# ALAC/At-Large ICANN66 Talking Points

***ICANN66 Plenary Session Topics:***

* *EPDP Phase 2: Unified Access Model for Non-Public gTLD Registration Data*
* *DNS Abuse*
* *Evolution of ICANN Multistakeholder Model*

# EPDP Phase II

Discussions around ICANN’s implementation of GDPR as it pertains to registrant (people who own their own domain names) data has entered its second phase. In phase one, the working group determined which data should be collected by registrars, which should remain public and which data is only made available to specific parties under specific circumstances. The At-Large community continues to be concerned that no geographic differentiation is proposed nor any distinction between individuals and legal entities. Our focus continues to be on minimizing the impact these changes will have on non-registrant end users, simply trying to use the internet. Therefore, we want to make sure that those involved, directly or indirectly, in consumer protection have access to relevant data about domain registrants. We have already seen a decrease in utility of SPAM and malware databases in the interim so the impact on individual end users is real. Specifically, the At-Large

* Request that the issue of geographic differentiation be re-opened during the EPDP Phase 2 in light of the new legal opinion and the lack of considering the competing needs of privacy vs the benefits of non-redaction on cyber-security activities and that the ensuing discussion factor in the needs of those using the data for cyber-security and other legitimate purposes;
* Request that the issue of legal/natural differentiation be discussed during the EPDP Phase 2 explicitly considering the competing needs of those using the data for cybersecurity and other legitimate purposes;
* Request independent studies related to the implementation of geographic and legal/natural differentiation as well as the impact of the Temporary Specification implementation on cyber-security.
* Support ICANN taking on as much of the liability for registrars and registries as possible.
* Support automation of data disclosure whenever possible.

# Evolution of ICANN’s Multistakeholder Model

ICANN has begun an exploration of its multi-stakeholder model for policy development and management of the DNS. Conversations have begun around places for improvement and the identification of initiatives that are ongoing to address those challenges. As an “advisory committee,” the At-Large have some unique challenges when attempting to insert themselves into deliberations in the ICANN community and remain committed to strengthening the voice of the individual end user and vigilant of any reforms that might adversely impact our influence. Specifically, the At-Large believe

* There is a need for a rebalancing of participation and powers within the ICANN organization.
* The At-Large Advisory Committee [believes in the ICANN priorities](https://community.icann.org/display/alacpolicydev/At-Large%2BWorkspace%3A%2BFirst%2BConsultation%2Bon%2Ba%2B2-Year%2BPlanning%2BProcess) of keeping the Internet secure and stable, and maintaining the multistakeholder model, and for the community to be directly involved in setting other priorities.
* The ALAC strongly believes that for ICANN appropriate resources must be made available to remove barriers that might prevent the full participation of the ICANN community in policy activities.
* The ALAC supports a system that:
  + strengthens the security of the Domain Name System (DNS) and the DNS Root Server System,
  + evolving the unique identifier systems to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base, addressing geopolitical issues impacting ICANN’s mission to ensure a single and globally interoperable Internet,

and ensuring ICANN’s long-term financial sustainability.

* Both the GAC and ALAC believe that including non-expert stakeholders to meaningfully participate in ICANN’s multi-stakeholder policy development processes

**DNS Abuse**

It has become increasingly imperative that the ICANN community address the challenge of DNS abuse in its many forms. According to the review of the last round of new TLDs by the Consumer Competition, Choice and Trust Review Team (CCTRT), the safeguards put in place in the last round were not effective and the compliance operation inside ICANN does not have the necessary tools to combat DNS abuse. There are discussions going on now about how to define DNS Abuse but there are also settled definitions that could be employed for immediate reform. Specifically, the At-Large believe

* DNS Abuse is one of the biggest challenges faced by Individual End Users
* No new round of TLD applications should begin without a thorough reform effort to mitigate DNS abuse.
* A good start is the implementation of the recommendations from the CCT RT