

Hello Izumi, I trust this email (later than I'd planned I'm afraid) finds you in Lisbon and in good health...

I did manage to elicit some responses from my outreach efforts regarding your draft... Realising that our small contribution will be only part of what you receive rather than edit the text per se I include below the following comments, points and sentiments from those organisations / people who did respond... by COB Friday.

Firstly, we must recognise that our experience here in .au is very different from the gTLD world... here we have considerable public interest and individual user input into our Domain Name system and policy development and we also (in many ways *because* of this input) have strong rules such as our eligibility criteria for all of our Open 2ld's... see <http://www.ada.org.au/policies/ada-2005-02/>

These rules go a long way towards giving our Domain Name users and general public interest of the Internet a great deal of security and confidence in names in the .au space... so even our consumer advocacy groups such as CTN see www.ctn.org.au have had little direct experiences of the types of frustrations that those only accessing the open slather gTLD's and may therefore be at some variance with those public interest and consumer protection driven views...

Further in October 2005 <http://www.ada.org.au/news-archive/ada-14102005/> & March 2006 <http://www.ada.org.au/pdf/ada-domainmon-public.pdf> auDA undertook a public consultation process regarding Domain Monetisation and this resulted in the publication of our auDA Policy [Clarification of Close and Substantial Connection Rule - Domain Monetisation \(2006-03\)](#) on 20 July 2006.

A full listing of the public submissions received can be found at <http://www.ada.org.au/reviews/monetisation-2006/> and I specifically stated in my distribution of your draft document that I would be pointing these references out to you for use by the ALAC, and that therefore no reiteration of those specific points needed to be made by the respondents.

In general, support, was received for the intent of the text you provided as Draft resolutions to the various councils on Domain Tasting but **not** for the text titled 'On Domain Monitization'

Based upon this and on the background information provided previously in this report, the following important points were made by our respondents.

- That the ALAC is to be encouraged to express their request in terms relating specifically to ICANN's mission and core values. e.g. part of ICANN's mission is to ensure the stable and secure operation of the Internet's unique identifier systems, and one of its core values is preserving and enhancing the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

- Any issues report that is produced through the ICANN policy development process, will need to answer whether the issue is within ICANN's mission and core values - rather than whether the issue is indeed something of importance to end users.

-ICANN is not explicitly a consumer protection body. If it is purely a consumer protection issue - then the first point of contact could well be a registrar code of conduct, or perhaps alerting the relevant consumer protection bodies in each country - e.g Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) in Australia, or the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) in the USA to investigate.

An example of such a code of conduct as it operates in Australia can be found at <http://www.auda.org.au/policies/auda-2004-04/> and the committee process by which this was developed can be followed in documents linked from the following page <http://www.auda.org.au/cop/cop-index/> and a full list of auDA Panels and committee activities past and present can be found at <http://www.auda.org.au/panels/panels-index/>

Kindest regards,

Cheryl Langdon-Orr
(CLO)