



## AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**EN**

AL/ALAC/ST/1010/1  
ORIGINAL: English  
DATE: 30 October 2010  
STATUS: FINAL

### **ALAC Statement**

#### **On the Community Working Group Report on Implementation of GNSO New gTLD Recommendation Number 6**

##### **Introduction**

By the Staff of ICANN

On October 25<sup>th</sup>, the Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, asked the Staff of At-Large to start a five-day online ALAC vote on the draft statement on Community Working Group Report on Implementation of GNSO New gTLD Recommendation Number 6. The online vote ended on October 29<sup>th</sup> and resulted in the ALAC endorsing the statement with 12-0 votes.

You may review the result independently under:

<https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=1425xSyrAIDII4siJAWtMCj3>

On October 22<sup>nd</sup>, the At-Large Staff transmitted the Draft Statement to Margie Milam, the ICANN staff person responsible for the public consultation process on Community Working Group Report on Implementation of GNSO New gTLD Recommendation Number 6 with a note saying that the document was currently undergoing ALAC ratification. On November 1<sup>st</sup>, the Statement was submitted to the ICANN Board of Directors.

(End of Introduction)

The original version of this document is the English text available at [www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence](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 Statement on the Community Working Group Report on Implementation of GNSO New gTLD Recommendation Number 6**

The At-Large Community urges the Board to fully implement the consensus recommendations of the Rec6 CWG. The work of this working group was the very example of the multi-stakeholder, bottom-up process that ICANN claims to be its foundation. The Board must encourage the ongoing work of the Rec6 CWG. We are confident that, given some reasonable extra time, outstanding issues that have not yet reached consensus may be resolved.

At-Large has always been generally against the very principle of gTLD string objections based on "morality and public order". However, we see the Rec6 CWG recommendations as an effective way to attend to the most pressing needs while addressing our concerns about the existing implementation. We wholeheartedly concur with the recommendations in the report that achieved *Full Consensus* or *Consensus*. Specifically, we wish to emphasize, as strongly as possible, our support for the CWG's consensus calls to:

- Completely eliminate the term "morality and public order";
- Replace the existing resolution dispute mechanism with processes defined by recommendations 3 and 4 from the CWG Report;
- Limit objection criteria to specific principles of international law and treaty;
- Deny national law as a sole criteria for objections based on these criteria;
- Resolve disputes of this nature early in the application process;
- Require individual government objections to be made either through the Community Objections Process or through one of the ALAC and the GAC;
- Enable the GAC and ALAC to submit objections through the Independent Objector;
- Uphold a gTLD creation process that encourages "the true diversity of ideas, cultures and views on the Internet".

We are also committed to achieving consensus on those issues in which no resolution has yet been made, and encourage the continuation of the CWG in these efforts. We believe that additional time in cross-community discussions would resolve them. We strongly urge support of recommendation of 14.1, to create a "Rec6 Community Implementation Support Team" (Rec6 CIST) to provide input to ICANN Implementation Staff as they further refine implementation details.

It is rewarding and noteworthy that these recommendations, in the main, closely resemble statements on the gTLD application process that were part of the Declaration of the At-Large Summit held during the ICANN meeting of March 2009, which stated:

*We emphatically call for the complete abolition of the class of objections based on morality and public order. We assert that ICANN has no business being in (or delegating) the role of comparing relative morality and conflicting human rights.*

*Abolishing the morality and public order class of objection will eliminate the risk to ICANN of bearing responsibility for delegating morality judgment to an inadequate DSRP.*

*Certain extreme forms of objectionable strings may be addressed through minor*

*modifications to the "Community" class of objection. While we fully appreciate the motivation behind this class of objection, we cannot envision any application of it that will result in fewer problems than its abolition.*

In addition, we wish to explicitly call attention to an issue that received substantial support but not consensus: that a super-majority of the Board should be required to reject gTLD applications based on these criteria.

If any of the above recommendations are seen to be "inconsistent with existing process", that is a clear indication that the "existing process" contains fundamental flaws that have been identified and must be addressed. ICANN's community has spoken in an unprecedented and unambiguous manner, and the At-Large Advisory Committee is proud of our effort to help such divergent views together to produce clear and workable policy.