

AFRALO input into WT C SWOT analyses

Cliquer ici pour accéder à la version française de ce page. Par contre, nous vous prions de rédiger vos commentaires à l'égard du tableau SWOT en bas en anglais.

For the French version of this page, please [click here](#). But please contribute to the SWOT tables below in English only.

Background

At-Large Improvements WT C (on ALAC/At-Large's planning processes) is responsible for implementing Recommendations 5 and 6 to come out of the [Final Report of the ALAC Review WG on ALAC Improvements](#):

- Rec 5: ALAC should develop strategic/operational plans as part of ICANN's planning process.
- Rec 6: At-Large should develop accurate cost models.

To complete this mandate, WT C is compiling three SWOT analyses (SWOT = strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) on ALAC/At-Large's:

- Strategic planning;
- Operational planning; and
- Budgetary planning.

As the next step, WT C would like to collect contributions to each of these three SWOT analyses from the RALOs' ALSes.

Instructions for AFRALO

WT C is asking each RALO to collect contributions from its ALSes to the three SWOT analyses below, which cover the ALAC/At-Large's (a) strategic, (b) operational, and (c) budgetary planning. *This request is a chance for your ALSes to directly influence ALAC/At-Large planning processes and procedures.* (Note: This request is separate from the ALAC's recent request for the RALOs' comments specifically on ICANN's FY2010-14 Strategic Plan.)

At present, each of the three SWOT tables lists the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats determined by WT C. We are now asking the ALSes to add to each of these lists. In considering its input, each ALS (along with its RALO) may review the points being added by the ALSes of the other RALOs; links to the SWOT contribution page of each RALO can be found on the [main WT C workspace page](#).

To proceed, we would like each RALO's leadership (or appointee) to "hold the pen" -- that is, to collect its ALSes' input (in whatever manner it sees fit), consolidate that input if it wishes, and to enter it into the below three SWOT tables. Therefore, we have given AFRALO's chairperson, vice chair, and secretariat editing rights to this page. (Please let us know if you would like us to grant editing rights to any other RALO member.)

When adding the points below that your ALSes would like to contribute, please:

- Place new points underneath those already in the SWOT tables;
- Add the points in English;
- Use a color other than black;
- Do not number/letter the points you add (even though the points already listed are numbered/lettered); and
- Feel free to use the designations "+1," "+2," etc. after any point already in a SWOT table with which your ALSes strongly agree.

Deadline: Please add your ALSes' contributions as soon as possible but no later than three business days after February's AFRALO meeting -- that is, **Monday, 7 February**.

Thank you very much. If you have any questions, please contact Seth Greene, the At-Large Improvements Manager, at seth.greene@icann.org.

A. SWOT on ALAC/At-Large strategic planning

This SWOT analysis relates to Rec. 5: ALAC should develop strategic/operational plans as part of ICANN's planning process.

A.S - STRENGTHS	A.W - WEAKNESSES
<p>A.S.1 - Membership diversity brings talent</p> <p>A.S.2 - Regional involvement and balance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. At-Large outreach is pillar of ICANN's strategic influence in Internet governance2. Involvement of all five RALOs is an asset3. Knowledge of local communities benefits outreach planning4. Knowledge of local actors (e.g., stakeholders, government leaders, policy makers, regulators) related to ICANN and Internet ecosystem5. Knowledge of possible outreach efforts6. First-hand involvement in Internet governance unrelated to ICANN and domain names <p>A.S.3 - At-Large strategy is bottom-up and reflects the consensus of many stakeholders</p> <p>A.S.4 - Current structure and existing processes are in place to avoid capture and allow scalability</p> <p>A.S.5 - At-Large, as home of individual Internet users, does not take into account purely commercial or vested individual interests</p> <p>A.S.6 - Number and diversity of stakeholders are growing</p> <p>A.S.7 - Level of participation by stakeholders is increasing</p> <p>A.S.8 - At-Large is core part of the original ICANN vision</p> <p>A.S.9 - At-Large's multi-stakeholder, bottom-up governance transcends operational domain name issues</p> <p>A.S.10 - At Large, as ICANN's conscience, brings unique considerations to strategic planning</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>	<p>A.W.1 - Specific details of At-Large strategy are not well defined or easily understood</p> <p>A.W.2 - Translations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Number is limited2. Delays exist <p>A.W.3 - Lack of clear strategic targets for the whole At-Large community (ALSes, RALOs, and ALAC)</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>

