

## 14 December 2022 SubPro ODA Community Webinar Q&A

*The SubPro ODP Team received questions during the webinars, some of which were answered live, and some of which went unanswered due to time constraints. Responses to questions raised during the webinar have been grouped by topic below, with some repeated questions that were combined and some answers that were expanded upon with clarifications not addressed during the webinars. Questions are grouped and ordered alphabetically by subject. Further inquiries can be directed to [subpro-odp@icann.org](mailto:subpro-odp@icann.org).*

### Alternative Proposals

**Q: Who would need to agree to pursue Option 2 instead of Option 1?**

A: The ODA is one input to be considered by the Board in taking action on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Final Report, which could include direction to ICANN org concerning the implementation of recommendations adopted by the Board. We expect the Board will examine the options presented and determine whether they have sufficient information to make a decision.

**Q: Assuming that all applicants that are already waiting for 10 years will submit their applications at the first opportunity, can you explain how option 2 is different from option 1? In my understanding, in both cases unlimited submissions will be taken into consideration with a max processing per year. In other words - what's the reason someone would NOT vote for option 2? What happens, for example, with submission number 451, 452 et cetera?**

A: It is correct that both options allow for unlimited application submissions. The difference between 1 and 2 is that Option 2 has a pre-established annual processing capacity. In this scenario, all applications would be prioritized, and those with priority numbers after the 450 annual applications processed would be deferred until the next annual processing cycle. Should the demand be large, we would expect to adjust our processing capabilities upward to draw down the backlog.

**Q: Is there a reason we only chose 4 cycles? Could the AGB be adapted for each cycle?**

A: In Option 2, we consider the round to consist of 4 cycles. It could be more or less, but the predictability for multiple windows of opportunity was seen as a good feature. The same AGB would apply to all four cycles; changing things in between would risk treating applicants differently.

**Q: For Option 2, how would ICANN prevent an applicant (or a portfolio applicant) from “reselling” the application slot(s) for profits?**

A: The 2012 round did not allow applications to be transferred and we'd presume the same for future rounds, except for adding the ability to form a joint venture (which is a form of transfer technically).

**Q: Why is "Dispute Resolution" not needed in Option 2?**

A: In reference to the list of services on [slide 54](#), that list is not the list of services or elements that will be conducted during the program but describes which elements will be incorporated into Program systems. In option 2, the objection and dispute resolution processes would be handled manually, outside of the system.

**Q: I'm probably missing something but I'm assuming that the number of applications won't change as a result of option 1 vs option 2 being adopted. Why can't the cost-cutting features of option 2 be adopted for option 1 with an objective of possibly building further on this in future rounds?**

A: A number of options are possible for implementation. The options presented are just two of those and are meant to highlight that different variables can be chosen for implementation.

**Q: [In Option 2] So number 451 and so on will be merged with the applications in the next application round and have to participate in the new draw again for the next batch of applications? And in theory, as long as each round attracts more than the max. number of applications, an application from the 1st round might be postponed forever. Is that worst-case understanding correct?**

A: The team has not fully developed all the details for option 2. But in the approach as described in the [ODA](#), this case would not occur, as all applications from cycle 1 would begin evaluation before applications from cycle 2.

**Q: With Option 2, if you get 2K applications in round 1, how will you ramp up to process more than 450 per year, so that applicants will not have such a substantial investment sit in limbo for potentially 4-5 years depending on the lottery draw?**

A: If, once demand is known, it is appropriate to increase processing capacity, this could occur either through increased manual processing resources or through increased engineering capacity.

**Q: With Option 1, if you get 2K applications, how long would it take to process all 2K applications? Could they all be completed in a single year?**

A: It is very difficult to estimate how long it would take to process a large group of applications as the volume, types, and distribution of applications are unknown. Specifically, the number of contention sets, objections and similar issues have an impact on processing. In Option 1, the processing cadence and schedule would be developed based on the applications received.

**Q: Regarding the two options, my impression is most of the report deals with the single batch option. With community priority not being completed, would that mean if we go with the second option communities couldn't apply? Or would they have to wait until later in the process?**

A: We spent most of our time on the ODP working on Option 1 and how we would suggest moving forward on open issues. Because of the high cost and timeline, we started to explore other options later in the process. It's not fully fleshed out, but we shared in [Appendix 19](#) our current thinking on how Option 2 would work.

Regarding community priority evaluation, we listed that as an area where we spent a lot of time and gave some suggested improvements based on implementation guidance. It is not foreseen that Option 2 would require substantive changes to the evaluation process, including the community aspects.

