



SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #17 1500 UTC 31 August 2017

Agenda

1

Welcome and
Opening Remarks

2

SOI updates

3

Application
Evaluation
(Continued)

4

AOB and closing

- 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- 2. SOI updates**

3. Application Evaluation (cont.)

Non-scored Questions

- Is that a theme for WT4 ?
 - Most non-scored questions relate to TLD usage, which could be base for objections of AC advice, not fail or pass evaluation
 - Not enforced by agreement, unless a voluntary PIC covers them
 - Can be changed after application (but need to be informed) or after contracting (and then not even needing to be informed)
- Apparent consensus:
 - Forward Q18 to WT2 (incorporation into agreement) and WT3 (objections and advices)
 - Keep Q23 with WT4 (Registry Services)

Registry Services

- Mainly used as a mean to collect information to build “Exhibit A” (Approved Services) in registry contracts
- Probably less useful when technical evaluation is done in bulk or not done at all (RSP Program)
- Undergoing discussions might streamline registry service adoption (“free to deploy” services, services requiring no contract amendment)

Registry Services - Straw-person

Applicants will be allowed but not required to specify additional registry services.

List of previously approved registry services (IDN Languages, GPML, BTPPA) to be included by reference in AGB and contract.

Applicants will be informed that such additional registry services won't be evaluated and are not guaranteed to be accepted. (no such guarantee in 2012 as well)

When applicants informed additional registry services, those will be evaluated thru RSEP at contracting time.

If applicants have not informed additional registry services, RSEP will only be available after contract signing.

Technical Questions - Security Policy

- No “secure-o-meter” for assessing information security of computational processes
- Some best practices available, although having an intense update rate
- Real security policies, procedures and strategies considered highly sensitive by a number of organisations - perhaps even more than financials
- Good number of registry operators outsource their back-ends; does the question apply to back-end, RO or both ?
- Proposed straw-person:
 - Keep Q30a (summary of security policy) almost as it's, clarifying that it only applies to provision of registry services and making its scoring 0-1 not 0-1-2.
 - Remove Q30b (full security policy)

Technical Questions - Security Policy - Draft Language

- “Principle D A set of technical criteria must be used for assessing a new gTLD registry applicant to minimise the risk of harming the operational stability, security and global interoperability of the Internet.”
- “Rec. 7 Applicants must be able to demonstrate their technical capability to run a registry operation for the purpose that the applicant sets out. “
- “Rec. 8 Applicants must be able to demonstrate their financial and organisational operational capability.”
 - Some would classify security policy as a technical capability, others as an organisational operational capability
- Proposed Implementation Guideline:
 - “Information Security shall only be assessed for registry services and only request non-sensitive information that will be publicized in the process, similar to Q30 part (a) in the 2012-round”

Financial Questions - ICANN Program Review Feedback

- “Consider whether an alternative approach to the Financial Capability evaluation” would be worthwhile”
 - ✓ Everyone agrees
- “Review Financial Capability CQs and responses to determine whether improvements to the application questions can be made”
 - But if the approach is changed, 2012 questions won’t be of much use

Financial Questions - Principles

- What are the threats being addressed ?
 - Insolvent registry
 - Lack of market performance
 - Parent company extinction or business line closure
 - Unwillingness to provide financial statements to contract due diligence
 - Applying to more TLDs that one can handle
- What other ways can we use to address those threats ? (Besides a COI so demanding that violates banking regulations)
 - Current financials - what about unprofitable companies like Uber and Amazon ? What about start-ups ?
 - Stock exchange listed companies - same questions as above
- Is there a deterrence effect for having financial evaluation ?

Financial Questions - Straw-person

No need to do any financial evaluation as part of the application process. ICANN Org would be allowed to eval any financial information deemed appropriate as required by usual corporate governance before contract signing (like OFAC regulations). Applicants will be provided in AGB a nonexhaustive list of likely documents to be required as part of the contracting process, if they succeed in their applications.

Financial Questions - Straw-person discussion

- By not evaluating financials, we don't deliver on a mentioned goal of potentially blocking speculation thru financial analysis
 - Was that achievable, for starters ?
- OTOH, we do streamline the process and provide fairness among applications without further need to control results output
- Will this decision make a floor of application fee a req. ?

Financial Questions - Straw-person draft language

Applicant will certify that funding for at least the critical registry services will be available even in worst-case scenarios.

ICANN Org will provide sample financial spreadsheets of common registry models (Brand TLDs, Current ROs adding more Open TLDs, new ROs applying for Open TLDs) for applicants to make informed decisions before making such commitment.

Evaluation Questions - Measurable criteria

- Rec. 9 - “There must be a clear and pre-published application process using objective and measurable criteria. “
- A good number of answers to questions were published
 - The ones that were not were clearly sensitive
- No Clarifying Questions(CQs) or answers to CQs were published, even for published questions
- When ICANN Org recently asked applicants on behalf of WT4, they incorrectly informed applicants that was restricted information
- Clarity of publication straw-person language:
 - “All Clarifying Questions and answers to those will inherit the public / non-public attribute of the answer where clarification is being sought for”

4. AOB