

At-Large suffrage request to RALOs

The issue relates to the [ALAC Rules of Procedure Working Group - RULE 27 - SELECTION OF AT-LARGE BOARD MEMBER Workspace](#), specifically the definition of the Electorate for the final step in (s)electing the person who will be chosen for Seat 15 of the Board of Directors.

An argument piece on this topic can be found in my [personal blog](#).

The specific request is support for a At-Large community dialogue on the issue. As part of the work of the Rules of Procedure (ROP), any changes to the definition of the electorate, specifically:

27.7 Electorate

- *The electorate for the final election shall be the fifteen ALAC members plus the five RALO chairs.*

were rejected. I asked for this clause to be made contingent on a full review by the community before the next election. That too was rejected.

What was approved was a request to the ALAC that this issue be discussed. As I understand it, the topic has been put on the table for the Beijing meeting. I believe that is too little, too late. I have been requesting a full discussion of this issue for about 2 years now. As we approach the deadline for (s)electing Board seat 15 again, I am afraid that we are approaching the point where the status quo will prevail because it is too late to make any changes any more. In my view, this will mean that the issue was captured and was postponed for an entire election cycle without review by successful use of the ALAC bureaucratic processes.

There are those that claim that this entire issue has been discussed and disposed of in the past. As I remember, there was a last minute review of the processes, a quick comment period that resulted in no substantive changes thought there were those calling for a real vote back then and the creation of a policy that would be reviewed again after its first use. Except for the cursory review by the ROP, this previous election was never subjected to an At-Large community review. To not review an (s)election process completely after its first use is institutionally irresponsible, yet, those who established the procedure in the first place, have done everything they could to make sure it is not reviewed or revised.

I was told that any serious review of the process and any re-opening of the discussion of elections would need RALO support. I find it somewhat cynical that RALO and ALS support is called for when the ALAC wants to stop something but is not respected enough when there is a need to review or fix something.

As my [blog](#) explains, I would prefer that once a Nominating Committee creates a slate of candidates, the registered members of the At-Large structures would be allowed to vote. I have come to realize that real suffrage for the At-Large is probably still improbable due to the Fear Uncertainty and Doubt (FUD) that is constantly spread about the time in the past, before there was an At-Large, when they tried elections and there seemed to some gaming of one of the votes. Of course this is ICANN and everyone tries games the process and we need to constantly tweak our processes to minimize that tendency. In this case, the game played was to deny Users a vote for ever more. I worry more about capture, and I believe that ALAC has captured this process to the detriment of the At-Large User. For me this is an issue about the accountability of ALAC to the ALS members.

In any case, since getting real suffrage for the At-Large seems improbable at this time, I want to suggest that at least each of the ALS representatives be given a vote. I understand there are practical issues that might need to be dealt with in setting this up, but I see no reason why a solution that includes ALS suffrage could not be put in place before the next (s)election for Seat 15.

Please note, I am not trying to eliminate the current process, only trying to expand the electorate as defined in 27.7.

I actually believe that the process defined for creating the slate of candidates is reasonable and allows for ALS/RALO participation. I only believe that the final step in the (s)election, the definition of the Electorate, is problematic.

At this point I am asking the RALO to support a full and inclusive At-Large community discussion on the Electorate as defined in 27.7 in time for this year's (s)election process.

If we get this full dialogue I will argue for ALS suffrage during this (s)election (2013) with further discussion on full suffrage for the next (s)election (2016). I will probably ask the RALO to support this as well, but first we need to get the At-Large community discussion underway.

Thanks