**Q: Is there potential to add in scenarios for option 2 to test if 2,000 applications came in on the first year and how we would scale up given the lower risk? It would be useful to have a range in confidence in the figures.**

A: This is something we could look at if Option 2 is further explored.

## Applicant Support

**Q: Why did the ODA assume the application fee would pay for Applicant Support? There is no guidance on the final report in that direction, and actually a good number of participants of the SubPro WG thought the auction proceeds from 2012 would fund ASP.**

A: The Applicant Support Program is part of the New gTLD Program, which has to operate in a cost recovery manner.

This is affirmed in Affirmation with Modification 15.3 in the [Final Report](#): "Application fees will be designed to ensure that adequate resources exist to cover the total cost to administer the new gTLD process. Application fees may differ for applicants *that qualify for applicant support.*"

The new gTLD Auction Proceeds Cross-Community Working Group (CCWG) provided recommendations for allocation of the 2012 round auction proceeds, which are now

forming the basis of a grants program. Once launched, this will be open to applications from any eligible organization across the world for projects that are supportive of ICANN's mission. See

<https://www.icann.org/en/announcements/details/added-session-icann-grant-program-implementation-update-webinar-02-12-2022-en> for more information.

**Q: On the 18 month implementation for option 2, concerned that some of the things that matter the most to the At Large community weren't on that list. What scope would be left out? Would applicant support be pushed to a later cycle, for example?**

A: That's not the intent. We didn't list everything here but did mention the GNSO Guidance Process (GGP) on applicant support, which is an area of ongoing work in the community. There's no intention to remove the Applicant Support Program from Option 2. An example of potentially reduced or delayed scope would be the implementation guidance around the system and reporting - a feature that allows people to sign up and follow an application so they get an update every time the application changed status. This wouldn't be needed to launch a round but could be added at a later point.

## Application Fees

**Q: For applicants, how much higher will the application fee be compared with 2012?**

A: This will be covered in the finance section. An overview can be seen in slide 50 of the [deck](#).

**Q: The application fees in both options are defined based on an estimation of 2.000 applications. Assuming that ICANN will only know the true number at the end of the application window: is there a chance that the application fees are adjusted or will ICANN take the risk (in case of less applications) or gain (in case of more applications)?**

A: The team has worked with the assumption that the relevant application fee information should be developed and published for applicants in advance. This is in keeping with the principles of predictability and transparency that are emphasized in the [Final Report](#) and application fees will be included in the Applicant Guidebook per recommendation 12.11

**Q: No one size fits all application, and cost for ICANN will vary. Has ICANN considered a more a la carte application fee? Would it be better to provide a tiered application fee, which could eliminate the need for an ASP?**

A: The team looked at fixed vs. per application costs as a part of the analysis. Some of

this analysis is described in the fees section of the [ODA](#).

Differentiating the fees would provide risks, so we want to be careful to not create an excessive amount of complexity, provide predictability to the applicants, and be able to clearly define and evaluate fees. Balance needs to be struck between specific fees for an application with predictability. More work needs to be done to determine that, we want to fit fees into measurable distinct groups of applications. The fundamental principle to respect is clarity, transparency, and predictability.

**Q: To what degree is it Org's role to consider tiered or other pricing models? At what point is this a policy vs implementation question?**

A: In developing pricing models, the org is guided by the general policy principle of cost recovery, and any specific policy guidance provided in the [Final Report](#). For example, Affirmation 15.1 provides that "...all applications in subsequent procedures should pay the same base application fee regardless of the type of application or the number of applications that the same applicant submits" and also that "this would not preclude the possibility of additional fees in certain circumstances."

**Q: Regarding cost, there was a reluctance to go beyond 185K, there is a disadvantage to the higher cost especially when it comes to geos and IDN applicants, could unintentionally cut some out of the market. Is there an opportunity after the first cycle to review the application fee to see if it could be reduced?**

A: Option 2 is described in the [ODA](#) with the fees and requirements established for a round that occur in all four cycles. A variation of this could be to reassess and make adjustments at certain checkpoints within the round; however, this would likely extend the time between cycles.

## Auctions

**Q: What discussion took place in the ODA with respect to auctions? Feels like another disputed output from the SubPro WG.**

A: There are two parts to the auction topic - the format of the auction and which type of model is used.

