Report of Public Comments

Title:	Community Input and Advice Process

Publication Date:	17 December 2012
Prepared By:	Marika Konings

Comment Period:		**Important Information Links**	
Open Date:	24 September 2012	**Announcement**	
Close Date:	14 November 2012	**Public Comment Box**	
Time (UTC):	23:59 UTC	**View Comments Submitted**	

Staff Contact:	Marika Konings	**Email:**	Policy-staff@icann.org

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

In fulfillment of Accountability and Transparency Review Team (ATRT) Recommendation No. 6, Staff has identified topics that are subject to formal policy development processes, and those that are generally within the ICANN Board level Organizational Administration Function. While Recommendation 6 has been completed, the work performed identified an area in which improvement is required – how the Board obtains the advice that it needs from the ICANN community beyond the traditional public comment process.

The document that was posted for public comment was intended to guide discussions in Toronto on enhancing the process by which the ICANN Board seeks advice from the community on topics that are not subject to formal policy development processes. It is the objective that these discussions could lead to a consistent and predictable process to be adopted by the ICANN Board for such inquiries.

ICANN Staff will work with the Board Governance Committee to review the comments received and determine next steps.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of two (2) community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Registries Stakeholder Group	Keith Drazek	RySG
At-Large Advisory Committee	ALAC	ALAC

Section III: Summary of Comments

As part of the paper a number of specific questions were asked that the commenters provided feedback on.

- *Should standardized processes be created for the Board's receipt of community input and advice?*

The RySG is of the opinion that a standardized process should be used as it would ensure transparency and predictability, while ALAC is of the view that, although it might be a nice idea in theory, it would be difficult and time-consuming in practice and also doubtful whether one process would meet the needs of potentially differing circumstances.

- *If so, should such a procedure be standardized across ICANN SOs/ACs, aligned with the current existing procedures, or should there be some flexibility among the SOs/ACs (certain parts are required for all, while other parts may be developed by the respective SOs/ACs).*

The RySG wonders to which 'existing procedures' the question refers, while ALAC notes that flexibility is important, noting that it may be difficult to settle one procedure that would align with al the different procedures that are currently in use by the different SO/ACs.

- *How should the Board request this input and advice?*

ALAC notes that the current form of Board resolutions and/or letters are a good starting point, but what is missing is dialogue and engagement with the Board to better understand the input / advice requested. Both ALAC and the RySG note that sufficient time should be provided by the Board for SO/ACs to respond. The RySG is of the view that it 'should also be possible for community groups to submit advice directly' even when it has not been requested by the Board.

- *What is the most effective and efficient method to deal with the issue topic identified? Should it be a working group, could current procedures be used? Who determines which method will be used?*

The RySG notes that a working group may be useful, although it may not always result in a consensus position.

- *Should working groups be chartered for each initiative?*

The RySG is of the view that it may not be necessary to charter a working group for each initiative.

- *How are different parts of the ICANN community expected to work together in these efforts?*

The RySG suggests that the concept of Cross-Community Working Groups should be further explored, although it would be helpful if a specific set of guidelines for such working groups would be developed. ALAC points to some recent cross-community efforts, with various degrees of success.

- *What minimum public consultation requirements, if any, should be required within this function?*

ALAC and the RySG both agree that public consultation is needed. The RySG suggests that similar requirements should apply as for current public comment forums while ALAC recommends that improvements should be made to ensure wider participation in public consultations. The RySG is also of the view that the Board should provide a timely response to advice received as well as providing a rationale for why advice was or was not taken on board.

- *Are there any topics that should not be subject to this function?*

The RySG is of the view that any topics that are subject to a PDP should not be part of this function. ALAC notes that as Advisory Committees cross the boundaries that may apply to the mandates of Supporting Organizations, it could apply very broadly for those groups.

- *Who within ICANN lead this effort?*

The RySG notes that 'the answer will likely depend on the nature of the issue' and will need to further considered. ALAC expects the Board to take a lead in this effort and points to the need for enhanced dialogue and engagement between all parties involved.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

ICANN Staff will work with the Board Governance Committee to review the comments received and determine next steps.