



EN

AL-ALAC-ST-0117-02-01-EN

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: 29 January 2017

STATUS: Final

AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ALAC Statement on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition

Introduction

Yrjo Lansipuro, ALAC Member of the European Regional At-Large Organization (EURALO) and ALAC Liaison to the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC), developed an initial draft of the ALAC Statement on behalf of the ALAC.

On 12 January 2017, the first draft of the Statement was posted on the [At-Large Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition Workspace](#).

On that same date, Alan Greenberg, Chair of the ALAC, asked ICANN Policy Staff in support of the At-Large Community to send a Call for Comments on the Statement to the At-Large Community via the [ALAC Announce Mailing List](#).

On 20 January 2017, a version incorporating the comments received was posted on the aforementioned workspace and the Chair requested that Staff open an ALAC ratification vote.

In the interest of time, the Chair requested that the Statement be transmitted to the ICANN public comment process, copying the ICANN Staff member responsible for this topic, with a note that the Statement is pending ALAC ratification.

On 29 January 2017, Staff confirmed that the online vote resulted in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 13 votes in favor, 0 vote against, and 0 abstention. You may view the result independently under: <https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=6508gBCVWUXPDV92APAnxG7k>.

ALAC Statement on the Identifier Technology Health Indicators: Definition

The initiative to define and measure indicators of the technological health of all ICANN-coordinated identifiers (Identifier Technology Health Indicators - ITHI) should not be confused with the other current “health” project that focuses on the condition of the gTLD marketplace. Nevertheless, there is a relationship between the two.

When the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) commented on the gTLD marketplace health index, it advised that developing a Key Performance Indicator (KPI) must first start with the insight into the ecosystem that the KPI is intended to convey, then develop metrics that best convey that insight, instead of just relying on data that happens to be available.

This approach informs the ITHI which asks each community to define a set of potential strategic risks that they are concerned about, and second, once those strategic risks are understood, propose to work with each operational community to define metrics that would help in tracking those strategic risks. Using an interesting but somewhat risky medical metaphor, the document defines the health of identifier system as an absence of five “diseases”, each with their description, symptoms, causes, risk factors, complications, impact and potential treatment.

Metaphors are sometimes useful in explaining complicated things in a more understandable language. However, carrying the medical analogy too far risks just substituting one jargon with another (complete with Latin terminology) and putting off potential readers. This would be a pity, because the approach itself has much value.

The ALAC would thus recommend simplifying and “de-Latinizing” the document. We fully support the basic approach rooted in SAC077, as applied to the ITHI.