There were some deliberations in the PDP and not all recommendations got consensus. We assumed in our design that we are continuing to use an auction process as the mechanism of last resort. With regard to private auctions, that was identified as one of the 7 issues the Board may want to look into further, as the SubPro Working Group didn't reach consensus.

**Q: On the previous slide [slide 39 of the [presentation](#)], what does "intend to operate" mean?**

A: This language is from the final report: Recommendation 35.3: Applications must be submitted with a bona fide ("good faith") intention to operate the gTLD.

**Q: Why not just ban private auctions?**

A: Please refer to the discussion on this topic in section 5.35 of the [ODA](#).

## Community Feedback Opportunities

**Q: The ODA contains an email for people to send feedback on the ODA. How long will that be open and how will feedback be handled? Will it be published like public comment? Will it be forwarded to the Board for them to consider as part of their deliberations? Is it possible that changes will be made to the ODA as a result of community feedback?**

A: The [subpro-odp@icann.org](mailto:subpro-odp@icann.org) email address will remain open while the ODA is under consideration by the Board. This email channel is meant for clarifying questions and the like. Any concerns with the content and the analysis will be passed onto the Board.

We do not expect to update the ODA based on community comments, as it is operational information that has been requested from the org by the Board.

**Q: Where do we go from here? How will feedback from the community be handled? Will there be iterations of the ODA based on feedback?**

A: The email address ([subpro-odp@icann.org](mailto:subpro-odp@icann.org)) in the ODA will remain open, if people have clarifying questions or comments they can send to that address, which is a public email list.

The audience for the ODA is the Board, so next steps will be taken by the Board who considers the ODA as a part of its deliberations. The ODA is an input, so we don't turn it in as a final design, many of the sections provide options. We don't expect the ODA itself to change, and we expect the Board will be interested in speaking with the community, at ICANN76 for example. That will become part of the record that the Board considers.

**Q: Is the Sub Pro WG now closed or will there be an opportunity for the Sub Pro WG to respond directly to the ICANN Board, prior to its absolutely critical decision to progress, let alone Option 1 or Option 2 . The financial risk(s) to ICANN.org are too high for the five year ++ Option 1, surely ?**

A: The org has delivered the ODA to the Board, which is the final step of the Operational

Design Phase.

## Finance

**Q: What's your inflation of 28% calculated?**

A: This is calculated based on 2.5% compounded for the past 10 years.

**Q: Can you please provide more information on the financial modelling as to the estimate of 2K applications. What market or other research is this estimate based on, and will any such research be published separately?**

A: ICANN has internally attempted to project the application demand and sought feedback from the community and external sources, but this is a challenging exercise that has not resulted in a usable estimate. Given the challenges in projecting this demand, org is operating under the assumption that volume would be similar to the prior round.

**Q: Do you have any more detail on the basis of the large estimated increase in costs for Program Ops compared to the 2012 round? (around 60% increase)**

A: As described in Appendix 8 of the [ODA](#), compounded inflation alone since 2012 is estimated at 20 percent or higher to baseline program services. In addition, after review of the 2012 round, there were multiple lessons learned that call for enhanced development to address applicant and community concerns and improve consistency in operations.

Furthermore, this proposed subsequent round takes into account additional services and complexities, such as string changes and the broad scope of registry voluntary commitments; as well as other recommendations from the [Final Report](#). Lastly, a direct comparison to the 2012 round is difficult to produce, since the program was not fully defined at the time of launch and cost elements are not easily separated into the cost categories as is proposed this round.

**Q: Given the changes to the economy and the current losses due to some investments -> will there be a change to the current investment policy?**

A: ICANN has investment policies for the funds that we manage, there is a separate policy for the Reserve Fund, New gTLD Fund, and Auction Proceeds. The policy is built around the goal and purpose of the funds and the work that would be carried out with these funds. These funds are invested and can be impacted positively and negatively by events within financial markets. Over time, these strategies have proven to be successful and resulted in a positive impact to our funds.

**Q: Are the ICANN costs to be "recovered" limited to only the INCREMENTAL costs associated with the gTLD round? If not, why?**

A: Cost recovery is based upon the costs incurred since the prior round and the operational costs of the next round. These costs would be incremental between rounds.

**Q: Given that ICANN will continue to draw down from the original 9 million allocation, given that ICANN has less than a million left, will you be recommending to the ICANN Board for an additional funding allocation, if so when?**

A: The costs of the ODP are effectively driven by the amount of time spent on supporting the Board's decision. If and when it is established that this support extends beyond the original assumption of effort and duration of the ODP, staff will revert back to the Board to evaluate efforts and funding.

