ICANN57 Proposed Agenda

3 November, 13:45-18:30

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Current Status
3. Update from CCT-RT and RPMs PDP
4. Work Track-based discussions
	1. WT1
		1. What went wrong with the Applicant Support Program in the 2012 round? Were the issues related to the guidance in the Joint Applicant Support WG’s Final Report, the implementation (and timing issues), the scope of the support, systemic issues, other, or a combination of multiple factors? How can these issues be improved or resolved? Is there a need for such a program in future rounds?
		2. From RSP Accreditation to Third-Party Certifier - what is the most effective method to meet the needs of RSPs, Registries, Registrars, Applicants, and possibly registrants/end/users? How will existing RSP’s be treated differently from new RSP’s? What are some ways to ensure the best practices are attained to ensure security and stability?
	2. WT2
		1. 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?
		2. This question is in regards to reserved names on the top level and second level. What is a reserved name? How does policy address reserved names as compared to how reserved names are addressed in the Applicant Guidebook?  What are the reserved names per the RA? Does policy need to address these differences? 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?
		3. 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?
	3. WT3
		1. Whether or not applications for future new gTLDs are accepted in rounds or other batch groupings vs. being accepted in an open & ongoing process ("first come, first served") will impact, among other things, the string contention process and objections. Should the community decide first what application acceptance methodology will be used in subsequent procedures and then deal with the downstream issues? Or should the effects and resolution of these issues, such as string contention, be fully dealt with in order to drive the application methodology?
		2. In order to determine what the role of an Independent Objector (IO) will be in subsequent application procedures it is necessary to both review what happened during the 2012 round and what has happened in both the community and world at large since the 2012 round. For example: What was the community's impression of the role the IO played in the 2012 round? Did it live up to expectations? Did the IO act in the community's best interest? Has the level of awareness within the community and consumers risen to the level that an IO is no longer necessary? Can costs of objections be reduced so that the IO is no longer necessary? Would an ongoing application process necessitate that an IO be in place to ease the burden of constant vigilance on the part of the community & consumers?
	4. WT4
		1. Should technical competence be shown during the application process or only required to be shown prior to signing a gTLD agreement? Should financial capability be shown during the application process or only required to be shown prior to signing a gTLD agreement? If one or both of those capabilities are not met, would the string be offered to other contention set members or only be available in subsequent procedures?
		2. IDNs - Should single character IDNs be allowed in languages where a single character could denote a word or phrase? Should IDNs still have higher priority in application processing? How should IDN variants be treated?
		3. What suggestions do you have for improving the application criteria and evaluation processes? Were the right questions asked? Was the way the questions were asked aligned with expectations of evaluators? Were the thresholds for passing appropriate? How can questions be made more clear to avoid the overwhelming number of clarifying questions that plagued the 2012 round? Were there issues with consistency for evaluation results?
		4. Name Collisions – What are the views on the strings that were recommended to be prevented from moving forward (.home, .corp, .mail) considering that .home and .corp have few dotless queries, while there is a prevalence in .mail, but all have been halted? As dotless operation is forbidden, should these two categories of risk be treated the same? Are there additional data sources that could/should be used for analyzing collisions? Are there additional High Risk strings that can be identified prior to the launch of subsequent procedures?
5. AOB
6. Parking Lot