

## Appendix I: Internet Usage Statistics

### World Internet Users by Region

Region	Internet Users (m)	% of Users	Population (m)	% of Population
North America (Canada & US)	167.12	41.05	303	5.09
Europe	113.14	27.79	728	12.23
Asia/Pacific	104.88	25.76	3,451	57.99
Latin America	16.45	4.04	512	8.60
Africa	3.11	0.76	771	12.96
Middle East	2.4	0.59	186	3.13
World Total	407.1	100.00	5,951	100.00

(Source: NUA Internet Survey, [www.nua.ie/surveys/how\\_many\\_online/index.html](http://www.nua.ie/surveys/how_many_online/index.html))

### Number of Internet Users in Africa

Country	Population	% African Population	Dial-Up Connections	% African Dial-Up Connections	% Population with Connections
Angola	11,177,537	1%	12,000	0.5%	0.11%
Burkina Faso	11,575,898	1%	2,700	0.1%	0.02%
Burundi	5,735,937	1%	450	0.0%	0.008%
Benin	6,305,567	1%	6,000	0.2%	0.10%
Botswana	1,464,167	0%	3,000	0.1%	0.20%
Congo, Democratic People's Republic	50,481,305	6%	1,500	0.1%	0.003%
Central African Republic	3,444,951	0%	600	0.0%	0.02%
Congo, Republic of	2,716,814	0%	100	0.0%	0.004%
Cote d'Ivoire	15,818,068	2%	6,000	0.2%	0.04%
Cameroon	15,456,092	2%	6,000	0.2%	0.04%
Cape Verde	405,748	0%	150	0.0%	0.04%
Djibouti	447,439	0%	900	0.0%	0.20%
Algeria	31,133,486	4%	2,250	0.1%	0.007%
Egypt	67,273,906	9%	300,000	12%	0.45%
Eritrea	3,984,723	1%	900	0.0%	0.02%
Ethiopia	59,680,383	8%	7,200	0.3%	0.012%
Gabon	1,225,853	0%	3,000	0.1%	0.24%
Ghana	18,887,626	2%	15,000	0.6%	0.08%
Gambia	1,336,320	0%	450	0.0%	0.03%
Guinea	7,538,953	1%	900	0.0%	0.012%
Equatorial Guinea	465,746	0%	600	0.0%	0.13%
Guinea-Bissau	1,234,555	0%	450	0.0%	0.04%
Kenya	28,808,658	4%	45,000	1.9%	0.16%
Comoros	562,723	0%	600	0.0%	0.11%
Liberia	2,923,725	0%	225	0.0%	0.008%

Lesotho	2,128,950	0%	600	0.0%	0.03%
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	4,992,838	1%	7,500	0.3%	0.15%
Morocco	29,661,636	4%	120,000	5.0%	0.40%
Madagascar	14,873,387	2%	4,500	0.2%	0.03%
Mali	10,429,124	1%	1,500	0.1%	0.014%
Mauritania	2,581,738	0%	300	0.0%	0.012%
Mauritius	1,182,212	0%	39,000	1.6%	3.30%
Malawi	10,000,416	1%	6,000	0.2%	0.06%
Mozambique	19,124,335	2%	12,000	0.5%	0.06%
Namibia	1,648,270	0%	9,000	0.4%	0.55%
Niger	9,962,242	1%	1,900	0.1%	0.02%
Nigeria	113,828,587	15%	9,000	0.4%	0.008%
Reunion Island	717,723	0%	1,500	0.1%	0.21%
Rwanda	8,154,933	1%	300	0.0%	0.004%
Seychelles	79,164	0%	3,000	0.1%	3.79%
Sudan	34,475,690	4%	10,000	0.4%	0.03%
Sierra Leone	5,296,651	1%	450	0.0%	0.01%
Senegal	10,051,930	1%	7,500	0.3%	0.07%
Somalia	7,140,643	1%		0.0%	0.00%
Sao Tome and Principe	154,878	0%	4,000	0.2%	2.58%
Swaziland	985,335	0%	2,700	0.1%	0.27%
Chad	7,557,436	1%	900	0.0%	0.012%
Togo	5,081,413	1%	5,100	0.2%	0.10%
Tunisia	9,513,603	1%	110,000	4.5%	1.16%
Tanzania	31,270,820	4%	7,500	0.3%	0.02%
Uganda	22,804,973	3%	9,000	0.4%	0.04%
South Africa	43,426,386	6%	1,622,000	67%	3.74%
Zambia	9,663,535	1%	9,000	0.4%	0.09%
Zimbabwe	11,163,160	1%	30,000	1.2%	0.27%

