

Summary of comments on the ALAC WG Draft Final report

May 2009

The Draft Final Report of the ALAC Working Group was posted for public comment on 11 February 2009 and comments were received until 30 April.

Ten comments were received.

Responses to specific recommendations

This summary of responses has been grouped around the key points contained in the report.

1. *The ALAC has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure. This continuing purpose has four key elements:*
 - *providing advice on policy;*
 - *providing input into ICANN operations and structure;*
 - *part of ICANN's accountability mechanisms*
 - *an organising mechanism for some of ICANN's outreach*

The section of the ICANN Bylaws that deals with ALAC should be changed to reflect this purpose.

There was general support for this point.

Organisation

2. *At Large should be given two voting seats on the ICANN Board*

A range of responses were received on this issue. Two were strongly in support. Others had reservations, including: concerns about multiple representation through potential duplication with the GNSO Users House; concerns about the selection process; and the need to integrate with other reviews.

3. *The ALAC-RALO-ALS structure should remain in place for now*

General support, although there were some concerns that the current structure impedes the free flow of information and advice from ALSs.

Effectiveness and participation

4. *Educating and engaging the ALSs should be an immediate priority; compliance should be a longer term goal*

There was general support for this recommendation.

5. *ALAC should develop strategic and operational plans (including performance criteria and cost information) as part of ICANN's planning process*

There was general support for this recommendation, although it was noted that ALAC should focus on providing policy advice rather than spending too much time on planning. Other comments suggested that any further funding must be tied to clear plans and deliverables.

6. *More effort needs to be put into developing accurate cost models for At Large activity*

There was general support for this recommendation.

7. *ALAC should be encouraged to make its own choice of tools for collaborative work*

There was general support for this recommendation.

8. *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*

There was support for this recommendation.

9. *ICANN should strengthen its translation and interpretation processes*

There was strong support for this recommendation. In addition, there was one comment recommending that ALAC members needed to be proficient in written and spoken English to be effective members of the committee.

Relationship with other ICANN entities

10. *The ALAC is the primary organisational home for the voice and concerns of the individual Internet user in ICANN processes, although individual users may choose to participate in many other ways in the ICANN process.*

There was support for this. However, one respondent was concerned about the possibility of multiple representation. One respondent was opposed to this recommendation on similar grounds.

11. *ICANN should develop a mechanism for allowing the voice of those recognised bodies who represent consumer interests to be heard at critical points in key decisions and to provide input into policy processes.*

There was support for this recommendation.

12. *As the provision of advice on policy is part of ALAC's purpose, ALAC should strive to provide policy advice on any issues that affect individual Internet users. Processes for providing advice on policy should be strengthened within ALAC for the development of policy advice, within SOs for requesting input from ALAC on policy issues and from SOs, ACs and the Board to provide feedback on how ALAC advice has been used.*

There was a concern that the advice provided on policy must be within the SO structure. ALAC in its response stated that it has a far wider role to play than TLDS.

Other comments

In addition to the comments above, there were comments that suggested the implementation of the recommendations would be complicated and would require additional resources for implementation.