



Track 1

Sara Bockey & Christa Taylor | 28 March 2017

Agenda 1 Slide

1

Welcome & Agenda
Overview

2

SOIs

3

Costing

4

Clarity of
Application Process

5

RSP Program

6

Next Meeting

Holistic Costing

Holistic costing approach to multiple rounds?

One of the key themes has been the prospect of multiple phases of a single program or multiple rounds. When cost recovery was discussed in the past, did anyone consider cost recovery across the different rounds? In other words, some of the thinking seems to be that cost recovery in the next round would be in isolation.

In other words, there must be some concern from existing applicants that they are in effect supporting future rounds and I'm just wondering if anyone's looked at it holistically or is the focus been solely looking at the costs of new rounds in isolation?

Thinking about costs holistically as opposed to discrete rounds or maybe... a first-come-first-serve type of process as well.

Feedback ??

Clarity of Application Process

- Has there been any discussion of how to capture information after the last round to help use it as guidance for the next round? Also, did anything come out of clarifying questions?
- Our PDP mandate is not to rewrite the AGB but make suggestions. Accordingly, recommend efficient collection and a better knowledge base and have it in one place. Focus on the practical in the AGB, meaning the HOW, not the WHY
- Make the process as predictable and clear as possible
- For areas of the AGB where there is an expectation of future engagement by third parties, such as Community Priority Evaluation, it is perhaps imperative to have those third parties in place (a head of time?) and include any necessary guidelines that will be used in their process and not generated after applications have been received
- Question raised: If the AGB were to go as it is today, does ICANN foresee changes or impact on clarifying questions to be the same as the previous round (still as unpredictable)?

RSP Program

To Solve:

- Changing from one service provider to another service provider.
- Repetitive testing of service providers
 - Is repeat testing an interpretation of the rules, a form of application rather than the fault with the rules themselves?
 - Same could be said of transfer – not a fault of the rules but rather an application of the rules.

Pros/Cons:

- Race to the bottom – such an approval process would set up minimum criteria that registry service providers need to meet, and that's all they will meet and no exceed and not innovate.
 - Current issues with SLAs - some current operators are sailing very close to those SLAs. Actually meeting the SLAs technically but there are concerns on how they're operating. Setting minimum standard that creates a capability to meet that minimum standard but not necessarily a satisfactory performance
 - Would making SLAs more stringent solve this?
 - Insight on statistics on how many have come close within X% of failure
 - SLAs exceed 27 time without triggering EBERO

RSP cont'd

- Anti-Competitive Obstacles: Implementing this kind of program reduces obstacles for new backend provider entrants. Thus, there is a anti-competitive type of risk by having a high level of constraints that is not necessary
- Commoditizing Backend Providers – Making every registry and service provider look like every other registry service provider.
- Concerned that this would homogenize the services that the backend registry providers are able to provide
 - Wouldn't support or reward innovation
 - Noted that a base registry agreement that applies to all of the registry operators that sets the core standards, should leave plenty of room for innovation and competition.
- Doesn't solve the issue of portability
 - Operational issues and concerns re: future rounds – registries currently discussing with GDD Staff
- Overarching concern: Not all registries are equal. One could be operating a private brand registry where the concern is that of the brand owner. The implications are very different to that of a multi-million TLD registry that serves many different customers and requirements. The requirements could be quite different.

Next Meeting

Thank-you for your Time and Thoughts!

Next Meeting:

April 11 at 20:00 UTC