**Q: Is there a more detailed breakdown of costs Org can share - the ODA is very high level components? It would be helpful to compare these cost elements with the 2012 round.**

A: The [ODA document](#) provides more details of the 2 options modeled and compares them to the estimated costs of the 2012 round. To note, the 2012 round is not yet closed and costs continue to be incurred currently and for the foreseeable future.

**Q: Will ICANN be providing a detailed breakdown of these internal and external expenses?**

A: The public ODP Community Status Reports provide a breakdown of the expenses, which primarily consist of staff time. See here the link to the report published on 14 October, <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/community-status-update-new-gtld-subpro-odp-14oct22-en.pdf>.

**Q: Given that most costs have been allocated to ICANN staff you should be able to give a final number on this spend shortly, or is ICANN Org still drawing down on those funds for these briefing sessions? Will ICANN be detailing which vendors it used and what specific services they provided? Do you have an ETA on when these final ODA numbers will be made available?**

A: The staff continues to spend time on this ODP and of course these webinars are examples of such. The [report](#) linked to earlier includes all the costs, whether staff time or external costs. The report including December costs incurred will be published sometime in January.



**Q: The original budget was \$9m, now that the ODP is complete do you have a final budget number for it?**

A: Of the \$9 million approved, as of 30 November we are at \$6.1 million. That does not include December costs and final invoices from some vendors.

**Q: Has ICANN org flexed the budget based on different volume/ applications levels?**

A: For the ODP, the team used a working assumption of 2,000 applications. See the Assumptions section in the [ODA](#) for more information.

## Next Steps

**Q: Who will decide about the definitive option to move forward? Is that ICANN Board, ICANN org, the community or different?**

A: The Board has asked for the ODA to inform its deliberation on the final report, so we expect the next step to be for the Board to resolve on the final report or to ask for more information, which could be addressed to either org, or community, or both.

**Q: Would the next step be for the board to make a decision on the final report? Would that drive the instructions for the options in the ODA? / Will the Board be making changes to the ODA based on feedback?**

A: The ODA is a response to the Board on the scoping questions it provided to the Org. As far as the Final Report, the Board did open a [Public Comment](#) proceeding for feedback previously, before the ODP happened, and that Public Comment summary has been completed and will be taken into account. The GNSO Council was also briefed, and they may have some interaction with the Board before they make a decision.

**Q: Will Karen's team continue to shepherd this through the Implementation Review Team (IRT), Applicant Guidebook development and the remaining processes?**

A: Yes, the people on this call will be the ones shepherding the rest of this process.

**Q: What's the expectation for when the Board will make a decision now that the ODA has been delivered?**

A: The Board has been briefed on the ODA, and the Board's SubPro caucus group has been kept up to speed throughout the ODP. The delivery of the ODA puts the ball in the Board's court as far as next steps. The ODA is out for people to read and absorb, and the Board, Org and community will likely come together on next steps in the coming

year.

## Public Interest Commitments (PICs) / Registry Voluntary Commitments (RVCs)

**Q: Why are PICs seen as 'enforceable' only by ICANN? Aren't global commitments visible in the public sphere beyond ICANN, and if commitments exceed ICANN's sphere of expertise, aren't there abstract and more effective non-formal, pressures on staying in tune with commitments, if in effect made in a manner visible? Why was there a discussion on what commitments an applicant is 'allowed' to make? Is it necessary to think of enforceability limits in receiving commitments?**

A: The concerns expressed in the [ODA](#) on the recommendations related to PICs are not about what an applicant should propose as a commitment, but what ICANN would be able to enforce.

**Q: What will ICANN do with PICs that are illegal or immoral or contrary to consensus policy?**

A: The applicant can propose any sort of PIC/RVC. The recommendations provide that there is an opportunity for people to review and comment on the proposed PICs, and ICANN would have to comply with any applicable laws as a part of signing the agreement.

**Q: How will ICANN handle comments to ICANN, specifically concerns and objections raised by the Community?**

A: There are a few cases where people would be proposing RVCs. The [Final Report](#) discusses that an applicant could propose an RVC in response to an objection or concerns received at any point in the process. When that occurs, the question is whether the party agrees that the commitment addresses the concern. Different reasons motivate the different proposed commitments, and there are different criteria and steps depending on the circumstances.

The specific process to comment on a proposed commitment would be developed in implementation.

