ALAC Comment Overview

We support many aspects of the model:

- IAP is needed and will not be costly
- CSC is needed to replace NTIA review of IANA reposts and generally do day-to-day monitoring. However, it MUST have a MS component and that component must have ability to raise red flags.
- The MRT is needed, but how it is convened, who is presented on it and in what numbers, how its operating rules get set, how any of this might change with time, and who finds it are quite problematic.

Contract Co. is being created to cover the eventuality that the IANA function needs to be completely separated from ICANN. Virtually everyone believes that this is not needed now, and many believe it will not be needed for a long time, but the threat of it happening is an important component of the model.

The ALAC does not believe that the complexity, cost, and potential long term dangers associated with Contract Co, are justified. Specifically, the ALAC believes that the IANA function should be vested in ICANN, and that accountability measures be put in place to allow the MRT and the ICANN SOs and ACs ensure that the IANA service continues to meet the community's needs. If it is possible to ensure that Contract Co is fully controlled by the MRT in the proposed model, it is similarly possible to ensure that with respect to IANA, ICANN is controlled by the MRT and its SOs and ACs.

Further Analysis and Alternatives

- Issues related to CSC
- Issues related to MRT and how the ICANN models simplifies things (many functions no longer needed (RFP, contracting); others partially can be delegated to ICANN staff; ICANN funds it; ICANN convenes it).
- Issues related to Contract Co. (litigation, control, ability to evolve, cost). In the alternative model, there is no Contract Co, but many of it's features relates to ensuring control by the MS community are inserted into ICANN.