

ccNSO/ALAC Liaison Report June 16th 2016

Posted June 11th 2016

1) June 10th 2016 - ALAC Statement on the Request for Input – Next Generation RDS to replace Whois

Introduction:

In this statement the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) proposes responses to two of four questions raised in connection with the above noted Request for Input. No response was offered for Questions 1) and 4).

Question One: Are there any additional documents missing from the list? -- No Response.

Question Two: Are the key inputs, as identified still relevant and up to date and if not, what input should the Working Group be considering?

Response: The list of Key Inputs is a very long one and serious consideration of each of the documents by all members of the Working Group would be far too big a task for the Working Group to reach any conclusions in a realistic timeframe. Without taking away from the importance of the documents, we suggest that the Working Group focus on more critical documents, including: • The latest WHOIS Policy Review Team Final Report 2012 • SAC Reports 054, 055 and 058: • 2013 RAA and 2014 New gTLD Registry Agreement • Relevant RFCs • The latest documents from the EU on data protection, particularly the latest Directive/Regulation • The EWG Final Report, together with additional statements by EWG members

Question Three: Views on completeness of the Charter Questions (listed below)?

Response: The WG must, at a minimum and by Full Consensus, address the following question:

- Should the domain name ecosystem capture, collect and curate personal data elements for a valid domain name registration transaction?
- Should ICANN compel the capture, collection and the curation of certain specific personal data elements of the domain name registration transaction? Specifically, the Working Group should identify all data that ICANN requires to be collected. This data, together with other data, can potentially be of concern to individual users. With the increasing use of data analytics, a great deal of information about people can be gained by analyzing data from a variety of sources in combination with other data.

Question Four: Any other information that should be considered? -- No Response

Link to original document [{LINK}](#)

2) May 9th 2016 - ALAC Statement on the Proposal for Multi-year Planning of At-Large Face-to-Face meetings

Summary:

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) is charged with representing the interests of individual Internet users by integrating users and user organizations world-wide into the ICANN ecosystem. To help in this endeavor, the ALAC conducts on-boarding and training. As a key component, representatives of At-Large Structures (ALSes) are periodically brought together, generally at ICANN meetings. These gatherings take on two forms: General Assemblies (GAs) where representatives of ALSes from within a single region attend an ICANN meeting held within that region¹; and At-Large Summits, where representatives from ALSes from all regions are brought together at an ICANN meeting to hold both At-Large wide plenaries as well as regional General Assemblies. The pattern that has evolved over the past years is that At-Large Summits have occurred at five-year intervals, and in the intervening years, each region has a General Assembly. There have been two Summits, one in 2009 in Mexico City during ICANN34, and one in 2014 in London during ICANN50. Five GAs (1 per region) were held in 2010-2013, and one GA has been held since London.

Although the funding process has evolved as has general ICANN budgeting, the GAs have been funded through the Community Special Budget Request Process, and the Summits through special requests to the Board Finance Committee.

The pattern of GAs and Summits is now well established and there is a general appreciation of their benefits among the ICANN Community.

The ALAC is proposing: That ICANN integrate these meetings into its normal planning and budgeting processes and do so in such a way as to allow these meetings to be scheduled and planned over multiple years, much as ICANN meetings themselves are planned ahead of time.

Link to original document [{LINK}](#)

3) May 21st 2016 - ALAC Comments on Proposed By-Laws

Summary: The following comments were submitted by Alan Greenberg. They have been reviewed by the ALAC and are now endorsed by a consensus decision of the ALAC.

Section 4.6(e)(v) Background:

The Affirmation of Commitment (AoC) Reviews are being integrated into the By-laws. The AoC called for the reviews to be held every three years, but was unclear as to how the three years was to be measured.

The three years has been interpreted flexibly to allow more time between some reviews and the Board has deferred some reviews due to community overload (with the agreement of the NTIA, the AoC co-signer). The CCWG Proposal required the new reviews to be carried out no less frequently than every five years, measured from the start of one review until the start of the next one. It was recently realized that the last WHOIS review started in October 2010, so when the new Bylaws are adopted, we will already be several months past the October 2015 date for the next one to start and will need to initiate the next one immediately.

Since the required review is on Registration Directory Services Review, renamed from WHOIS Review, we would technically NOT be in default, since there never has been an "RDS Review". But it is assumed that this distinction will not affect ICANN's actions.

It is strongly suggested that the draft Bylaws be revised to allow additional flexibility to defer the RDS review until there is a real RDS or RDS plan to review, and we would even suggest that once implemented, the new Bylaws soon after be amended to add the missing "if feasible".

Section 7.4(d) Background:

The CCWG Proposal requires the Empowered Community (EC) to take a variety of actions but was not specific on exactly how this would happen or what people would take responsibility for ensuring that the actions are carried out. As a result this had to be addressed during Bylaw drafting. The concept of the EC Administration was created, embodied by the Chairs (or other delegates) of the AC/SOs participating in the EC.

Along with the creation (or perhaps naming, since there was always a need for such a body/group) of the EC Administration, a section was added to the draft By-laws placing restrictions on the people involved in the EC Administration.

It is strongly suggested that Section 7.4(d) be replaced by: "No person may serve simultaneously on the EC Administration and as a Director or Liaison to the Board. If a member of the EC Administration is appointed as a Liaison to the Board, that person must be replaced by their AC/SO on the EC Administration prior to the Liaison appointment becoming effective. If a person is nominated by the Nominating Committee or an AC/SO to become a Director, that person must be replaced by their AC/SO on the EC Administration prior to the EC Administration designating that person as a Director and prior to that person taking part in any Board activities as an observer."

Link to original document {[LINK](#)}

Respectfully submitted
By Ron Sherwood (ccNSO/ALAC Liaison)