Source: *Wired* Infoporn insert July 2000 – original sources include The World Bank Group, eMarketer, CIA World Fact book, ITU, UN Economic Commission for Africa, NUA Internet surveys

### Number of Internet Users in Asia and Pacific Region

Country	Date	Number	% of Population
Armenia	July 2000	30,000	0.90
Australia	November 2000	8.42 million	43.94
Azerbaijan	July 2000	8000	0.10
Bangladesh	July 2000	30,000	0.02
Bhutan	July 2000	500	0.02
Brunei Darussulam	July 2000	4000	1.19
China	July 2000	16.9 million	1.34
Fiji	July 2000	7500	0.90
French Polynesia	July 2000	5000	2.01
Guam	July 2000	5000	3.23
Georgia	July 2000	20,000	0.40
Hong Kong	November 2000	3.46 million	48.69

Indonesia	July 2000	400,000	0.18
Japan	November 2000	38.64 million	30.53
Kazakhstan	July 2000	70,000	0.42
Kiribati	July 2000	1000	1.09
Kyrgyzstan	July 2000	10,000	0.21
Laos	July 2000	2000	0.04
Macau	July 2000	40,000	8.98
Malaysia	July 2000	1.5 million	6.88
Maldives	July 2000	2000	0.06
Marshall Islands	July 2000	500	0.73
Micronesia	July 2000	2000	1.50
Mongolia	July 2000	3000	0.11
Myanmar (Burma)	July 2000	500	-
Nepal	July 2000	35,000	0.14
New Caledonia	July 2000	5000	2.48
New Zealand	November 2000	1.49 million	39.03
Pakistan	May 2000	1.2 million	0.85
Papua New Guinea	July 2000	2000	0.04
Philippines	July 2000	500,000	0.62
Samoa	July 2000	500	0.28
Singapore	November 2000	1.85 million	44.58
Solomon Islands	July 2000	3000	0.64
South Korea	October 2000	16.4 million	34.55
Sri Lanka	July 2000	65,000	0.34
Taiwan	July 2000	6.4 million	28.84
Tajikistan	July 2000	2000	0.03
Thailand	March 2000	1 million	1.65
Tonga	July 2000	1000	0.98
Turkmenistan	July 2000	2000	0.04
Uzbekistan	July 2000	7500	0.03
Vanuatu	July 2000	3000	1.58
Vietnam	July 2000	100,000	0.13

Source: Nua (2001). How Many Online, [http://www.nua.ie/surveys/how\\_many\\_online/asia.html](http://www.nua.ie/surveys/how_many_online/asia.html)

### Internet users and penetration in Latin America

Country	Internet users	% of LAC total	Penetration
Brazil	9,840,000	59.82%	5.70%
Mexico	2,500,000	15.20%	2.49%
Argentina	900,000	5.47%	2.44%
Chile	625,000	3.80%	4.12%
Colombia	600,000	3.65%	1.51%
Peru	400,000	2.43%	1.50%
Venezuela	400,000	2.43%	1.70%
Uruguay	300,000	1.82%	9.40%
Costa Rica	150,000	0.91%	4.04%

Guatemala	65,000	0.40%	0.51%
Cuba	60,000	0.36%	0.54%
Jamaica	60,000	0.36%	2.26%
Panama	45,000	0.27%	1.60%
El Salvador	40,000	0.24%	0.65%
Bolivia	35,000	0.21%	0.43%
Trinidad y Tob.	30,000	0.18%	2.55%
Dominican Rep.	25,000	0.15%	----
Ecuador	20,000	0.12%	0.15%
Honduras	20,000	0.12%	0.33%
Nicaragua	20,000	0.12%	0.42%
Paraguay	20,000	0.12%	0.36%
Bahamas	15,000	0.09%	5.09%
Belize	12,000	0.07%	4.82%
Antigua y B	8,000	0.05%	5.50%
Barbados	6,000	0.04%	2.19%
Haiti	6,000	0.04%	0.09%
Other	71,500	0.43%	2.08%

