**RrSG Questions:**

* How did ICANN calculate 20,000 users?
* This doesn’t talk about the number of requests submitted, how was that considered? The number of requests will impact costs. Cost recovery for 5,000 is different to 5 million requests
* Why 24x5 support, instead of 24x7?
* How many full-time staff does ICANN Org intend to hire to staff the SSAD?
* Where does ICANN expect the data to be hosted?
* Exactly where does initial funding come from?"
* How will annual costs be collected from users? Will it adjust? Be billed before or after?

**RySG Questions:**

* How did ICANN calculate the number of “20,000 users”? Assumption offered from questions directed to EPDP
	+ Noting that this does not take into account a separate figure of the number of requests submitted/expected, how was this number taken into account?
	+ Noting that there is large impact on cost recovery based on volume, how is a large volume of requests specifically covered (e.g. 5k vs.  50K vs. 50 Million)
* We note the estimates refer to 24x5 support, instead of 24x7? Noting the SLAs on CPs are 24X7 under the current policy recommendations, would this appear to be not compatible. Does this affect the estimates? Assumption made and can be adjusted. Current global support is operated by 24x5
* How many full-time staff does ICANN intend to hire to staff the SSAD? At this stage, full operating specifics not yet provided; percentages & ranges used at this stage. Detailed plan would include this
* Where does ICANN expect the data to be hosted? Not yet defined.
* Where does ICANN anticipate the start up funding to come from?  ICANN has approved budgets through 2021 which do not account for this large expenditure.  Not yet considered from annual budget perspective; best to wait until further refined model.
* How will annual costs be collected from users? Will it adjust? Will cost be determined at submission or after disclosure? Fees based on cost recovery based on development and on-going maintenance.
* What does ICANN estimate the cost per query to be?
* What parties are anticipated to be required to pay fees per request?  Per our original request, who has ICANN identified as the “direct beneficiaries of the service”.
* We believe this requires a cost/benefit analysis. The questions posed by ICANN noted the financial sustainability analysis of the UAM could provide the same useful indications for Team’s deliberations; however the responses do not cover such a review. Recognizing the very narrow scope of automated requests for the SSAD, in light of the recent Bird & Bird legal advice, and the ability under the law for data subjects and other requesters to make inquiries at no cost directly to Rys and Rrs, the Registries believe a cost/benefit or feasibility analysis should be done.
	+ Shall ICANN be carrying out such a feasibility / sustainability study in addition to the costings exercise? When can we expect that, noting the small time frame remaining?

Agreed; CBA should be required.

* Does ‘contingency costs’ include any legal risk / DPA fine contingency funding? This estimate does not contain an assumption made at this stage regarding legal risk or liability. Contingency is based on development and maintenance

**Active Question Log:**

* Amr - The 3 months are to test integration with Contracted Party systems? – No estimate yet for integration with CPs; 9 months estimate based on prior system dev experience (very high-level)
* Stephanie - Why separate the accreditation and central gateway? Separated function within the proposed model; estimating it will be performed and managed by separate entities. Automation final determination/understanding will benefit.
* Matt - Based on these assumptions, does ICANN believe it has any providers under contract today who would be able to provide any of these various services? Dev of systems vs. operations; ICANN would conduct RFPs for competitive bid to meet the requirement; System dev. Potential contractors, but RFP is required; Services some vendors could possibly do parts, but given unique nature, RFP is not only required, but desired.
* Margie - Also - has ICANN evaluated any of the systems being developed by others (PWC, WIPO/Info Networks) Not performed, in-house only at this stage
* Matt - Will RFP’s be issued for each element of the system? See question above; number of RFPs unknown at this time but likely distinct.
* Georgios - What is your assumption about the time that the authentication and identification is valid? Estimate two-year cost model for accreditation
* Hadia - 2.1.2 speaks about the development of the central gateway and the accreditation system - my understanding the cost estimate did not include any estimates in relation to CPs systems development and operation Confirmed under bullet #1 Q&A
* Stephanie - Speaking of risks. When do you plan to do a risk assessment on this thing? Hopefully not after it is built.... I would think that the risk assessment should follow the PIA, once that is done. Better late than never, re the PIA. The PIA will test all the assumptions made in the proposed policy, prior to spending the money to build it.... Risk assessment not yet determined for this estimate exercise.
* Marc – [Comment] Identity providers assumption based on geographic vs. groupings of requestor types. Perhaps both GEO and Requestor type is required? Finding eligible providers could be a challenge. [Question] – Benefits of cost estimate now, but what flaws or gaps did you identify in flaws or gaps of the proposed model the EPDP has at this stage? The nature of assertions is the largest gap. Little information as to what those are and how to address them and how to verify them. A constant thread is disclosure rate vs. cost and how that may be perceived. Org will work to identify other gaps….perhaps as part of a risk analysis. Understanding the standards that define applicants for accreditation will be helpful. Greater clarity/separation of assertions around the requestor vs. the actual request. From a technical perspective, greater clarity on the role(s) requirements for managing the assertions (little specific in content of report and absent on diagrams).