



**EN**

**AL/ALAC/ST/0812/2**  
**ORIGINAL: English**  
**DATE: 30 August 2012**  
**STATUS: Final**

## **AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **ALAC Reply to Comments on the Draft Statements of ICANN's Role and Remit in Security, Stability, and Resiliency of the Internet's Unique Identifier System**

#### **Introduction**

By the Staff of ICANN

Julie Hammer, ALAC Liaison to the SSAC and At-Large member from the Asian, Australasian and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization (APRALO), composed an initial draft of this Statement after discussion of the topic within At-Large and discussion of the topic on the At-Large Mailing Lists.

On 17 August 2012, this Statement was posted on the [ALAC Reply to Comments on the Draft Statements of ICANN's Role and Remit in Security, Stability, and Resiliency of the Internet's Unique Identifier System Workspace](#).

On that same day, Olivier Crépin- Leblond, Chair of the ALAC, requested ICANN Policy Staff in Support of ALAC to send a call for comments on the draft Statement to all At-Large members via the ALAC-Announce Mailing List.

On 23 August 2012, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Chair of the ALAC, requested that Staff begin an ALAC ratification on the Statement.

On 30 August 2012, Staff confirmed that the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 9 votes in favor, 0 votes against, and 1 abstention. You may review the result independently under: <https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=2611I9Mb7aXMdKExXYHKMcBJ>.

The Chair then requested that the Statement be transmitted to the Public Comment process, copying the ICANN Staff member responsible for this Public Comment topic.

[End of Introduction]

The original version of this document is the English text available at <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence>. Where a difference of interpretation exists or is perceived to exist between a non-English edition of this document and the original text, the original shall prevail.

# ALAC Reply to Comments on the Draft Statements of ICANN's Role and Remit in Security, Stability, and Resiliency of the Internet's Unique Identifier System

On 20 June 2012, [ALAC comments](#) were posted on the '[Draft Statement of ICANN's Role and Remit in Security, Stability and Resiliency of the Internet's Unique Identifier Systems](#)' (which will be referred to in this document as the 'Role and Remit Statement'), which was produced in response to Recommendations 1 and 3 of the [draft report of the Stability, Security and Resiliency of the DNS Review Team \(SSR-RT\)](#).

Following the close of the comment period, the ALAC has reviewed all comments posted by other members of the Community and would like to offer a reply specifically related to the [comments posted by the GNSO ISPCP Constituency](#).

The ALAC recognizes the merit of the views expressed by the GNSO ISPCP Constituency and in particular:

- Agrees that it is important in the context of the Role and Remit Statement to make it clear when it is discussing 'ICANN the corporation' and when it is discussing 'ICANN the community'. The ALAC recognizes that this document is intended to focus primarily on 'ICANN the corporation' but it needs to include substantial reference to 'ICANN the community', especially in relation to any discussion of SSR relationships.
- Agrees that it would strengthen the Role and Remit Statement to provide more detailed descriptions of ICANN's 'coordination role' (Question 1) and its limits (Question 2).
- Supports the need to better define the roles and responsibilities of members of the broader 'ICANN the community' in order to clearly differentiate the role and remit of 'ICANN the corporation'. This is a non-trivial amount of work that will take time, effort and collaboration across the community to complete.
- Endorses the DSSA-WG risk diagram on page 3 of the GNSO ISPCP comments as a sound basis upon which to evolve and build a diagrammatic representation of roles and responsibilities across the SSR ecosystem.
- Endorses the DSSA-WG table on page 7 of the GNSO ISPCP comments as an appropriate list of security management functions upon which to base discussion and definition of roles and responsibilities.

The ALAC also notes that in the [final version of the SSR-RT Report](#), the numbering of some of the Recommendations has changed and that this may lead to some confusion in the context of these discussions. Recommendation 1 in the draft SSR-RT report remains Recommendation 1; however, Recommendation 3 in the draft SSR-RT report has become Recommendation 4 in the final version.

The ALAC again commends the Security Team for this work and looks forward to further collaborating in its evolution.