## Appendix II: At-Large Membership and Other Statistics

### At-Large Membership Registrations and Domain Name Ownership in African ccTLDs

Domains			Sorted by number of domains @Jan 2001	ALM registrations	
% of Africa	Jan-00	Jan-01			% Africa
0%	1	0	.bi - Burundi	3	0.4%
0%	27	0	.bj - Benin	48	6.1%
0%	0	0	.gq - Equatorial Guinea	0	0.0%
0%	0	0	.lr - Liberia	0	0.0%
0%	0	0	.sd - Sudan	2	0.3%
0%	40	1	.dj - Djibouti	10	1.3%
0%	1	1	.re - Reunion Island	4	0.5%
0%	2	1	.so - Somalia	0	0.0%
0%	1	2	.cv - Cap Verde	6	0.8%
0%	3	6	.cg - Congo, Republic of	0	0.0%
0%	5	6	.td - Chad	9	1.1%
0%	7	7	.cf - Central African Republic	7	0.9%
0%	6	8	.ao - Angola	3	0.4%
0%	2	9	.sc - Seychelles	1	0.1%
0%	1	13	.mw - Malawi	1	0.1%
0%	5	14	.cm - Cameroon	14	1.8%
0%	12	15	.gm - Gambia	4	0.5%
0%	6	18	.er - Eritrea	1	0.1%
0%	15	24	.gw - Guinea-Bissau	0	0.0%
0%	110	27	.gh - Ghana	112	14.1%
0%	3	29	.ly - Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	1	0.1%
0%	26	34	.dz - Algeria	5	0.6%
0%	2	36	.ga - Gabon	19	2.4%
0%	33	40	.km - Comoros	1	0.1%
0%	1	52	.gn - Guinea	7	0.9%
0%	8	83	.cd - Congo, Democratic People's Republic	4	0.5%
0%	81	84	.et - Ethiopia	3	0.4%
0%	11	86	.ml - Mali	11	1.4%
0%	75	87	.sl - Sierra Leone	1	0.1%
0%	96	87	.tn - Tunisia	14	1.8%
0%	50	102	.ls - Lesotho	0	0.0%
0%	162	112	.mz - Mozambique	4	0.5%
0%	59	120	.mr - Mauritania	20	2.5%
0%	120	159	.tg - Togo	14	1.8%
0%	32	168	.ne - Niger	27	3.4%
0%	139	171	.ug - Uganda	12	1.5%
0%	961	353	.ma - Morocco	27	3.4%
0%	259	362	.rw - Rwanda	0	0.0%
0%	211	380	.bf - Burkina Faso	17	2.1%

0%	337	548	.mg - Madagascar	31	3.9%
0%	306	705	.sn - Senegal	41	5.2%
0%	447	784	.st - Sao Tome and Principe	0	0.0%
0%	218	816	.tz - Tanzania	6	0.8%
0%	77	842	.ng - Nigeria	16	2.0%
0%	537	892	.zm - Zambia	4	0.5%
0%	661	981	.sz - Swaziland	2	0.3%
1%	629	1350	.ci - Cote d'Ivoire	3	0.4%
1%	602	1621	.ke - Kenya	21	2.7%
1%	2,226	2356	.bw - Botswana	3	0.4%
1%	2,073	2918	.zw - Zimbabwe	8	1.0%
2%	2,043	3251	.na - Namibia	2	0.3%
2%	823	3275	.mu - Mauritius	8	1.0%
3%	4,640	5848	.eg - Egypt	34	4.3%
87%	167,635	187,649	.za - South Africa	201	25.4%

Country Code domains that are carried and used on Internet hosts determined by the Internet Software Coalition, <http://www.isc.com/ds>. At-Large Applications (unverified), [http://members.icann.org/pubstats\\_unverified.html](http://members.icann.org/pubstats_unverified.html)

#### At-Large membership registrations in Asia and Pacific.

	At-Large Membership	Population	GDP/Capita	Internet Users <sup>1</sup>	Internet Users % Population	At-Large % of Internet Users
Japan	38,931	126.6m	US\$37,610	38.64m	30.5%	0.101%
China	33,670	1250m	US\$780	16.9m	1.35%	0.199%
Taiwan	9,193	22.1m	US\$13,918	6.4m	28.9%	0.144%
S. Korea	6,439	47.3m	US\$9,670	16.4m	34.6%	0.039%
India	2,025	986.6m	US\$440	4.5m	0.46%	0.045%
Australia	1,161	19.2m	US\$19,841	8.42m	43.8%	0.014%
Thailand	819	61.8m	US\$2,010	1.0m	1.62%	0.082%
New Zealand	229	3.8m	US\$14,130	1.49m	39.2%	0.015%
Singapore	226	4.1m	US\$25,170	1.85m	45.1%	0.012%
Hong Kong	122	7.1m	US\$24,070	3.46m	48.7%	0.004%

