to the Nominating Committee (NomCom).

Removing the TLG delegate from the Nominating Committee (NomCom) weakens the coverage and undermines the inclusion of the Internet community in ICANN's governance processes.

The rationale given by the Board ("the Board notes that each of the four organizations that make up the TLG are already engaged in ongoing community outreach efforts. The removal of the NomCom TLG delegate does not prevent these organizations from continuing with their outreach efforts.") misses the purpose of the NomCom. The NomCom is an independent committee tasked with selecting a majority of the members of ICANN's Board of Directors and other key positions in ICANN's Advisory Committees (AC) and Supporting Organisations (SO). NomCom members are not accountable to their appointing constituencies, but for adherence to the ICANN Bylaws and for compliance with the rules and procedures established by the NomCom.

Having a person of technical expertise (such as the TLG delegate) on the NomCom aids the NomCom to:

- Recruit persons with technical expertise for positions in ICANN's structures, not just for outreach for involvement in ICANN's public policy development.
- Evaluate candidates' technical expertise being considered by the NomCom for positions in ICANN's structures.
- Select the best candidates for positions in ICANN's structures.

The outreach component in the NomCom is about getting persons to be **IN** ICANN, not just bringing information about ICANN to persons who have not heard about ICANN before.

The ALAC cannot find any compelling reason[s] to refute these benefits and therefore advise against removal of the TLG delegate to the NomCom.

2) The rationale of removing volunteer positions to save ICANN money.

The ALAC is very disappointed with the ICANN Board's rationale that the removal of the TLG Liaison to the ICANN Board and the TLG delegate to the NomCom "is anticipated to have a positive fiscal impact on ICANN" and "will provide a financial savings to ICANN".

This is the first time this reason was introduced and contradicts the rationale given by the ICANN Board in its [September 28 2013 Board resolution](#) which stated, "This action is not anticipated to have a fiscal impact on ICANN."

It disparages the volunteers, not only those that have served on the TLG as liaisons to the Board or as delegates to the NomCom, but the multi-stakeholder volunteers (especially those not financed by industry players) in ICANN. Such disparagement of volunteers' efforts who contribute time and energy to ICANN's policy work away from their work and family does not portray ICANN in a positive light, especially given ICANN's expanded efforts of engaging with the global Internet community involved in Internet Governance issues.

It is counter-intuitive for ICANN, an organisation that relies on volunteers' goodwill to participate in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, to advance such a statement.