Track 1

Sara Bockey & Christa Taylor | 31 January 2017

Agenda 1 Slide

1 Welcome

2 SOIs

3 Topic Reviews & Recap Jan 10: Queuing, Submission Period & Fees

4 Systems

5 Communications

6 Accreditation Program

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			

Application Queuing – Review

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

- **January 10 Meeting Outcomes:**
    - "Lottery" style system 10 approvals and no objections
    - No responses received from the email

Follow-ups:
Need to confirm ICANN can/will continue to use a "lottery" style license/system in future rounds

Further discussion:
If rounds are not going to be used, then what method should be used?
If it's a continuous application period – how will we deal with application queuing?
First come first served? What is appropriate?

Application Submission Period – Review

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

January 10th meeting outcomes:
- Initial period is three months, subsequent period is two months -- 7 approvals and no objections.
- No responses received from the email

Follow-ups:
Draft language needed as there currently is no guidance for length of time .
Further discussion:
- Does the application submission period of 3 months and 2 months have any implications on applicant support?
- If we have a few next 'rounds' followed by continuous application periods, how should the application submission period be handled?

Application Fees – Review

- Current methodology is *cost recovery.*
- There was 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
- *From the final report: "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 - VOTE

Application Fees

Tasks	Restricted	Brand	Open	Community
Administration				
Executive				
IANA				
Corporate Affairs				
Policy				
Global Partnership				
IT				
Legal				
ICANN meetings				
Registrar Liaison				
At-Large				
Ombudsman				
Board Expenses				
HR				
Finance				
Nominating Committee				
Internal Operations				
Services				
Registry Liaison				
Contractual Compliance				
Project Mgmt				
Organizational Security				
L-Root Management				
Internal Labor Hours				

Time

Resources

Risk

$\neq$

https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/cost-considerations-23oct08-en.pdf

Variable Fees - Review

- 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

Systems

Background: Applicant-facing systems did not share architecture or a credential database resulting in minimal integration and a fragmented experience. Additionally, there was a TAS glitch resulting in delays and negative comments.

Technical Systems used during first round:
- TLD Application System (TAS) - allow applicants to submit their apps & receive the results of the various evaluation procedures, such as Financial Capability, Technical/Operational Capability, Registry Services, overall Initial Evaluation Results
- Customer Portal - responsible for allowing applicants to submit questions to ICANN and for ICANN to provide responses
- Additional solutions developed to support the program
  - Digital Archery
  - Centralized Zone Data Service
  - Application Comments Forum
- Challenge: Multiple logins and different user experiences

The Final Report suggested the creation of a more integrated set of applicant-facing systems.

Goal: Consider providing implementation guidance, such as a minimum set of security and infrastructure standards, for consideration by ICANN during implementation of subsequent procedures.

Communications

Background: Issues on receiving answers to questions submitted through the Customer Portal in both adequacy and consistency of the response as well as timeliness in delivery.

Concerns raised re:
- Equal access to information.
- Insufficient distribution of webinar information.
- Perceived lack of outreach to Developing Countries.

Goal: Provide implementation guidance related to communication methods, goals for communications, success criteria and other elements

Examples:
- Create a robust and timely knowledge base with expansive search capabilities
- See if GDD team has statistics on their ability to achieve Service Level Agreements (SLAs) and metrics to help understand what elements of the program may have induced the most customer support cases
- Reach out to targeted groups or sectors to identify if the communications were effective.
  - Consider what themes should be conveyed and to what parties, as it may be beneficial to customize messaging based on the needs of the particular demographic

Accreditation

There is a RSP WG being run by GDD. Some think that it requires policy.

Does the current SubPro PDP WG think it's within their remit to develop policy for RO RSP transfers?

CCT2 Questions

Google Doc can be viewed here:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1iZBCVEAJPBYEDg7jLsMHKkNczR_b6-jH2Wl5eVH-WWM/edit

Next Meeting

- Today's outcomes will be circulated to everyone on the list for feedback.

- Next Work Track 1 meeting is scheduled for:

  Tuesday, February 14, 2017 at 03:00 UTC

  Topics:
  Accreditation
  Applicant Support
  Application Fees & Variable Fees
  Applicant Guidebook
  Communications