<sup>1</sup> Internet User data from NUA Internet Surveys, Asia  
<[http://www.nua.ie/surveys/how\\_many\\_online/asia.html](http://www.nua.ie/surveys/how_many_online/asia.html)>

Japan, NetRatings, Inc. November 2000; China, CNNIC, July 2000; Taiwan, iamasia, July 2000; South Korea, KRNIC, October 2000; Indian Market Research Bureau, March 2000; Australia, NetRatings, Inc. November 2000; Thailand, Newsbytes Asia, March 2000; New Zealand, NetRatings, Inc. November 2000; NetRatings, Inc. November 2000; NetRatings, Inc. November 2000.

**Distribution of At-Large Membership(Unverified) across the Asia and Pacific Region**

<b>Country</b>	<b>No. Members</b>
Afghanistan	17
Australia	1161
Bangladesh	5
China	33670
Hong Kong S.A.R., China	122
India	2025
Indonesia	51
Japan	38931
Korea, Democratic People's	154
Korea, Republic of	6439
Lao People's Democratic Republic	2
Malaysia	107
Mongolia	1
Nepal	4
New Zealand	229
Pakistan	39
Philippines	65
Singapore	226
Sri Lanka	8
Taiwan	9193
Thailand	819
Viet Nam	5
Other Countries	509
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>93782</b>

Source: ICANN(2000). Total At-Large Applications (unverified), [http://members.icann.org/pubstats\\_unverified.html](http://members.icann.org/pubstats_unverified.html)

**Distribution of At-Large Membership across Europe**

<b>Country</b>	<b>No.</b>
----------------	------------

	<b>Members</b>
Albania	3
Andora	3
Austria	1754
Belarus	50
Belgium	221
Bosnia and Hertzegovina	1
Bulgaria	35
Croatia / Hrvatska	10
Czech Republic	28
Denmark	89
Estonia	17
Finland	90
France	3040
Germany	20475
Gibraltar	4
Greece	62
Hungary	32
Iceland	7
Ireland	247
Italy	1670
Latvia	26
Liechtenstein	5
Lithuania	6
Luxembourg	71
Macedonia	2
Malta	5
Moldova	6
Monaco	1
Netherlands	417
Norway	205
Poland	56
Portugal	199
Romania	39
Russian Federation	2111
San Marino	2
Slovakia	14
Slovenia	19
Spain	287
Sweden	209
Switzerland	1879
Turkey	197
Ukraine	165
United Kingdom	2150
Yugoslavia	33

Source: ICANN(2000). Total At-Large Applications (unverified),  
[http://members.icann.org/pubstats\\_unverified.html](http://members.icann.org/pubstats_unverified.html)



## **Appendix III: Participants/Interviewees**

### **Individuals consulted for North American Study**

Karl Auerbach, ICANN At-Large Director  
Elana Broitman, Register.com  
Becky Burr, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering (formerly of the U.S. Department of Commerce)  
Vergil Bushnell, Consumer Project on Technology  
Marilyn Cade, AT&T  
Chris Chiu, American Civil Liberties Union  
Diane Cabell, Berkman Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University  
Roger Cochetti, Verisign  
Chuck Costello, Carter Center  
Lorrie Cranor, AT&T Labs  
Susan Crawford, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering  
Harold Feld, Media Access Project  
Ken Fockler, ICANN Board Director  
Michael Froomkin, University of Miami School of Law  
David Johnson, Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering  
Anders Halvorsen, Information Technology Association of America  
Hans Klein, Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility  
Rick Lane, U.S. Chamber of Commerce  
Andrew McLaughlin, Chief Policy Officer, ICANN  
Mike Roberts, Former CEO/President, ICANN  
Andrew Shen, Electronic Privacy Information Center  
Barbara Simons, President-Emeritus, Association for Computing Machinery  
Theresa Swinehart, Worldcom  
Jonathan Weinberg, Wayne State University School of Law  
David Young, Verizon

