

ccNSO Advise on Consumer Choice Trust and Competition metrics

Introduction and Background

At its meeting 10 December 2010, the ICANN Board requested advice from the GNSO, ccNSO, ALAC and GAC on establishing the definition, measures, and three-year targets for those measures, for competition, consumer trust and consumer choice in the context of the domain name system (DNS), such advice to be provided for discussion at the ICANN International Public meeting in San Francisco from 13-18 March 2011 (See: <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-10dec10-en.htm>).

The requested advise, in particular the proposed measures and 3 years metrics will be part of the review to examine the extent to which the introduction or expansion of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice. This review is intended when new gTLDs (whether in ASCII or other language character sets) have been in operation for one year.

At the time the ccNSO Council deferred the discussion to the GNSO, awaiting their initiative on this matter.

Following the Board request the GNSO established a working group on Consumer Choice, Trust, and Competition Working Group (CCI WG) to produce an Advice Letter for consideration by Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs) in order to assist them in responding to the Board request. The WG included members from ALAC as well and none from the ccTLD community.

The GNSO Metrics WG has prepared an advice letter (reference included). The ccNSO is requested to review the material of the WG and to formulate its own advice to the Board as originally requested by the Board. The CCIWG advise was up for public comment, and has been finalized. The ALAC has already submitted their acceptance and a GAC position is anticipated as well.

The Final draft advise was on the GNSO Council agenda for discussion at it's meeting on 13 September. Decision making on the Advise has been deferred and is now scheduled for the GNSO Council meeting in Toronto (17 October, same day as the ccNSO Council meeting).

Options

1. Defer decision making until the ccNSO Council has been properly briefed on the advise by the CCI WG and the GNSO Council position is clear (post Toronto). The topic should be included as part of the joint ccNSO-GNSO meeting (briefing and status update GNSO Council deliberations). The potential decisions could:
 - a. ccNSO Council letter;
 - b. ccNSO Statement following the ccNSO Statement Procedure

2. The ccNSO formulates its own independent advise, taking into account the work done by the CCIWG, following the ccNSO Statement procedure.
3. The ccNSO does not take a position on this matter, although requested as such by the Board.

Suggested way forward

Assuming the ccNSO Council intends to provide an advise to the Board, the preferred option a ccNSO position following the ccNSOP Statement procedure, as this will reflect broad support for the position. As the CCIWG advise has already been supported by ALAC and is now under consideration by the GAC it is advised to take the CCIWG as a baseline.

Note that it will take at least 7 weeks to develop a ccNSO Statement as of the moment the council decides to do so (assuming we can find volunteers).

Annex A:

Request from ICANN staff supporting the WG to forward to the cNSO.

Most recently the Consumer Metrics WG created their final version of an advice letter to be submitted to the ICANN Board about defining Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition for the Affirmation of Commitments. The WG was also chartered to create metrics and proposed three year targets. As a part of the Board resolution, the advice was also requested of the ALAC, GAC and ccNSO.

Can you help to push the two links below out to your community so that they can review material and begin to formulate their advice to the Board as well?

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/cctc/cctc-final-advice-letter-17aug12-en.pdf>

<http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/cctc/cctc-next-steps-17aug12-en.pdf>

The ALAC has already submitted their acceptance and I anticipate the GAC to do the same.