

# ccNSO/ALAC Liaison Report May 12<sup>th</sup> 2016

## Posted May 9<sup>th</sup> 2016

### 1) May 6<sup>th</sup> 2016 - [ALAC Statement on the Draft ICANN FY17 Operating Plan & Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan Update](#)

#### Introduction

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) reviewed the draft FY17 Operating Plan & Budget, and found it generally well done, with more clarity compared to the ones in previous years.

That being said, the ALAC has identified a number of areas that need further clarification:

In the draft FY17 Operating Plan & Budget, it is considered that the PTI is established to carry out the IANA naming function only, and that there will be an IANA department in ICANN (different from the PTI) to carry out the other two IANA functions (numbering and protocol parameters). This is not consistent with what is proposed in the CWG-Stewardship Final Report.

However, the ALAC understands that since the publication of the Draft FY17 Operating Plan & Budget, this issue has been discussed with the CWG Implementation Oversight Task Force and that the plan and budget will be fully aligned with the CWG Stewardship Final Report, with PTI assuming all three roles.

The ALAC is submitting, under separate cover, a proposal to integrate multiyear planning for At-Large General Assemblies and Summit meetings into the ICANN operating plan & budget instead of using community special budget support and ad hoc requests.

See the full document and the proposed answers to the above ALAC questions.

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

### 2) April 23<sup>rd</sup> 2016 - [ALAC Statement on the Final Report Recommendations of the Geographic Regions Review Working Group](#)

#### Introduction

The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC) appreciates the excellent work done by the Geographic Regions Review Working Group. The improvement this final report brings is appreciated.

The origin of the ICANN Geographic Regions was the need to ensure a geographic diversity within the ICANN Board. We strongly believe that the Geographic Regions review should address that very aspect to preserve and improve the geographic diversity in the ICANN Board composition. The ALAC agrees that the general principle of geographic diversity is valuable and should be preserved and that its application must be more rigorous, clear and consistent.

One aspect of the rigorousness, the clarity and the consistency should be to define one single criterion for the identification of a person's region. Today, for the ICANN Board of Directors, it is a choice between citizenship (or origin) and residency. This non-rigorous approach may result in having a large number of the Board Directors residing and working for long time in the same region, thus having the same spirit and the same interests.

The ALAC supports ICANN formally adopting and maintaining its own record of the assignment of countries and territories to ICANN's Geographic Regions, and the ALAC believes that the Board should have the ultimate oversight over the ICANN Geographic Regions' framework including the 5 years review and reassignment process.

See the original document for a full understanding of the ALAC concerns and comments on this subject.  
**Link to original document** [{LINK}](#)

### **3) April 16<sup>th</sup> 2016 - ALAC Statement on the Draft Framework of Principles for Cross Community Working Groups**

#### **Introduction**

The ALAC has supported the creation of Cross Community Working Groups (interchangeably referenced as CCWGs or CWGs) for this very reason. Historically the ALAC as a co-Chartering Organization of several of these Cross Community Working Groups, is well aware of the diverse requirements and the current lack of unity regarding the chartering process and framework by which those groups operate. The ALAC must however call attention to a number of important points that warrant further discussions:

1. The finite nature of a CCWG's life cycle
2. Chartering Organizations' decisions on a CCWG's output
3. Additional points include the following questions:
  - Should there be a requirement that all CCWG recommendations must be considered by the ICANN Board, if minimum requirements are met (similar to the GNSO Policy Development Process)?
  - Should more formalized Operating Procedures be developed for CCWGs?
  - Should additional mechanisms be developed to deal with situations in which Chartering Organizations may disagree or want to discontinue their engagement?
  - Should there be a mechanism to close a CCWG if it is clear that it will not be possible to produce a final report or that circumstances have overtaken the need for a CCWG? (See Section 3.3.4 and 3.4.2 above)
  - Should specific requirements be listed for the appointment of members?
  - Who launches a call for volunteers/participants?

See the full document and the proposed answers to the above ALAC questions.

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

*Respectfully submitted  
By Ron Sherwood (ccNSO/ALAC Liaison)*