### **Individuals consulted for Asian and Pacific Study:**

Masanobu Katoh, Elected At Large Director, Head, Fujitsu Washington Office, US.  
Jun Murai, ICANN Initial Director, Professor Keio University, Japan.  
Hirofumi Hotta, Manager, NTT (now JPRS), past Names Council Member, ISP constituency, Chair, Asia & Pacific Internet Association.  
Ichiro Miyazaki, Director, Data Communication, Ministry of General Affairs, Post and Telecommunication  
Byung-Kyu Kim, Korea Network Information Center  
Ji-Eun Park, Korea Network Information Center  
Kilnam Chon, KAIST (Korea Advanced Institute of Science & Technology)

Shin-Dong Kim, Hanlim University  
Young-Eum Lee, Korea National Open University  
Eun-Mi Kim, Kookmin University  
Ji-Sook Woo, Seoul Women's University  
Eung-Hwi Jun, PeaceNet  
Yang-Woo Koh, PeaceNet  
Jae-Sook Choi, Korea Federation for Environmental Movement  
Won-Jae Lee, CNCR(NGO)  
SaeByeol Lee, People's Solidarity for Participatory Democracy  
Jeongho Oh, Center for Internet Governance Studies.  
Interviews have been conducted with experts from a number of Asia and Pacific region countries however their comments have not been fully incorporated in this interim report and they are not listed by name at this time.

### **Individuals consulted for Europe**

*(Non-exhaustive list as some participants preferred to remain anonymous)*

Vittorio Bertola, Italy, Former Candidate  
Klaus Birkenbihl, ISOC Germany  
Giampaolo Bonora, ISOC Italy  
Caspar Bowden, Foundation for Information Policy Research (FIPR), UK  
Constantine Chassapis, Greece, Former Candidate  
Malcolm Corbett, POPTel, UK  
Hans Peter Dittler, Germany, Former candidate  
Monika Ermert, Heise, Germany  
Roberto Gaetano, Italy, Chair of General Assembly  
Giorgio Griffini, Italy, Former Candidate  
Andrea Grimm, Gesellschaft für Informatik, Germany  
Mariusz Kondrat, ISOC Poland  
Stefan Krempl, journalist, Germany  
Siegfried Langenbach, Germany, Membership Advisory Committee (MAC)

Kira Litvina, Russian Institute for Public Networks, Russia

Pilar Luque, .es ccTLD, Spain  
Jörg Maas, Gesellschaft für Informatik, Germany  
Snjezana Milivojevic, Media Center, Serbia

Alan McCluskey, ISOC/Switzerland

Desiree Miloshevic, Virtual Internet (UK)  
Erich Möchel, Quintessenz, Austria  
Andy Müller-Maguhn, Germany, ICANN-Director  
Iliya Nickelt-Czycykowski, Germany, Membership Implementation Task Force

Andreas Pommer, VIBE/ Austria

Elisabeth Porteneuve, AFNIC (NIC-FR), France

Thomas Rössler, Förderverein Informationstechnik und Gesellschaft (FITUG), Germany

Christiane Schulzki-Hadduti, journalist, Germany

Alexander Svensson, ICANNCHANNEL, Germany

Majorie Sylvain, zdnet, France

Patrick Van Eecke, Interdisciplinary Centre for Law and IT, KULeuven, and Landwell, Bogaert & Vandemeulebroeke, Brussels, Belgium,

Patrick Vande Walle, ISOC Luxembourg

Carolin Welzel, Politik-digital, Germany

Christopher Wilkinson, UK, European Commission

Other preferred not to be mentioned.

### **Individuals consulted for Latin American/Caribbean Study**

Raimundo Beca, AC Member, Chile. Business sector.

Karen Higgs , APC, Uruguay. NGO sector.

Clara Collado, .do's administrator, Dominican Republic. ccTLDs.

Florencio Utreras, Executive Director of REUNA, Chile. Non commercial sector.

German Valdez, AC Member (observer), Nic México.

Tony Harris, Executive Director of CABASE, Argentina. ISPs' sector.

Guillermo Carey, Carey Asociados, Chile. Name Council member. IP Sector.

Ida Holz, .uy's administrator, Uruguay. ccTLDs.

Erick Iriarte, derecho.org and .pe advisor, Perú. ccTLDs, non commercial and IP sector.

Julian Dunayevich, LACNIC, Argentina. Address community, government and Education sector.

Vany Martínez, Name Council member, Panamá. Non commercial sector.