**Q: The Board has spoken of applicants providing the objective means to determine compliance. Was that considered?**

A: The team considered a number of mechanisms that might address the concern around ICANN's mission and the scope of commitments by applicants, and ultimately suggested a path forward in updating the Bylaws to resolve the ambiguity.

**Q: Why was it necessary to rename Public Interest Commitments into Registry Voluntary Commitments?**

A: This was a decision by the SubPro PDP Working Group, to distinguish between two types of commitments. See p. 38 onwards in the [final report](#).

## Predictability

**Q: If you look at the proposed option in the ODA to run a draw, that's a bad thing for predictability. If there is a way to optimize and accommodate uncertainty in volume and demand, that would go a long way.**

A: The use of a prioritization draw to determine the order of processing was affirmed (Affirmation 19.1) in the Subsequent Procedures Final Report.

## Prioritization

**Q: In Option 2 of the 450 per year what priority (if any) would be given to Community / IDN applications?**

A: As described in Appendix 19 of the [ODA](#), the SubPro Working Group recommended a specific formula for prioritizing IDN applications. While the principle of prioritizing IDN applications within each cycle could be retained in the cyclical round proposal [Option 2], the exact formula specified in Recommendation 19.3 might need to be adjusted to support the approach for scheduled cycles and batches.

**Q: In the option 2, how will the applications be prioritized?**

A: The team has not fully developed all the details for option 2. But the process in Appendix 19 of the [ODA](#) foresees using a prioritization draw process similar to what occurred in the 2012 round and as recommended in the [Final Report](#).

**Q: This second option is interesting. But how do you choose which 450 applications go into the first batch?**

A: The process in the [ODA](#) foresees using a prioritization draw process, as described in Appendix 19.

Here is the link to the 2012 Draw:

<https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/prioritization-draw>

**Q: How do you propose to conduct global outreach to try to get a far better**

**understanding of the level / volume of applications by category specifically, especially as at the present there is priority draw for IDNs applications. Scenario : What if there were 450 IDN applications, which would take priority in the first year, Where does that leave a .brand applicant waiting years I guess....**

A: A variation of this question was posed in the first webinar earlier today. Regarding the scenario example in the question, we would propose to keep the IDN prioritization as in the past and as recommended in the [Final Report](#). The specific formula might change, however.

**Q: Just a thought: Wouldn't it require consent by applicants, or an explicit indication that the applicant pays \$300000 and bears associated costs of putting together an application only for the 'chance' of being drawn by lottery as a legitimate applicant?**

A: The process described in the [ODA](#) does not include the prioritization draw as a 'chance' to be an applicant. The draw is simply a way to sequence the applications for processing.

**Q: There are some positives about option 2, my concern is that the batches will be done by way of a prioritization draw, but if you accept not just 450 applications in each individual round would you consider that it's not really about 450 applications, it may be about 450 unique strings? There could be string contention in applications that don't end up in the prioritization draw.**

A: On Option 2, the team started to explore this concept and include as many details in the ODA as would show current thinking. About contention and prioritization coexisting, the [ODA](#) describes this in Appendix 19.

**Q: It is still \$25000 +, (in some cases 250000 several fold), for a random chance?**

A: There is no proposed limit on the number of applications received. The [Final Report](#) recommended all applications undergo a prioritization draw with a specific formula in Recommendation 19.3 which is essentially a random draw with some priority given to applications for internationalized domain names. That is something we would look at during implementation.

## Rights Protection Mechanisms

**Q: What Is ICANN doing to ensure the protection of "Brand owners"?**

A: Applicants may apply as a .Brand TLD which applies Specification 13 to the base Registry Agreement.

For the top level, the Final Report recommends continuing to make the Legal Rights objection available in future rounds, in the event a rights holder believes an application infringes their rights. For second level registrations, rights protection mechanisms such as Sunrise and Trademark Claims Periods, will continue to apply. The Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP recommended some changes to the current policies. See: <https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/rpm>

## RSP Pre-Evaluation

**Q: The ODA as written implies that an applicant needs to pick an RSP at application time. This violates Affirmation 27.6, which says: "Applicants must be able to demonstrate their technical and operational capability to run a registry operation for the purpose that the applicant sets out, either by submitting it to evaluation at application time or agreeing to use an RSP that has successfully completed pre- evaluation as part of the RSP pre-evaluation program.182 ". Is this going to be rectified in an ODA corrigendum?**

A: The ODA design anticipates that there are two paths for applicants - using a pre-evaluated RSP or going through the technical evaluation during application evaluation.

