

ICANN 57 Proposed Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Current Status (Overarching issues/CC1)
3. WT based discussions
 - a. WT1
 - i. What went wrong with the Applicant Support Program in the 2012 round and is there still a need for such a program?
 - ii. Some have stated that a Pre-Approval or Accreditation process would be beneficial for registries and registry service providers. Is this an accurate assessment? If so, how should such a process be set up?
 - b. WT2
 - i. Is a single agreement still suitable for the needs of subsequent procedures? Noting that the 2012 round saw the introduction of TLDs with needs that differ from the standard ICANN model, the idea of different agreements suited to a specific category has seen increased demand. Do we need to consider allowing for category based agreements and what is the justification for such? If yes, in what ways could we consider a "category based agreement"? Or, how should the single base agreement address the various needs of different categories?
 - ii. For Reserved Names, what is a reserved name and what are the reserved names per the RA? Do any changes need to be made to the reserved names to reflect the changes in recent processes that allow for the release of such reserved names?
 - iii. In the 2012 round a Continuing Operations Instrument was required to be submitted in the form of a Letter of Credit to fund an Emergency Back End Registry Operator. That requirement proved to be difficult for a number of registries to meet. What other options are there to fund the EBERO functions? Also, some registries, such as Brand TLDs, consider that a Continuing Operations Instrument is not required due to the nature of their TLD. This spans into the background of EBERO requirements, as well, but would the Continuing Operations Instrument be required for TLDs that would qualify for an exemption to the Code of Conduct for the RA?
 - c. WT3
 - i. Rounds vs. Continuous (1st come 1st serve)
 - ii. Do we need an Independent Objector in future?
 - a. WT4
 - i. What suggestions do you have for improving the application processes; Name Collisions (e.g., What are the views on non-applied for strings that would fall into one of the two risk profiles (ones with prevalence of dotless queries and not) that could be suggested to be not allowed for the time being in subsequent new gTLD procedures. What data sources could/should be used for analyzing collisions for subsequent procedures?
 - iii. IDNs