

WT C's SWOT Analysis_ver 2

In this version (ver 2) of the SWOT:

- The input from WT C has been consolidated and reorganized.
- A numbering/lettering system has been added to allow for the easy identification of the individual points.

Note: This is *not* the version of the SWOT in which WT C members should be adding new data. To add new data, please see version 1 of the SWOT.

A. Strategic planning (related to Rec. 5)

<p>A.S - STRENGTHS</p> <p>A.S.1 - Membership diversity brings talent A.S.2 - Regional involvement and balance: 1. At-Large outreach is pillar of ICANN's strategic influence in Internet governance 2. Involvement of all five RALOs is an asset 3. Knowledge of local communities benefits outreach planning 4. Knowledge of local actors (e.g., stakeholders, government leaders, policy makers, regulators) related to ICANN and Internet ecosystem 5. Knowledge of possible outreach efforts 6. First-hand involvement in Internet governance unrelated to ICANN and domain names A.S.3 - At-Large strategy is bottom-up and reflects the consensus of many stakeholders A.S.4 - Current structure and existing processes are in place to avoid capture and allow scalability A.S.5 - At-Large, as home of individual Internet users, does not take into account purely commercial or vested individual interests A.S.6 - Number and diversity of stakeholders are growing A.S.7 - Level of participation by stakeholders is increasing A.S.8 - At-Large is core part of the original ICANN vision A.S.9 - At-Large's multi-stakeholder, bottom-up governance transcends operational domain name issues A.S.10 - At Large, as ICANN's conscience, brings unique considerations to strategic planning</p>	<p>A.W - WEAKNESSES</p> <p>A.W.1 - Specific details of At-Large strategy are not well defined or easily understood A.W.2 - Translations: 1. Number is limited 2. Delays exist A.W.3 - Lack of clear strategic targets for the whole At-Large community (ALSes, RALOs, and ALAC)</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>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>

B. Operational planning (related to Rec. 5)

<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>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>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>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>

C. Budget (related to Rec. 6)

<p><u>C.S - STRENGTHS</u></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><u>C.W - WEAKNESSES</u></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><u>C.O - OPPORTUNITIES</u></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><u>C.T - THREATS</u></p> <p>C.T.1 - Limiting ALAC's budget could:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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.) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Possible consequences could include ALSes' abandoning At-Large, reducing At-Large's usefulness and legitimacy