<p>A.O - OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>A.O.1 - Ability to feed local and global issues into ICANN strategy A.O.2 - Very powerful communication channel A.O.3 - Useful tool for ICANN outreach A.O.4 - Local ALSes can help with local events (i.e., act as liaisons to local stakeholders) A.O.5 - Developing countries and emerging economies provide many prospects A.O.6 - Opportunity exists to create a road-map, based on various scenarios, for At-Large's future A.O.7 - A better understanding between At-Large and ICANN Strategy team could lead to increased use of At-Large as a strategic resource for ICANN A.O.8 - Public participation could be strengthened by integrating the Public Participation Committee's strategy with At-Large's processes, facilitated by Staff A.O.9 - Consultation and coordination between RALOs should be strengthened</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>	<p>A.T - THREATS</p> <p>A.T.1 - Lack of funding limits outreach A.T.2 - Lack of volunteers reduces time spent on strategic issues A.T.3 - Lack of established feedback loop from ICANN A.T.4 - Loss of ICANN credibility if At-Large does not grow A.T.5 - If bottom-up process is broken or At-Large strategy is not considered: 1. Loss of local support 2. Loss of stakeholder input A.T.6 - ICANN's control by government-led agencies A.T.7 - Competition from another agency similar to ICANN A.T.8 - International pressure limits ICANN's revenue</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>
---	---

B. SWOT on ALAC/At-Large operational planning

This SWOT analysis relates to Rec. 5: ALAC should develop strategic/operational plans as part of ICANN's planning process.

<p>B.S - STRENGTHS</p> <p>B.S.1 - Membership diversity can bring talent B.S.2 - Local organizational knowledge brings unbiased view of operations: 1. Lower costs of implementation 2. Local political insight B.S.3 - Local community input: 1. Grassroots input 2. RALO involvement is an asset B.S.4 - On-the-ground, workable and well-defined actions B.S.5 - At-Large uses electronic tools to bring its members' different backgrounds and experiences to bear on planning process</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>	<p>B.W - WEAKNESSES</p> <p>B.W.1 - At-Large reacts slowly B.W.2 - At-Large maturity still not completely achieved B.W.3 - Translations: 1. Number is limited 2. Delays exist</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>
<p>B.O - OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>B.O.1 - Strengthen maturity of At-Large by improving processes B.O.2 - Use At-Large as a powerful communication channel B.O.3 - At-Large operating plan could be a useful step in preparing an accurate budget B.O.4 - At-Large's abilities and reach could be used to convey ICANN's message locally B.O.5 - At-Large could incorporate public participation into ICANN's operational planning B.O.6 - At-Large comments, as result of consensus-based process, should be considered by ICANN Board and staff B.O.7 - Plans (such as a Second At-Large Summit or RALO GAs) proposed by At-Large should be considered by ICANN</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>	<p>B.T - THREATS</p> <p>B.T.1 - Lack of resources (including operational funding, staff headcount, translation services, Web services, conference-call services, other daily logistical needs, etc.) B.T.2 - Less operational effectiveness and visibility leading to a lack of volunteer interest B.T.3 - Lack of volunteers would limit operational planning and capabilities</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>

C. SWOT on ALAC/At-Large budgetary planning

This SWOT analysis relates to Rec. 6: At-Large should develop accurate cost models.

<p>C.S - STRENGTHS</p> <p>C.S.1 - Membership diversity can bring talent C.S.2 - In-house knowledge of budgetary requirements within At-Large C.S.3 - Improved consultation among the RALOs and their representatives on ALAC C.S.4 - Cost-effective actions C.S.5 - Experience sharing among RALOs C.S.6 - A bottom-up budget structure for At-Large</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>	<p>C.W - WEAKNESSES</p> <p>C.W.1 - Lack of established feedback loop from ICANN C.W.2 - Communication problems ICANN finance C.W.3 - No possibility of ROI figure - "investing in At Large is like investing in R&D" C.W.4 - ICANN currently only source of funds for At Large C.W.5 - Lack of clear funding schedule/calendar with regards to face to face general assemblies introduces uncertainty C.W.6 - We need to improve our interaction with the staff during the budget planning process.</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>
<p>C.O - OPPORTUNITIES</p> <p>C.O.1 - ALAC/At-Large could provide information regarding At-Large budgetary needs in a more timely manner and in the required format</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>	<p>C.T - THREATS</p> <p>C.T.1 - Limiting ALAC's budget could: 1. Directly and severely affect outreach capability 2. Allow for fewer or no face-to-face meetings (including but not limited to GAs, ICANN meetings, Summits, RALO meetings, other "inreach" efforts, etc.) a. Possible consequences could include ALSes' abandoning At-Large, reducing At-Large's usefulness and legitimacy</p> <p>ADD ALS CONTRIBUTIONS HERE</p>