



## PROPOSAL

# EN

### AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

AL.AC/RV.0909/1  
ORIGINAL: English  
DATE: 17<sup>th</sup> September 2009  
STATUS: DRAFT  
Author : Rudi Vansnick

## **Develop relationship between ALSes and ccTLDs**

**As part of the inter constituency relationship between ccNSO and ALAC.  
Working group ALS – ccTLD bridge**

### **1 Purpose**

At Large is the name for the community of individual Internet users who participate in the policy development work of ICANN. Currently, more than 100 groups representing the views of individual Internet users are active throughout the world. You can learn more about the community and its activities on this website, as well as how to join and participate in building the future of the worldwide Domain Name System (DNS) and other unique identifiers which every single user of the Internet relies on every time they go online.

Under the umbrella of participation in building the future of the DNS, a closer relationship between existing regional At Large Structures and ccTLDs (specifically, small and medium-sized operators) is desirable. The actual relationship between ccTLDs and ALSes is based on individual approaches while at the top there is a closer collaboration between ALAC and ccNSO through the liaisons. The global purpose of this project is to co-ordinate and assist ALSes in approaching and strengthen their relationship with the national/local ccTLD organisation. Where ccTLDs are not member of ccNSO, the ALS could help in making the ccTLD member of the ccNSO while ccTLDs could help in having regional ALSes where they are not yet present.

### **2 Scope**

During the last ICANN face-2-face meeting in Sydney a first step in the set-up of this project has been achieved. A second step would consist in establishing a (small) working group which would work on the pragmatic approach to develop relationship between ALSes and ccTLDs as described in point 1.

I would like to split up the ccTLDs in 3 groups :

- the “big” ones (large number of domain names booked)
- the middle ones having still an important number of domain names booked less representative for the country
- the small ones (especially in regions like Africa, South America, some parts of Asia and Pacific Islands);

Why this split? The approach of the ccTLD's will be different. For the first group ALSes in that specific country would not bring added value to the ccTLD, perhaps they are already linked and are networking together. As such the level of approach would

rather go in the direction of having an open communication channel allowing them to comment on some topics or issues without having to go through official bodies and procedures. I refer here to the already known issues in abuse of domain names.

The second group will rather be in balance with the ALSes, so the relationship could be build up on promotional campaigns in both directions. Policy in regards rights of internet users, domain name owners could also be an extra topic of discussion in the relationship.

In the third group the added value of the ALSes would be high, even in some cases very high. The ALSes could influence the promotion of the TLD in those countries through their membership. Policy and governance will be more important topic. As we know that in certain countries ccTLDs are managed by government there are very often political agendas not allowing as such the participation of external groups or organisations (ALSes).

However, in order to obtain a clear view on the existing situations in relationships between ALSes and ccTLDs, I would like to propose a small survey, organised regionally (through the RALOs), at our ALSes. The survey would consist of a few questions helping us in defining the typical approaches for each region and permitting us to report back to ccNSO on the present situation of relationships between ALSes and ccTLDs.

### **3 Process of the project**

Time line would be as follows :

- proposal working group **ALS – ccTLD bridge** during ICANN meeting in Seoul and creation of basic team (max 5);
- set-up and running survey : day 0 + 30 days;
- collecting information and build report : day 31 + 30 days;
- report to ALAC results and make proposition of dissemination of results : ICANN meeting in Nairobi (March 2010).

Eventually, if possible, plan a first meeting with chair ALAC + chair ccNSO and liaisons on the outcome and possible proposal of action during the ICANN meeting in Seoul.

Having had a small meeting with Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Andrés Piazza, I got already their commitment to participate in this working group with the above goal. I would like to have one person per RALO in this group. As such, I would like to ask ALAC for approval to allow me to work out this working group as soon as possible.

### **4 Membership of the working group ALS – ccTLD bridge**

The **ALS – ccTLD bridge** WG will have the following members:

- 5 ALAC members representing the 5 Ralo's;
- the ALAC liaison.

The **ALS – ccTLD bridge** WG may select its own chair from the members of the Working Group. ICANN will provide adequate staff support to the WG.