In the first case, the processes in the [ODA](#) are designed for the applicant to identify the RSP at the time of application, to meet the requirement in Recommendation 27.14 of taking into account the total number of TLDs and expected registrations for an applicant's given RSP. While this information could potentially be collected and evaluated at delegation time instead, this would create a less streamlined process as the information would need to be collected, reviewed, and confirmed at that stage. In the event that the TLD could not be supported for the total number and volume expected, the applicant and/or RSP would then need to go back and repeat several steps.

**Q: Is it expected that the RSP pre-evaluation process will result in increased implementation time/costs? My understanding is that it was meant to do the opposite (compared to RSP evaluation and testing being done on a case-by-case basis for each application)?**

A: The RSP Pre-evaluation needs to be developed, so in the short term there is cost to build that; however, it is expected to reduce cost over time.

**Q: Note that the RSP Pre-evaluation is supposed to have cost-recovery in itself, so there shouldn't be any fees paid by applicants to cover it.**

A: The RSP Pre-Evaluation is also meant to operate on a cost recovery basis. However, ICANN org will incur costs to develop systems and processes to create the pre-evaluation program. Costs for the RSP Pre-Evaluation program are expected to be

recovered by those requesting pre-evaluation as RSPs, and are not expected to be passed on to applicants.

**Q: More granularity would be helpful to understand how assumptions were arrived at around financials/RSP approval.**

A: As described in the [ODA](#), the team worked with the assumption that (>90%) of the applications would use a pre-evaluated RSP. The team anticipates that the RSP Pre-Evaluation component will save cost and time in future rounds, but there is a significant start-up cost to build it, as this is not a pre-existing process for the org.

**Q: ICANN is assessing a 4K fee to evaluate a switch for RSP pre-eval, can you explain how security and stability would be different for existing Registry vs. new applicants?**

A: Technical Testing is a subset of the full technical evaluation. The cost for the full technical evaluation was higher than \$4k. The costs in the 2012 round also came down over time due to the volume of evaluations and tests conducted.

RSP testing is included, which will show how many TLDs a Registry can support.

**Q: What new elements are being planned for RST automation that differs from what you have in house today?**

A: Please see Appendix 15 of the [ODA](#) for details on the elements being planned for RST automation.

## Systems

**Q: Which option and investment ensures a better rework and reuse of IT systems for future rounds?**

A: The systems used in the 2012 round are not usable for future rounds. If the question is related to ongoing sustainability of systems for the next (and future rounds beyond the next round) then: Option 1 is a fully transactional system and would have the most efficiency in processing from round to round. Option 2 is a limited set of functionality that, while reusable, does not provide as much processing automation (requiring manual processing in future rounds).

**Q: What will the impact on the options be on existing IT priorities?**

A: The expectation will be that the majority of work will be outsourced to external vendors, specifically the implementation delivery team. There are a couple of supporting

teams that need additional resources such as the public website, but that would be minor in the grand scheme of things.

SubPro should not impact existing operations as we are not intending to use the core operating budget to fund the Program.

## Timeline

**Q: To clarify, for option 2 does the 6 month ramp up mean that the timeline is really 24 rather than 18 months?**

A: Yes. The 6 month ramp up is required to obtain resources and prepare for the 18 months of implementation work.

**Q: In looking at the timeline, there's a lot of operational processes to work out. Drafting and approving the AGB in 11 months seems sensible. Concerned about timelines that they ignore a ramp up, last time we were surprised about the ODP ramp up. When would the 6 month ramp up mentioned in the report begin?**

A: The need for a ramp-up period would be an input to the Board in directing the org's work on implementation. This could begin at any time depending on such direction.

There is typically a 3 month ramp up period for the org to develop a project charter, allocate resources, get commitment from the functions needed. The ramp up was noted in the systems section of the [ODA](#), which would be needed to get the specialized resources for the system build. The Board is responsible for deciding on the recommendations and beginning the work/providing resources as needed. It could be that the Board directs the org to begin ramping up before they decide to launch implementation.

**Q: I understand the reason for the disclaimer on the impact of outstanding issues on the timeline but on this basis, how should we understand/interpret the projected 11 month timeline for the AGB drafting process? Is this 11 months best-case scenario, worst-case scenario, or the squarely achievable?**

A: The timeline for Option 2 represents a best-case scenario in the sense that the Board, org, and community all agree to collaborate to meet the same target and execute accordingly.