## Appendix IV: Surveys/questionnaires

### Results of the African survey questionnaire

#	Question	Yes	No
1	Are you aware of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) and it's role in creating global Internet policy?	78%	22%
2	Did you hear about ICANN due to the voter education and registration process prior to the ICANN At-Large election last year?	31%	29%
3	Did you register to vote in the ICANN At-Large elections?	23%	77%
4	Did you vote in the ICANN At-Large elections?	17%	83%
5	Are you aware of the results of the ICANN At-Large elections?	44%	56%
6	Would you like to participate in global Internet policy formulation in the future?	81%	19%
7	Would you like to vote for the Directors of the Board of ICANN in the future?	72%	28%
8	The continent of Africa has <1% of the world's registered domains (under African ccTLDs), but still elected one of five At-Large directors in the election last year. Do you think this is appropriate and fair?	87%	13%
9	Should more be done to promote the work of ICANN in Africa, and to involve the African Internet community in policy formation?	96%	4%
10	Should ICANN take into particular account the needs of Africa when formulating its policy decisions?	89%	11%
11	Country of residence:	[#]	[%]
	Benin	1	1%
	Gambia	1	1%
	Kenya	1	1%
	Mauritius	1	1%
	Namibia	1	1%
	Uganda	1	1%
	South Africa	86	87%
	Not specified/other	7	7%
12	Are your professionally involved in the ICT (information communication technology) industry?	86%	14%
13	Would you like to receive a copy of our report?	89%	11%
14	Are you willing for us to contact you with some further, open questions?	80%	20%

Supplemental analysis	
Of those aware of ICANN, the percentage professionally involved in the ICT industry is:	90%
Of those aware of ICANN, the percentage that heard about ICANN due to the voter education and registration process is:	40%

Of those who heard about ICANN due to the election and registration process, the percentage that registered to vote was:	48%
Of those who registered to vote, the percentage who voted in the election was:	70%
Of those who voted, the percentage who are aware of the results is:	82%
Of those aware of ICANN, the percentage who are aware of the results is:	57%
Of those who would like to participate in global Internet policy formation in the future, the percentage that would like to vote for Directors of the Board of ICANN in the future is:	83%

### Open Questionnaire - Africa

Sent to all individual answering 'yes' to question 14 of the e-mail survey.

#### ***Issues relating to the 'At-Large-Membership (ALM)' Recruitment Drive and the Subsequent Election of the ALM Directors.***

As part of the effort to examine and review issues relating to the 'At-Large-Membership' (ALM) recruitment drive and outreach programme as well as the subsequent election of the ALM Directors will it be possible to comment on the followings?. [Note: Q1 & Q2 are aimed at those actually involved in the ALM recruitment drive and outreach programme; for example members of the Membership Implementation Task Force (MITF) for Africa]

1. From your point of view what problems were encountered during the actual recruitment drive as per the Africa region?

2. In view of the problems encountered during recruitment drive, what will you consider as the lessons learnt from the exercise.

3. Any views in relation to the Candidate Nomination Process? Do you think the procedure was fair and transparent?

4. Any views on the campaigning process itself? Specifically....

(i) Do you think the electorate had enough chance to know who the candidates were?

(ii) Do you think the online dialog phase designed to facilitate interaction with the candidates during the campaign process was informative?

5. Any comments on the election process itself? Specifically....

(i) Do you think people understood the rules and procedures governing the election process including applying for membership, membership activation to qualify for cast your vote and the voting process itself?

(ii) Do you think the Web-based membership application procedure did not exclude those without Web-access from the process?

(iii) Do you think the membership activating procedure did not exclude some people from further participation in the process?

(iv) Do you think the voter education exercise prior to the actual election was adequate and informative?

(v) Do you think the on-line voting exercise was conducted in a fair, transparent and in an 'all-inclusive' manner?

(vi) Do you think the Web-based voting process excluded some eligible voters without Web-access from participation in the voting process? (Note: of the 315 eligible voters from the Africa region only 130 cast their vote)

(vii) Any other comments or observations in relation to the election process?

(viii) Any recommendations, or suggestions for the future...?

6. Africa has the lowest activated 'At-Large-Membership' count (i.e. 315 out of the total of 76,183 worldwide). [The membership percentages are: 0.4%(Africa), 50.2% (Asia & Pacific); 30.8% (Europe); 4.7% (Latin America & Caribbean); 14% (North America)].

