ALAC / At-Large @ ICANN68
Talking Points and Policy Sessions

During the ICANN68 Virtual Policy Forum, the ALAC/At-Large community will evangelize talking points regarding the end user perspective on DNS Abuse, Registrant Data, Subsequent Procedures, Registry Voluntary Commitments (previously PICs), and Universal Acceptance (UA).

DNS Abuse

- **Talking Points**
    1. Current levels of DNS Abuse are unacceptable and rising.
    2. Compliance needs new tools to combat systemic DNS Abuse.
    3. No new round of applications until DNS Abuse is addressed.
- Relevant Sessions at ICANN68
    1. DNS Abuse and Malicious Registrations During COVID-19
    2. DNS Abuse: Establishing an Acceptable Threshold
    3. DNS Abuse: COVID-19 and End-user Issues
    4. GAC DNS Abuse Mitigation (with PSWG) (Note: 2 Sessions)
    5. DNSSEC and Security Workshop

Notes

ALAC, in its advice to the ICANN Board (Dec 2019) recommends defining bad actors based on quartiles: Identify the registrars that fall outside of the pattern of the rest of the registrars, perhaps by using a fraction like #ofabusedomains/#ofdomainssponsored. See this article for details. To do this, the ALAC: 1) objects to any attempt by ICANN org or community members to stop collecting registrar data, and 2) recommends that the ICANN DAAR project be whitelisted from all registrar and registry WHOIS / RDAP rate limiting.

Given that the issue of DNS abuse is an important concern for At-Large, there will be two sessions devoted to this topic during ICANN68. The first will be a session focused on DNS abuse during the COVID-19 pandemic focusing on end user issues. The second DNS abuse session is a cross-community collaboration to discuss a more defined role for ICANN-accredited registrars with regards to DNS abuse, which is one of the recommendations from the ALAC Advice statement. For more information, see At-Large and DNS Abuse on the At-Large website.

Registrant Data

- **Talking Points**
    1. Want to protect the privacy of registrants.
    2. Need to balance with consumer protection.
    3. Current EPDP outcome insufficient to protect individual end users.
- Relevant Sessions at ICANN68
    1. (GNSO) - Registration Data Policy IRTDNS
    2. DNS Abuse: COVID-19 and End-user Issues

Notes

See ALAC statement on Initial Report of the Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Team – PHASE 2 (23 March 2020)
See ALAC statement on Registration Directory Service (RDS-WHOIS2) Review Team Final Report (12 December 2019)
See ALAC advice to the ICANN Board on GNSO Expedited Policy Development Process (EPDP) on the Temporary Specification for gTLD Registration Data Policy Recommendations for ICANN Board Consideration (17 April 2019)

See recent [CPWG meetings](#), EPDP II updates by Hadia Elminiawi and Alan Greenberg, ALAC Members to the EPDP.

Subsequent Procedures

- **Talking Points**
    1. The work of the SubPro WG is incomplete.
    2. DNS concerns must be addressed prior to ANY new round.
    3. Remain concerned about indigenous and community participation.
- Relevant Sessions at ICANN68
    1. GNSO - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG
    2. PICS and PICDRP: What's the Right Path Forward?
    3. DNS Abuse: COVID-19 and End-user Issues
    4. GAC Subsequent Rounds Discussions (Note: 3 Sessions)
    5. New gTLD Applicants: Expanding the Circle

Notes
See recent [CPWG meetings](#), SubPro updates by Justine Chew, member of the SubPro WG and ALAC Member of APRALO.
See ALAC statement on [Work Track 5 on Geographic Names at the Top Level - Supplemental Initial Report of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process](#) (22 Jan 2019)
See ALAC statement on [Supplemental Initial Report on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (Overarching Issues & Work Tracks 1-4)](#) (21 December 2018)

Registry Voluntary Commitments (previously PICs)

- **Talking Points**
    1. Must have a way to hold registries to their commitments
    2. History of PICs is difficulty with enforcement
    3. Contract Compliance must identify RVCs which will be difficult to enforce
    4. At-Large Requires Means/Money to bring a DRP on behalf of End Users
- Relevant Sessions at ICANN68
    1. PICS and PICDRP: What's the Right Path Forward?
    2. GAC Subsequent Rounds Discussions (Note: 3 Sessions)

