

ALAC Requirements for Affirmation of Commitment Reviews Call for Applicants

Number of ALAC Seats per Review Team

While understanding the desire to limit Review Team size, the ALAC believes that our single seat allocation in the ATRT was both insufficient and sent a poor message to the At-Large Community regarding how much their opinion and contributions into this process was valued and appreciated. That cannot be changed, but we believe that the allocation for future reviews must not make the same mistake.

We believe that the number of seats required will vary based on the subject matter of the review being carried out and on the degree of involvement and/or concern our AC has in that matter. Focusing on the two RTs to be convened this year:

Whois Policy

Based on very differing views within At-Large, particularly on the issue of privacy, and on the wide range of cultural and linguistic backgrounds that we represent, the ALAC believes that we should be allocated 3 seats on the team. This is the minimum number that will allow us, and ultimately the Selectors, to reasonably represent the diversity in views, geography and cultural backgrounds that make up At-Large.

Preserving security, stability and resiliency of the DNS

The ALAC believes suitable technical expertise and experience must be demonstrated by applicants. To that end from we propose that 2 seats be allocated - one reserved for the current ALAC Liaison to the SSAC (so a positional as opposed to personal role allocation, but a standard application will also be submitted) and one other to allow for geographic, cultural and economic development differences within our global community.

Endorsement Timing

The process that the ALAC will use to endorse applicants is not yet finalized. However, it does not need to be part of the documents distributed to potential applicants.

In terms of timing, the 45 days following the close of the applications period requested by the GNSO will be sufficient for our purposes as well.

Requirements for applicants seeking ALAC endorsement

Whois policy

1. A statement of why the applicant believes that he/she is in a position to fairly evaluate ICANN's Whois policy from a perspective of effectiveness in meeting the often competing requirements.
2. A statement of why the applicant believes that he/she will be able to do this from the perspective of the global ICANN At-Large Community and the ALAC. Various groups within At-Large have differing views on some Whois issues, particularly those related to privacy. The statement should make it clear if or how the applicant balances these views.
3. An attestation that the applicant is able and willing to commit the required time to the review over its planned one year duration. It is expected that this time commitment will vary depending on the stage of the review, but will range from 4-5 hours per week to 3-4 days per week (the latter including face-to-face meetings).
4. An indication of whether the applicant would be representing any other party or person through her/his review team participation and, if so, identification of that party or person.

Preserving security, stability and resiliency of the DNS

1. A statement of why the applicant believes that he/she is in a position to fairly evaluate ICANN's plans for DNS security, stability and resiliency; as well as the implementations of such plans. The statement should give some indication of what the applicant believes are the critical issues in this review.
2. A statement of why the applicant believes that he/she will be able to do this from the perspective of the global ICANN At-Large Community and the ALAC.
3. An attestation that the applicant is able and willing to commit the required time to the review over its planned one year duration. It is expected that this time commitment will vary depending on the stage of the review, but will range from 4-5 hours per week to 3-4 days per week (the latter including face-to-face meetings).
4. An indication of whether the applicant would be representing any other party or person through her/his review team participation and, if so, identification of that party or person.