**New gTLD Metering – Suggestion for developing a plan & facilitating community comment**

**Prepared by Chuck Gomes in his personal capacity, 12 Sep 12**

To assist in the development of a metering plan as well as to facilitate the planned community comment in that regard, I suggest that the suggestions submitted during the public comment period be grouped into the following seven groups:

1. **Non-usable suggestions** – These suggestions should be eliminated for reasons such as the following and the community should be informed why these ideas do not work:
	1. Irrelevance (e.g., suggesting digital archery be used)
	2. Inconsistency with certain provisions of the guidebook (e.g., using evaluation scores)
	3. Inconsistency with GNSO recommendations (e.g., using time stamps)
	4. Legal risk (e.g., random ordering).
2. **Non-controversial constructive suggestions** – These ideas should be seriously considered in any metering plan. Suggestions in this group should meet the following criteria:
	1. They should help smooth the process.
	2. They should be easily implementable.
	3. They should not give preferred ranking to one applicant over another (e.g., allowing applicants to opt for later processing).
3. **Previously discussed suggestions** - Excluding any suggestions from 1 & 2 above, this group should include all ideas that have been previously discussed in the new gTLD process (e.g., categorizing strings and favoring some categories over others or changing the base registry agreement). Additional public comment should be requested on these ideas including asking the question as to whether previous decisions should be revisited.
4. **New Ideas** - Excluding any suggestions from 1, 2 & 3 above, this group should include all new ideas (e.g., allowing applicants that applied for multiple strings to prioritize their strings). The public should be asked to identify the pros and cons of these ideas.
5. **Suggestions requiring additional evaluation steps** – This group should include suggestions for metering that would require additional evaluation efforts that are not included in the guidebook (e.g., judging whether certain strings are more in the public interest than other strings or whether some strings are competitive threats to one another). If these kinds of ideas are considered, public comments would be needed regarding how to develop applicable criteria, who would perform the evaluations, etc. (Note that some of these ideas may fit in one or more of the groups above.)
6. **Ideas related to the in-process Initial Evaluation process** – This group should include all ideas that relate tothe current single batch Initial Evaluation period including announcing all results at one time. (Note that some of these ideas may fit in one or more of the groups above.)
7. **Suggestions to improve application evaluation efficiency**.