Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
1	Quality vs quantity of ALAC advice produced.	ALAC should be more selective in the amount of advice it seeks to offer, focusing on those issues which might have the greatest impact upon the end user community, and going for quality rather than quantity. ALAC should develop a more transparent process for distinguishing between different types of advice, and publish that advice on the At-Large website.	Accept	The ALAC currently focuses on quality vs quantity and does not as a rule issue comments that the ALAC does not believe are important to ICANN and users. This has been a very conscious policy that has evolved over several years. The importance of this will be reinforced as new workers become involved in At-Large. The ALAC agrees that its web site does not always fully represent the diverse nature of its various statements and will work with staff to improve upon that.
2	At-Large has struggled to reflect/process end user-opinion; barriers to individual participation; perception of unchanging leadership group.	At-Large should adopt the proposed Empowered Membership Model (EMM) with a view to removing the barriers to participation for Internet end-users, and encouraging greater direct participation by At-Large members in At-Large policy advice and related "Outreach and Engagement" processes. (See EMM Recs)	Reject as a whole, but see specific EMM Recommendations	The ALAC rejects the EMM as recommended by the Review. The ALAC does, however agree with the intent of some aspects of the EMM and will address them under the EMM-specific recommendations.
3	Staff resources are disproportionately concentrated on administrative support. Staff should have greater capacity to support preparation of policy advice.	At-Large Support Staff should be more actively involved in supporting the policy work of the ALAC, drafting position papers and other policy related work based on ALAC input. Staff competencies should be adjusted accordingly.	Accept in principle	In other parts of ICANN, particularly those which generate large and substantive documents, staff plays a key role in such drafting, but explicitly at the bidding of the volunteer community. Much of ALAC's outputs are far less massive and the need for such support is lessened. At-Large Staff does support this activity and that is expected to grow. At-Large does require additional support for creating records of its meetings and discussions are under way to address this.

Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
4	Leadership Team (ALT), which is not mandated by ICANN Bylaws, concentrates in the established leadership too many decision-making and other administrative powers which should be spread among the members of the ALAC.	The ALT should be dissolved and its decision-making powers fully restored to the ALAC.	Reject	The ALT does not make substantive decisions, both according to the ALAC Rules of Procedure and actual practice. It is a consultative and advisory body for the Chair and was created to allow the Chair to delegate to those who had indicated a willingness to put additional time into ALAC and to bring in a regional perspective. The ALT does on a regular basis make recommendations to the ALAC for its consideration.
5	Uneven contribution of At Large to coordinated ICANN strategy for 'Outreach and Engagement'. Missed opportunities for coordination with other constituencies and ICANN staff.	At-Large should redouble efforts to contribute to meetings between ICANN Senior Staff, ISOC and other I* organisations to develop a joint strategic approach to cooperative outreach.	Accept in principle	At-Large does not typically participate in any discussions between ICANN Senior Staff, ISOC and I* organizations, but would welcome such an opportunity. At-Large does regularly work with representatives of these organizations at various levels and intends to continue to do so. It is unclear that this will lead to significant outreach however.
6	Election processes are excessively complex and have been open to allegations of unfairness.	At-Large should adopt a simpler and more transparent electoral procedure for the selection of the At-Large-appointed member of the Board of Directors. Two alternative mechanisms are proposed (Section 10.5.3) both of which would be an improvement over the current process.	Reject	The procedure to select the Director selected by the At-Large Community was designed in a bottom-up method. It is a more rigorous method than generally used by the ICANN SOs and is not unlike the NomCom in its efforts to select good Directors. The procedure will no doubt evolve going forward. The ALAC does not believe that the Board should be involved in directing the ALAC on how to select its Board member.

Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
7	Excessive amounts of At-Large Community time spent on process and procedure at expense of ALAC's mandated responsibilities to produce policy advice and coordinate outreach and engagement activities. Too many internal working groups are a distraction.	At-Large should abandon existing internal Working Groups, too many of which are currently focused on process, and a distraction from the actual policy advice role of At-Large. Their creation should in future be avoided. If absolutely necessary, any such group should be strictly task/time limited and policy focused, or its role taken on by volunteer pen holders assisted by policy capable staff.	Reject	Working Groups, under a variety of names, are the basic way that ICANN and its constituent parts discuss issues, address concerns, come to agreement and make decisions. The ALAC believes that they are core to its success, both in furthering its process development (as suggested by the Review Recommendations on outreach, collaboration tools and social media) as well as in the formulation of its policy advice.
8	Social media and other Internet-based tools could be used more effectively, and at minimal cost, to continuously survey and channel end-user input into ICANN policy making processes.	ALAC should use social media more effectively to engage with end users (e.g. via Twitter / Facebook polls, etc.). These polls should not be binding in any way, but the ALAC could use them as a gauge of end user opinion.	Accept	The ALAC supports the use of Social Media, currently makes use of various platforms and intends to both continue and to enhance such usage. The ALAC has an active Social Media WG with just this focus. The ALAC does however note that not all ICANN issues are conducive to being summarized in 140 character sound-bites, and that polling on such platforms are unrepresentative and not actionable.
9	Need for increased At-Large Community awareness and staff training regarding the use of social media.	ALAC should arrange for the designation of one of its support staff as a part-time Web Community Manager who will be responsible, inter alia, for coordinating outreach via social media (Rec 8). These responsibilities could be allocated to an existing member of staff.	Accept in principle	The ALAC supports the designation on At-Large support staff to help enhance its use of Social Media. The ALAC does note that assignment of staff is not a function that its volunteer community has any control over.

Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
10	There are a multitude of communications channels used by At Large. This has led to fractured and undocumented communications.	ALAC should consider the adoption and use of a single Slack-like online communication platform. An instant messaging-cum-team workspace (FOSS) alternative to replace Skype/Wiki/website/mailing list.	Accept with reservations	The ALAC has a WG which looks at how technology can enhance its effectiveness. Examples are the use of machine translation to address communications in one of its regions with significant language barriers, and the Captioning project that has just been integrated into the core ICANN budget and has been very well received by other parts of the ICANN community. The ALAC notes that it cannot simply adopt a new communications vehicle without the support (both budget and technical) of ICANN IT Services, and also notes that in parts of its communities, cost and availability of bandwidth is problematic as is local government restrictions on the uses of certain platforms.
11	While broadly popular, Global ATLAS meetings every 5 years have been difficult to organise and short on effective results. More frequent regional meetings would be more effective in encouraging both policy input and outreach while familiarising more of At Large with workings of ICANN.	At-Large should replace 5-yearly global ATLAS meetings with an alternative model of rotating annual regional At-Large Meetings, held in conjunction with regular ICANN meetings. Regional meetings should include an Internet Governance School element. Participants should include all qualified ALMs.	Reject	The Recommendation explicit says to no longer hold At-Large-wide gatherings and the ALAC strongly believes that there is a real need to ensure that we not function purely in our regional enclaves. Moreover, the detail backing up the Recommendation suggests that there be five regional meetings every two-three years. That is an average of two such meetings per year. The ALAC does not believe that we have neither the volunteer nor the staff resources to carry this out. ICANN only recently integrated the current cycle or regional meetings and At-Large wide Summits and the ALAC believes that we should go through a leave one full cycle before contemplating major changes.

Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
12	ALAC input to a coordinated ICANN Outreach sub-optimal.	As part of their annual outreach strategies RALOs should continue to put a high priority on the organisation of and participation in external events in their region (IGF, RIR ISOC, etc.). CROPP and other funding mechanisms should be provided to support the costs of organisation and participation of At-Large members.	Accept (in principle?)	As the recommendation note by the use of the word "continue", this is a current strategy and is carried out to the extent that volunteer time, staff time, and funding allows. The CROP (formerly CROPP) is a good start in supporting this activity, as is occasional GSE support of external activities. Significant enhancement will require significant funding and staff support. (Perhaps a comment that we also need to measure the effectiveness of such "outreach".)
13	Need more systematic RALO participation in regional events	In the interests of transparency, a clear indication of all opportunities for At-Large travel funding support and the beneficiaries thereof, should be published promptly and in one place on the At-Large webpage.	Accept in principle??	(Note that this recommendation has morphed over the drafts from a publication of travel funding to a publication of opportunities and recipients.)

The ALAC agrees that opportunities for travel and outreach should be well documented and easy to locate, as should reports (both the recipients and more substantive reports of outcomes). However, the programs themselves are manages by various parts of ICANN and often published on their respective parts of the ICANN web. Having information replicated on the At-Large site is likely to cause information to become dated or out-of-sync. However, the ALAC strongly supports making such information easy to locate. The ALAC also notes that At-Large should not be the only part of ICANN subject to such clear disclosure of who is receiving support. |

Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
14	Need for an innovative approach to funding a revitalised At-Large.	The ALAC should, via the appropriate WG, request access to a share of the gTLD Auction Proceeds. Requested funds should be earmarked to support end user and broad civil society engagement in ICANN. Such a mechanism could replace or complement the existing operational expense incurred by ICANN to support the At-Large Community.	Reject	The ALAC strongly supports actions to guarantee continued and enhanced funding of At-Large. However, the ALAC is well aware that the gTLD Auction Proceeds were committed to be used for community programs and not ICANN operational funding. Moreover the ALAC is also well aware that the current CCWG looking at Auction Proceeds is not in the business of allocating such funds to recipients, but is designing the process under which application for such funds will be made.
15	Need to reinforce impact of outreach and engagement activities.	Using the same qualification system as for policy rapporteurs, ALAC should select 5 rapporteurs to contribute to ICANN's plans for a demand driven multi sectoral approach to outreach, and learn from the work of the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement group. Rapporteurs would serve for one year (3 meetings) to encourage turnover and more genuine grass roots input.	Reject with qualification	The ALAC is rejecting the concept of policy rapporteurs as defined in the Review. It is unclear exactly what the "Outreach Rapporteurs" would do at the ICANN meetings they attend. The ALAC does note however that there are at times opportunities at ICANN meetings for outreach activities and does believe that volunteer travel to such meetings should be available if applicable.
16	Absence of consistent performance metrics.	ALAC should adopt a set of metrics that are consistent for the entire At-Large Community to measure the implementation and impact of the EMM and track the continuous improvement in the performance of the At-Large Community.	Accept with qualification	The ALAC already define a set of metrics for performance for ALAC Members. The ALAC also has an activity to develop metrics for other volunteers and community members. This activity was largely put on hold during the IANA Stewardship and CCWG-Accountability efforts. There is also an ongoing activity to establish criteria for ALS performance. As the ALAC is explicitly rejecting the EMM model, there is no plan to monitor its performance.

Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
EMM 1		At-Large should remove the current criteria for At-Large membership, notably the requirement to join an ALS in order to become an active policy contributor to the At-Large Community. All internet end-users with an interest in ICANN's policy development function or outreach should be able to become involved in the activities of At-Large in the same way.	Accept with qualification. As with all EMM-related recommendations, acceptance is in relation to the intent and not the EMM-specific implementation.	The ALAC strongly supports the ability of users to participate in At-Large without the need for joining or forming and ALS. Three of the five regionals already have such an ability, and the ALAC and the RALOS are committed to ensuring that this is extended to all five regions. Although it is desirable to have the rules and process as uniform as possible across regions, the ALAC is aware of the cultural and other differences and understands that complete uniformity may not be possible.
EMM 2		ALAC should define a set of metrics for assessing the level of active engagement of "policy advice" or "outreach and engagement" ALMs. Active ALMs should be provided with funding to attend regional meetings including AGMs, Internet Governance Schools, and the rotating regional ATLAS meeting when it occurs in their region.	Accept	Although based on experience, such metrics are neither easy nor foolproof, but the ALAC agrees that being able to measure such performance is desirable. The ALAC is not in a position to guarantee travel funding to all active At-Large contributors, although we will continue to have this as a target. Moreover, the ALAC is aware of the limitations that ICANN has in massively funding activities outside of its core mission.

Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
EMM 3.1		ALAC should update its Rules of Procedure to include a new procedure regarding the role and function of Rapporteurs. Rapporteurs will initially be appointed for 1 year. Renewable once for Policy input rapporteurs. Outreach Rapporteurs will serve for one year only to improve throughput. Calls for expressions of interest from qualified ALMs should be issued 6 months before their year of service	Reject with qualification	The ALAC does not believe that the concept of a Rapporteur as described in the review is practical nor would it have the desired results. The recommendation does not take into account the difficulty and time-commitment in getting up to speed on a topic, not the large loss if discarding that knowledge due to a year being up.

The ALAC does believe that the concept of designated rapporteurs, or perhaps liaisons to policy WGs does have merit. |
EMM 3.2		Using the same qualification system as for policy rapporteurs, ALAC should select 5 rapporteurs to contribute to ICANN's plans for a demand driven multi sectoral approach to outreach, and learn from the work of the ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement group. Rapporteurs would serve for one year (3 meetings) to encourage turnover and more genuine grass roots input (Recommendation # 15).	Duplicate of Recommendation 15.	
EMM 4		At-Large should update its Rules of Procedure to include a new procedure regarding the appointment of RALO leaders and their corresponding responsibilities on the ALAC. ICANN Bylaws should also be updated accordingly.	Reject	The ALAC does not believe that ICANN or At-Large would be well served by having RALO-selected ALAC Members do double duty as both ALAC members and RALO leadership. It is sufficiently difficult to get most volunteers to commit to the level of work associated with either of these positions. Asking them to do double duty if not reasonable.
EMM 5		At-Large should update its Rules of Procedure to include a new procedure regarding the functioning and membership of the CoE.	Accept in principal??	(Nice to acknowledge those who have contributed but no current appointments. May become an obligation even if not warranted. Do we need it?)

Rec.#	Issue	Recommendation	Status	Comment
EMM 6		ALAC Rules of Procedure should be updated with addition of a new procedure regarding the appointment by the NomCom of 5 ALAC members who will also act as Liaisons.	Reject	The importance of the Liaison positions and the importance of selecting a qualified person who meets the target group's criteria (if any); the difficulty of having the NomCom find such qualified people; the potential for harm rather than good; and the issue of asking new ALAC members to do double duty in light of experience with many previous NomCom appointees all indicate that this is a non-starter.
EMM 7		ALAC Rules of Procedure should be updated with the addition of new procedure regarding the use of random selection for the appointment of key At-Large leadership positions.	Reject	Although random selection may be used as a last resort among clearly qualified and acceptable people at times, it is a poor mechanism with which to make the vast majority of leaders. Reference to IETF misunderstands how the IRTF uses random selection (for its NomCom, not leadership positions, and even then candidates must meet a stronger criteria than just volunteering)