Notes
Registry Voluntary Commitments (previously Public Interest Commitments), have an unfortunate history of ineffectiveness and unenforceability. The CCT Review Team reported that the PICs made little different to registry behavior in new gTLDs. This is unfortunate given the desire of end users to see a more semantic web (ie gTLDs that reflect content), governments need to protect consumers and the desire of registries to have a mechanism to make commitments to ICANN. Not only did this come up during the 2012 round of new gTLDs but also in the context of the proposed aquisitioni of PIRS by Ethos Capital. Accordingly, we need to find a way to scope those RVCs that can easily be enforced by ICANN's Contract Compliance teams and those that will require a DRP. In the latter case, the current requirement for direct harm makes DRPs difficult to launch. The At-Large would ask for the standing and support to bring RVC DRPs on behalf of "individual end users," generally.

Universal Acceptance (UA)

- **Talking Points**
    1. 80% of websites non-compliant.
    2. Undermines ICANN's credibility.
    3. Must be addressed prior to ANY new round.
- Relevant Sessions at ICANN68
    1. Universal Acceptance Annual Strategic Action Plan Webinar (PREP)

Other Sessions of Interest

- The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks and Challenges
- ICANN and COVID-19 – Advancing Policy Work in the Current Environment

Notes
The DNS and the Internet of Things: Opportunities, Risks and Challenges (Tuesday, 23 June @ 05:00 UTC / 13:00 KL)
Zoom Webinar Link: https://icann.zoom.us/j/92051842416
Session info: https://68.schedule.icann.org/meetings/rsn2yoT8HYXaqZmy5

The At-Large continues to follow developments of IoT and the DNS, with stakeholder meetings with the SSAC on the topic. The At-Large Liaison to the SSAC, Andrei Kolesnikov, provides reporting to the At-Large on the topic to the ALAC and Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG).

The At-Large supported the SAC105 paper on the topic, with Olivier Crepin-Leblond, CPWG Co-Chair, [noting](#): "The matter was discussed on the ALAC call of 27 August 2019. Andrei Kolesnikov, ALAC Liaison to the SSAC, mentioned that SAC105 was not a Statement as such that required any action from SOs and ACs. The purpose of SAC105 is purely informational and doe not require any response from anyone. Thus it was felt that the ALAC did not need to comment on this topic. Perhaps, as an alternative a note from the ALAC Chair to the SSAC Chair congratulating the SSAC for its excellent document SAC105, would be a nice way forward. The ALAC should also bear in mind the existence of this document, to be used in future ICANN Strategic Planning discussions."

ICANN and COVID-19 – Advancing Policy Work in the Current Environment (Thursday, 25 June @ 05:00 UTC / 13:00 KL)
Zoom Webinar Link: https://icann.zoom.us/j/94440718839
Session info: https://68.schedule.icann.org/meetings/R2oKcfymPMACChq3j

The ALAC Chair, Maureen Hilyard, identified earlier this year during the onset of the pandemic the At-Large Priority Activities for 2020. See: https://community.icann.org/x/MSiJBw The priorities include policy advice development, Post-ATLAS III Activities (Post-ATLAS III Feedback, At-Large Regional Policy Engagement Plan, At-Large Review Implementation, ALS Mobilization, At-Large Review Implementation, At-Large Position Descriptions, At-Large Policy Platform, Capacity Building, Outreach & Engagement, Operations/Communications), 2020 At-Large Elections, Selections and Appointments, and ICANN Meeting planning.

The ALAC Chair noted, "there is a growing concern at the moment relating to the pressure that volunteers in At-Large and other constituencies are feeling as they try to keep up with their regular schedule of working group meetings (…) There will understandably be those who will have to reduce their participation temporarily. Depending on how long this situation continues, another reality is that it is inevitable that we will lose members who cannot sustain the cost of internet connection - especially those in developing countries where internet costs are high yet connectivity is low."