From your perspective, what do you think are the reasons for this level of 'under-representation' (lack of interest/participation) in the ICANN process within the African region.

7. Do you think the 'under-representation' problem will have a negative impact on Africa's involvement in the ICANN process, structure and governance in the future?

8. Any specific suggestions as to how the 'under-representation' problem can be addressed.

***Issues relating to general institutional framework and the future role and purpose of the ALM as per the ICANN structure and governance (including accountability, transparency and legitimacy)***

9. From your point or view, to what degree should the general Internet community be involved in ICANN?

10. Should the ALM have a role in the ICANN process up-and-above electing the ALM Directors?

11. Should there be membership requirements, and if so what should they be?

12. What processes and structures do you think should be established within ICANN for At-Large Member involvement?

13. Is the ALM the best way to ensure 'public participation' in the ICANN process?

14. Would you regard the election of the ALM Directors as the best way to ensure ‘public representation’ in the ICANN structure and process?

15. Is the ALM the best way to ensure ‘public interest’ in the ICANN process?

16. Which of the following roles (or combination of roles) do you think the ALM should play within the ICANN structure and process

- Outreach: – to inform the Internet community about ICANN’s activities and to channel public opinion regarding them.
- Electorate: – to choose (in an as-yet unspecified manner) Board members capable of representing the public interest effectively.
- Agenda-setting: – similar to the Government Advisory Committee (GAC), a public voice to identify issues of concern and appropriately direct them into ICANN’s policy infrastructure.
- Policy advice: – participate in substantive debate over policies, either within or outside of existing ICANN Supporting Organizations (SOs).
- Watchdog: – to monitor and review activities of the Board and the SOs, and protect against false consensus, policies against the public interest, or inappropriate expansion of ICANN’s mission.
- Legitimizing body: – enhance the legitimacy of ICANN’s activities, further insulating ICANN from the hegemony of the American government, or from inappropriate influence by entrenched interests.

17. Could you rank these roles in order of importance. For example will you regard the *agenda-setting* role of the ALM more important than its *watchdog role* of the ALM if it is considered as the best form of facilitating the process of public ‘representation’, ‘participation’, ‘interest’ in the ICANN structure and process. You may decide to do the rankings below (with ‘1’, the highest rank, ‘2’ the second highest rank and so on)

- [ ] Outreach role
- [ ] Electorate role:
- [ ] Agenda-setting role:
- [ ] Policy advisory:
- [ ] Watchdog role:
- [ ] Legitimizing body:

18. Which other ALM roles will you recommend up-and-above those identified above

***Issues relating to the possible ways by which various stakeholders in the region could provide input and participate in ICANN’s deliberations relating to future ALM elections and the structure of its Board.***

19. Relating to the question of how best to ensure public representation within the ICANN structure, which of the following ‘public representational’ model will you regard

as most appropriate to facilitate the identified roles of the ALM within the ICANN structure: (Note: You are free to suggest a combination of these models – provided they are complimentary or reinforcing)

- Nine Board seats, directly elected by a large At-Large Membership (the *status quo*)
- Board seats allocated on a purely global basis, on a regional basis, or a mix of the two (this last being the *status quo*)
- Board seats allocated along some objective, non-geographic metric
- Nine Board seats, directly elected by a more limited ALM (e.g., At-Large Members would have to meet more stringent criteria for participation, such as ownership of a domain name or demonstration of technical expertise)
- An At-Large Council, directly elected by an ALM, that selects Board members from its own ranks (parliamentary model)
- A sub-option would be to organize the At-Large Council along purely national lines – one member from each country of the world.
- An At-Large Council, directly elected by an ALM, that selects Board members from outside (indirect election)
- Elimination of the At-Large Membership and Board seats, devolving its responsibilities to the existing SO (Supporting Organization) structure.
- Reduction/Elimination of the At-Large Membership and Board seats, coupled with the creation of a user- or consumer-based SO (with three SO Board seats)
- Separation of the Address and Protocol SOs from ICANN, since the policy issues they raise are more limited than those of the DNSO (Domain Name Supporting Organization).
- An At-Large Advisory Committee, along the lines of the Government Advisory Committee (GAC), that would not have Board seats but would have some other oversight of ICANN's activities (i.e., veto power, reconsideration authority, etc.)
- Other possible 'public representation' models of the ALM or other public entities within the ICANN organizational structure.