



# Track 1

Sara Bockey & Christa Taylor | May 30, 2017

# Agenda 1 Slide

1

Welcome &  
Agenda Overview

2

SOIs

3

Topic Review

4

RSP Program

5

AOB

6

Next Meeting

# Topic Review – Applicant Support

Support for Applicants From Developing Countries: Evaluate effectiveness of Applicant Support program to assess if the criteria were properly designed, outreach sufficient, monetary support sufficient, etc. In particular, was there enough outreach in developing economies to 1) contribute to the design and nature of the process and 2) to ensure awareness of the opportunity afforded?

Summary to date:

- a) Discussion around the use of excess funds being used for promotional activities in underserved regions
- b) Medium customer to target but unclear on details
- c) Beyond just application fees - on-going fees
- d) Need to understand why it failed first
- e) Need to follow up with GAC/APAC re any outreach to date. GAC was to put together work plan with new approach to understand challenges and enforce with data.

Feedback – How do we want to proceed, what information do we need? Other thoughts?

# Topic Review – Applicant Guidebook

Applicant Guidebook (AGB): Is the AGB the right implementation of the GNSO recommendations? If so, how can it be improved to ensure that it meets the needs of multiple audiences (e.g., applicants, those monitoring the policy implementation, registry service providers, escrow providers, etc.)

Summary to date:

- a) Less historical/policy approach
  - cut the background and rationales out. Put them in Appendices for those that want to read
- b) Step-by-step version by type of application
  - create a practical guide to applying

Feedback – Any additions? Thoughts? Items to consider?

# Topic Review – Clarity of Application Process

Clarity of Application Process: How can the application process avoid developing processes on an as-needed basis (e.g., clarifying question process, change request process, customer support, etc.)

Summary to date:

- a) CQs: streamline answer submissions: offer a 'apply to all applications' check box
- b) Insight into clarifying questions that were asking in a general context
- c) Contacts by category: add the ability to add contacts for each section
- d) Knowledge database: improve search capability and keywords

Feedback– Any additions? Thoughts? Items to consider?

# RSP – Draft Requirements & Principles

Thanks to all who have contributed to the Google Doc

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1nWljRzRgDQgmSISxyf7G6f2Dv7XDoD01D30KfWhoHNw/edit?pli=1#>

Currently, we have proposed draft framework for the following:

2. Efficiency in evaluation and pre-delegation for ICANN, applicants, and RSPs must be improved.
6. An RSP Program should be designed in such a manner so it does not increase ICANN's liability
7. Applicants must have access to a list of Registry Service Providers and a list of the functional areas they have been pre-approved for through the RSP Program.
8. Pre-approval of RSPs could be done in such a way as to take into account the capacity of such RSPs, the type of TLDs they support and the services they provide.
11. If a RSP program is the agreed upon solution, do we have different categories of providers?



# RSP – Need proposed draft framework for:

## 1. Security and stability of gTLDs must not be negatively impacted, and preferably improved.

### Discussion & Considerations:

- Applicants' (or applicant's provider) must be able to demonstrate technical capability equal to or greater than the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program
- The evaluation of a Registry Services Provider should account for the number of TLDs it supports with respect to the five critical services it provides (DNS, SRS, Whois, DNSSEC and Data Escrow)
- Service Levels for Registry Service Providers must be equal to or greater than the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program
- How do we avoid a 'race to the bottom' by setting minimum criteria that RSPs need to meet but not exceed and/or innovate
- SLAs exceeded 27 times without triggering EBERO (more information into the why?)
- Consideration for 2012 RSPs, who should receive some type of Grandfathering in the accreditation program

### Proposed Framework: ??

# RSP – Need proposed draft framework for:

## 3. Evaluation and pre-delegation testing must be consistent, predictable, and to the extent possible, objective.

### Discussion & Considerations:

- Multiple evaluations of the same registry service provider by different evaluators or more/less diligent evaluators that led to inconsistent evaluation results despite presenting the exact same technical registry solution

### Proposed Framework: ??



# RSP – Need proposed draft framework for:

**4. The costs associated with the evaluation and testing of an RSP should be borne by the RSP as opposed to the Applicant where the Applicant and RSP are not the same entity.**

## Discussion & Considerations:

- New RSPs not approved through the 2012 process would be afforded the opportunity to become pre-certified at their own cost up to a given date before the commencement of the next new gTLD process (*D. Austin*)
- In essence, ICANN application costs should decline and the accreditation costs to RSPs could be recovered from the RSPs applicants
- 32/37 had SLAs exceeded

**Proposed Framework: ??**

# RSP – Need proposed draft framework for:

## 5. RSPs must be able to innovate and differentiate themselves

### Discussion & Considerations:

- Concern on homogenizing services that the backend registry providers are able to provide.
- 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.
- Significant risk that innovation and differentiation will be stifled through a prescriptive RSP program (*S. Langstone*)

Proposed Framework: ??

# RSP – Need proposed draft framework for:

**9. Applicants must not be required to select a “pre-approved” RSP, but shall be able to either propose providing its own registry services or selecting a new RSP. If that occurs, such new RSP must be evaluated prior to the ultimate selection of the Applicant to manage one or more specific TLDs.**

## **Discussion & Considerations:**

- Applicants must not be prohibited from serving as its own Registry Services Provider.

**Proposed Framework: ??**

# RSP – Need proposed draft framework for:

## 10. How do we solve the issues of changing from one service provider to another service provider?

*(Registry Stakeholder Group discussion in parallel - relevant info should be captured here)*

**Discussion & Considerations:**

**Proposed Framework: ??**

# Next Meeting

Thank-you for your Time and Thoughts!

Next Meeting:

**Tuesday, June 12, 2017 at 3:00 UTC**