

**ccNSO/ALAC Liaison Report January 21<sup>st</sup> 2016**  
**Posted January 15<sup>th</sup> 2016**

**1) December 28<sup>th</sup> 2015 - ALAC Statement on the CCWG-Accountability - Draft Proposal on Work Stream 1 Recommendations**

**Introduction:**

Alan Greenberg, Chair of the ALAC and member in the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN Accountability (CCWG-Accountability), composed an initial draft of the ALAC Statement. This Statement is the result of extensive consultation within the At-Large community and the At-Large Ad-Hoc Working Group on IANA Transition and ICANN Accountability. On 16 December and 17 December 2015, briefings on the ALAC Statement were held to solicit input from the wider At-Large Community.

On 21 December 2015, the final draft of the Statement, incorporating the comments received, was posted on the aforementioned workspace and the Chair requested that an ALAC ratification vote on the proposed Statement be held during the ALAC Monthly Teleconference on 22 December 2015.

Link to full document and recommendations {[LINK](#)}

**2) December 21<sup>st</sup> 2015 - ALAC Statement on the gTLD Marketplace Health Index Proposal**

**Summary:**

The Affirmation of Commitments Section 9.3 mandates a review of the new gTLD program and its impact on promoting competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. Overall, since the creation of a gTLD Marketplace Health Index will serve to help analyze the overall health and diversity of the global gTLD marketplace, the ALAC welcomes this initiative.

The current KPI dashboard (<http://www.icann.org/progress>), now in beta, offers a helpful set of immediately recognizable metrics. The difficulty comes in choosing and explaining the make-up of the indexes that are displayed. Any ambiguity might qualify this exercise as being simple box ticking. If not implemented carefully, this is indeed the implied risk of the gTLD Marketplace Health Index.

The proposed Key Performance Indicators and Data Sources are mostly based on the work undertaken by successive working groups on Consumer Trust and Confidence. As they are a follow-up to community work, the ALAC supports all of the candidate concepts listed in the three categories:

## 1. Robust and Competitive gTLD Marketplace 2. Trusted gTLD Marketplace 3. Stable gTLD Marketplace

**Community Questions 1. Are there any additional concepts not identified in this proposal that are vital to a healthy and diverse global gTLD marketplace? a. If yes, what are they? b. How should ICANN measure these additional concepts? c. How can ICANN efficiently collect the data required to measure these additional concepts?**

**From the perspective of FINAL USERS, one of the basic Indicators of health of the DNS should be if the Domain Name is not only legally secure, but also alive and ACTIVE.**

Link to full document and recommendations [{LINK}](#)

## 3) December 16<sup>th</sup> 2015 - ALAC Statement on the New gTLD Program Implementation Review Draft Report

The ALAC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the **New gTLD Program** Implementation Review Draft Report. We recognize that the review has been a self-assessment by ICANN staff of their execution of the processes involved at each stage of the implementation of the **New gTLD Program**. The review provides a pragmatic overview of lessons learned from the implementation process which will not only inform the formal Review Team's assessment of the implementation process but also provide solutions for creating improvements in the effectiveness and efficiency of this process based on staff assessment of this first round of implementation.

Of concern to our community was the life-cycle of the application and evaluation process relating to this first batch of applications and that the remaining applications will still not be completed until the end of 2017 which is far beyond originally projected timeframes. Among the reasons for the delays include some effectiveness and efficiency issues relating to the time spent on some requirements of the application process that may not have been completely necessary for all applications as there was no contractual requirement attached. It was noted that some areas of the application may benefit from further community discussion based on staff lessons learned.

We encourage the Review Team to support the recommendations made by staff, and at the same time give full consideration for more practical support to ensure that the remaining and future batches of applications are expedited as quickly and efficiently as possible.

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

#### **4) December 15<sup>th</sup> 2015 - ALAC Statement on the Proposed implementation of GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations on Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP) Part D**

The ALAC supports the Report of the Implementation of the GNSO Policy Development Process Recommendations of the IRTP-D. However, in discussions in the original WG and the Implementation WG, the ALAC stressed the need for clear and accessible information on both the transfer process itself and the dispute resolution mechanisms for non-compliant transfers. Specifically, the recommendations are:

Recommendation #11: The WG recommends that ICANN take the necessary steps to display information relevant to disputing non-compliant transfers prominently on its website and assure the information is presented in a simple and clear manner and is easily accessible for registrants.

Recommendation #12: The WG recommends that ICANN create and maintain a user-friendly, one-stop website containing all relevant information concerning disputed transfers and potential remedies to registrants. Such a website should be clearly accessible from or integrated into the ICANN Registrants' Benefits and Responsibilities page or similar.

That information is not currently on the ICANN website in a place or format that would be easily accessible and understood by registrants. We therefore urge the GNSO to ensure that such information is provided on the ICANN website in clear, simple language as soon as possible.

Link to original [{LINK}](#)

#### **5) December 2<sup>nd</sup> 2015 - Contractual Compliance Mission and Consumer Trust - Letter to Fadi Chehadé**

##### **Introduction:**

On December 2<sup>nd</sup> Alan Greenberg, Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee wrote to ICANN President, Fadi Chehadé , seeking clarification on a number of items as they relate to ICANN staff functions and the issue of Consumer Trust.

##### **Update:**

Link to original Letter [{LINK}](#)

Link to full reply from Fadi Chehadé [{LINK}](#)

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