From the ALAC List -- An interesting summary of pre- and post- vote comments on the ICANN board triple x decision.

Dear All,

The discussion by members of the [ICANN] Board, before the vote, was quite revealing. Here is a brief résumé of positions expressed (not in the order of speakers):

George S., who voted against, offered, by far, the most constructed and forward-looking position, based on 5 points:

* The vote was NOT about "adult content". If dot-xxx were not approved, the amount and availability of pornography would not change much;

* ICM built its "sponsored" application on what it said was wide community sponsorship. We saw this was not true (the pornography industry spoke strongly against ICM's application). George pointed out that this sponsorship claimed by ICM was a fallacy;

* the vote was NOT about "freedom of speech";

* the future of the DNS might be at stake;

* ICANN has a duty to uphold the global public interest. ICM can in no way be said to be promoting the global public interest.

Bertrand dLC (for) made a dramatic statement, the thrust of which was that if dot-xxx were not approved now, it would find its way through other means, say in a round of new gTLDs, with added inconvenience.

Erika M. said that in the current dilemma, with doubts either way, the Board should "take the risk" of saying yes.

Katim T. said his position was based on one consideration alone: the Board should not go against the GAC's advice.

Kuo-Wei W. supported George's position.

Rita R-J (for) made a strong statement, based on one argument: the Board has the obligation to respect its own process. Failing to do so would erode confidence.

Ray P. (for) defended the same position as Rita R-J.

It is interesting to note that among those who abstained, 3 did so not based on conviction, but because of a conflict of interest (Sébastien B., Ram M., Bruce T.).

Since the vote in San Francisco, there have been a large number of reactions and opinions on the Internet. I found the 3 following quite revealing:

- George's statement attracted admiration, even from someone like Kieren McCarthy who worked (still works?) for the ICM application :

http://twitter.com/kierenmccarthy/status/48812091162886144

 - One of the more thoughtful pieces was written by John R. Levine in his blog. This sentence is of special interest, IMO:

 "I used to have more sympathy for the process argument, but now I've come around to the viewpoint that ICANN's job is to

act in the public interest, and if the process conflicts with that, the process is wrong." View his article here:

http://jl.ly/ICANN/xxx11.html

- India has indicated it will block the whole .xxx domain when it is implemented:

http://www.lemonde.fr/technologies/article/2011/03/24/l-inde-veut-bloquer-le-xxx_1498087_651865.html

Regards, Jean Jacques