

ICANN 33



ALAC REVIEW WG MID POINT CONSULTATION

04 November 2008

Tricia Drakes
Chair, BGC ALAC Review Working Group

The journey so far...

- BGC ALAC Review WG formed 23 January 2008
- Members: Harald Alvestrand, Karl Auerbach, Vittorio Bertola, Tricia Drakes (Chair), Thomas Narten, Nii Quaynor and Jean-Jacques Subrenat
- Independent review by Westlake Consulting
 - Draft report published June 2008
 - Final report posted July 2008
- WG consultation with the community since the release of the draft report
- “Mid-point Consultation Report” posted 23 Oct 2008



Consultation to date

- Two public sessions & ALAC meetings in Paris
- Online comment forums on draft and final versions of the Westlake report
- Attendance at ALAC, some RALO & GNSO teleconferences post Paris pre Cairo
- Various feedback/comments on WG “Mid-point Consultation Report”
- Meetings with ALAC, GNSO & others in Cairo
- Our session today



Feedback at Cairo meeting (so far)

- Support for the general direction of the report
- Specific feedback
 - Support for ALAC nominated Board seat(s)
 - Allows ALAC to work within the core areas of ICANN
 - Some discussion about mechanisms, but no clear solution yet
 - Some reservations - ALAC Board Liaison proposal
 - Promise of feedback on recommendations other than in relation to Board seats 😊
 - General issues/links with other ICANN Reviews



Feedback at Cairo meeting (so far) (2)

Specific Feedback (Continued)

- Support for importance of planning
- Support for RALO reform (incl. individual users participation)
- Stress on the importance of translation (ALAC and beyond)
- Support for including the end user voice in the GNSO process
- Reconsider language “only channel” for end user participation
- Support for deployment of resources at the edge
- Support for improving participation



Some Key Questions

- At Large Nominated Voting Board Seats
 - Yes? If so, how could that mechanism work?
 - Accept loss of ALAC Board Liaison?
- Resources (funding, staff)
 - What is the appropriate level of resourcing?
 - What is the optimal blend of staff and other resources?
 - How are resources most effectively deployed?
- Participation
 - What needs to be done to further improve participation?
- Relationship of ALAC to other ICANN entities
 - How can ALAC advice be better integrated into ICANN policy processes?
 - What is/are the most appropriate channel(s) for the voice of the individual Internet user in the ICANN model?



Next Steps

- Public comment forum (closes 12 December)
<http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#alac-midpoint-rev>
- WG keen to consult/receive further feedback post Cairo including participation in teleconferences with interested groups
- Based on the feedback received, the WG will prepare draft final recommendations for submission to BGC and discussion at the Mexico ICANN meeting





The following slides are for information



ALAC Review – Report links

- Independent Review of the At Large Advisory Committee Report by Westlake Consulting (Final Report – English & Translations)

<http://www.icann.org/en/reviews/alac/>

- ALAC Review “Mid-point Consultation Document” (English & Translations)

<http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-23octo8-en.htm>



“Mid-point Consultation Document”

Key Points for Discussion (page 4) - 1

The key points of the Working Group’s initial thinking for discussion with the community are:

- The ALAC has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure. This continuing purpose has three key elements:
 - providing advice on policy;
 - providing input into ICANN operations and structure;
 - part of ICANN’s accountability mechanisms

- Organisation

- At Large should in principle be given two voting seats on the ICANN Board
- The ALAC-RALO-ALS structure should remain in place for now



“Mid-point Consultation Document”

Key Points for Discussion (page 4) - 2

- Effectiveness and participation
- Educating and engaging the ALSs should be an immediate priority; compliance should be a longer term goal
- ALAC should develop strategic and operational plans (including performance criteria and cost information) as part of ICANN’s planning process
- More effort needs to be put into developing accurate cost models for At Large activity
- ALAC should be encouraged to make its own choice of tools for collaborative work
- The public comment period should be kept at 30 days except in special circumstances, in which case ALAC may request an extension to 45 days
- ICANN should strengthen its translation processes



“Mid-point Consultation Document”

Key Points for Discussion (page 4) - 3

- Relationship with other ICANN entities
 - The ALAC is the appropriate organisational channel for the voice and concerns of the individual Internet user in ICANN processes
 - Since ALAC is the appropriate channel for the voice and concerns of the individual Internet user, it is inappropriate for other ICANN entities to attempt to claim to represent that individual user voice
 - Processes for providing advice on policy should be strengthened both within ALAC for the development of policy advice and within SOs for requesting input from ALAC on policy issues

