



EN

AL-ALAC-ST-0406-01-01-EN

ORIGINAL: English

DATE: 16 April 2018

STATUS: Ratified

## AT-LARGE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

### ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests

#### Introduction

Justine Chew, Individual Member of the Asian, Australasian and Pacific Islands Regional At-Large Organization (APRALO), developed an initial draft of the Statement on behalf of the ALAC.

On 27 March 2018, the first draft of the Statement was posted on its [At-Large workspace](#).

On 30 March 2018, the ALAC Chair submitted comment. On that same date, ICANN Policy Staff in support of the At-Large Community sent a Call for Comments on the Statement to the At-Large Community via the ALAC Work mailing list.

On 02 April 2018, ICANN Policy Staff requested an extension for submission of the comment on behalf of the ALAC Chair. A [version incorporating additional comments](#) received was posted on the aforementioned workspace on 06 April 2018 and the ALAC Chair requested that Staff open an ALAC ratification vote.

In the interest of time, the ALAC 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 12 April 2018, Staff confirmed that the online vote results in the ALAC endorsing the Statement with 13 votes in favor, 0 vote against, and 0 abstention. Please note 86.67% (13) of the 15 ALAC Members participated in the poll. The ALAC Members who participated in the poll are (alphabetical order by first name): Alan Greenberg, Alberto Soto, Andrei Kolesnikov, Bastiaan Goslings, Hadia Elminiawi, Holly Raiche, Javier Rua-Jovet, John Laprise, Kaili Kan, Maureen Hilyard, Ricardo Holmquist, Sebastien Bachollet and Tijani Ben-Jemaa. 2 ALAC Members, Bartlett Morgan and Seun Ojedeji, did not vote. You may view the result independently under: <https://www.bigpulse.com/pollresults?code=557147fLyKIIfYct4CykDFQIA7>. Note: 4 ALAC Members voted manually after poll close.

## **ALAC Statement on ALAC Statement on ALAC Statement on Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests**

The ALAC thanks the ICANN organization for the extended opportunity to provide comments to the the Draft Procedure for Community gTLD Change Requests of 31 January 2018 ("Draft Procedure") for ICANN to consider changes to Specification 12 of Community generic Top Level Domain (gTLD) Registry Agreements requested by community gTLD registry operators. Community TLDs are of crucial importance to At-Large.

The ALAC notes that this said draft procedure was developed by ICANN org in collaboration with the Community gTLD Change Request Process Working Group and with input from RySG members and the ALAC is supportive of the guiding principles for a procedure which is consistent with Section 2.19 of Community gTLD Registry Agreements and one which would prevent Community gTLD Registry Operators from seeking to modify the Community Registration Policies enumerated in the Specification 12 of their respective Community gTLD Registry Agreements, that would remove those Community Registration Policies, excessively broaden or narrow registrant eligibility and/or name selection requirements, or result in significant negative impact to the TLD Community.

The ALAC supports the Draft Procedure (including the proposed Community gTLD Change Request Form), **subject to three provisos** touching on the following areas:-

### **(1) Required outreach to the TLD Community**

The ALAC notes that each "TLD Community" would be unique to what a Community gTLD Registry Operator has described within its Specification 12 and we understand that a change in circumstances may lead a Community gTLD Registry Operator to seek a Community gTLD Change Request.

While we are supportive of the requirement for consultation with and inclusion of documentation of support by the TLD Community, we would like to clarify that under section 2.1 of the Draft Procedure, where there has been a departure in the description of the TLD Community originally provided for by the Community gTLD Registry Operator in their Specification 12, the nature and reason(s) for this departure must clearly be included in the Community gTLD Change Request submitted by the Community gTLD Registry Operator.

A requirement for this declaration would immediately assist in flagging a question of whether the interests of the TLD Community originally described by the Community gTLD Registry Operator in their Specification 12 are impacted on and how so, and if those members of the TLD Community so affected have been consulted as part of their Community gTLD Registry Operator's Community gTLD Change Request, and if not, why not.

We believe this requirement would also add value to ICANN's performance of reviewing evidence of gTLD Community outreach and support as specified under section 3.1(b) of the Draft Procedure.

### **(2) Change Request Comment Period**

The ALAC recommends that the commenting process referred to under section 2.3 of the Draft Procedure be specified as a formal ICANN Public Comment which follows the regular ICANN Operational Consultations process.

### **(3) Approval Criteria**

The ALAC recommends that the target timeframes of 30 days mentioned in sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 of the Draft Procedure be made clearer for avoidance of doubt and to maintain consistency with the rest of the Draft Procedure, and hence proposes that they be amended to read as follows:-

"3.2.1 Approval

If ICANN determines the Request is approved, ICANN shall provide approval to the Registry Operator within **30 days of the determination** or shall provide written explanation and indication of the new deadline in case of delay. ....

3.2.2 Rejection

If ICANN determines the Request is rejected, ICANN shall notify the Registry Operator of its rejection of the Change Request and clearly state its rationale for rejecting the Request within **30 days of the determination** or shall provide written explanation and indication of the new deadline in case of delay."

We would also appreciate the opportunity to understand and comment on any other approval or rejection criteria that may be included in this Draft Procedure hereon.