



Track 1

Sara Bockey & Christa Taylor | 10 January 2017

Agenda 1 Slide

1

Welcome

2

SOIs

3

Topic Reviews

4

Clarity of
Application Process

5

Application
Queuing
&
Submission Time

6

CCT2

Schedule of Topics – WT1

Order	Topic	Dependencies	Timeline
A	Accreditation Programs Feb 13	Preliminary outputs that impact fees to be completed by Nov 2nd	Aug 15 – Dec 13
A	Applicant Support		Aug 15 – Feb 17
B	Clarity of Application Process Jan 10		Nov 2 – Dec 14
B	Application Fees Jan 31		Nov 2 – Dec 14
B	Variable Fees		Nov 2 – Dec 14
C	Application Queuing Jan 10	Clarity of Application Process	Nov 29 – Dec 27
C	Application Submission Period Jan 10		Nov 29 – Dec 13
D	Systems Jan 31	Systems, Clarity of Application Process	Dec 27 – Jan 24
D	Communications Jan 31		Dec 27 – Jan 24
E	Applicant Guidebook Feb 13	- Preliminary outputs that impact fees to be completed by Nov 2nd - Preliminary outputs that impact queuing or submission to be completed by Nov 29th - Preliminary outputs that impact systems to be completed by Dec 27th	Dec 14 – Feb 17
F	Draft Request for Constituency		
F	Seek Input from SO/AC/SG/Cs		

Update on Topics

- ⊙ Accreditation – New working group and we will be carving out policies for WT1 to focus on for the next meeting.

<https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2017-01-03-en>

- ⊙ Focus on evaluating or changing registry service providers.
- ⊙ Applicant Support – Discussion on a ‘brainstorming’ group
 - ⊙ Suggestions to date include:
 - ⊙ Broadening support to IDNs or other criteria
 - ⊙ Focusing AS on the "middle applicant" - defined as developed but struggling regions, as opposed to underserved or under developed regions.

Clarity of Application Process

Review for any changes/additions

Goal: How can the application process avoid developing processes on an as-needed basis (e.g., clarifying question process, change request process, customer support, application prioritization).

Application Prioritization - While processes and applicant support improved over time, it has been observed that Application Prioritization, while viewed as largely irrelevant, could be improved and it may be beneficial to have ICANN looking at ways they could improve efficiencies.

Streamline Answer Submissions - Create a way for an applicant or RSP to answer questions once as opposed to answer same question for every application it supports. Means to provide answers to questions and then have it disseminated across all applications being supported.

Knowledge Database - Organize database so it can serve as a user friendly, FAQ type database. Improved readability and search-ability. Be sure to capture clarifications so that there isn't so much ambiguity in the AGB.

Application Queuing

Goal: Deliberate on different application processing methodology

- ⊙ Application Queuing: Review whether first come first served guidance remains relevant and if not, whether another mechanism is more appropriate
- ⊙ Feedback:
 - A. Yes first come first served is relevant – no changes required?
 - B. Could be relevant but we need to brainstorm on other options?
 - C. Not relevant and depends on _____

Application Submission Period

Goal: Provided the New gTLD Program continues as rounds-based, the application submission window length may warrant additional debate to determine if it is the proper amount of time...taking into account any other recommend changes to the program that may simplify or complicate the application submission process

- ⦿ Application Submission Period: Is three months the proper amount of time? Is the concept of a fixed period of time for accepting applications the right approach?
- ⦿ Assuming that the next round is for a fixed period of time, is three months sufficient?
- ⦿ Feedback:
 - A. Yes, keep it at three months
 - B. No, it should be shorter.
 - C. No, it should be longer.
- ⦿ If B/C: The appropriate amount of time? _____

Application Fees

- ⊙ Methodology is *cost recovery*
- ⊙ With a surplus of approx. \$90m (with \$20m+ related to development costs which was based on the volume of applications)
- ⊙ Although we are unable to attain the exact numbers and methodology, there is significant overages based on our calculations
 - ⊙ Development costs – explainable due to the expected vs actual volume of applications ~ estimate \$20m
 - ⊙ Variable costs – not explainable based on the projected vs. actual costs but estimate an overage of ~\$50m
- ⊙ *“it may be useful to evaluate how well costing estimates compared to actual costs incurred by ICANN... consider providing implementation guidance to be taken into account when ICANN works with the community to develop the costing methodology for subsequent procedures.*

“Lack of invoices were a challenge”:

- ⊙ Solution: ICANN implement a automatic system for invoice creation where the invoice is sent to the contact email based on process triggers?
 - ⊙ Consensus: implement an invoicing system

Variable Fees

- ⊙ Variable Fees: Should the New gTLD application fee be variable based on such factors as application type (e.g., open or closed registries), multiple identical applications, or other factor?
 - ⊙ Consensus: fixed fee
- “Lack of invoices were a challenge”:
 - ⊙ Solution: ICANN implement a automatic system for invoice creation where the invoice is sent to the contact email based on process triggers?
 - ⊙ Consensus: implement an invoicing system

CCT2 Questions

Next Meeting

- ⦿ Today's outcomes will be circulated to everyone on the list for feedback.
- ⦿ Next work track 1 meeting is scheduled for:

Tuesday, January 31, 2017 at 20:00 UTC

Topics:

Communication
Systems

Accreditation Program
Application Fees