CC2: Work Track 1 – Application Queueing

1.7 Application Queuing

1.7.1 – The WG believes that the process for establishing the evaluation processing order for applications should be similar to the prioritization draw from the 2012 round. This is, in fact contrary to the first submitted first processed/evaluated guidance provided in the 2007 Final Report. Do you agree that a process similar to the prioritization draw should be used in the future? If rounds are not used, would this method still be appropriate? Would a prioritization draw, or similar method, work for a continuous application period or would it be better to base processing/evaluation on order of receipt?

Nominet, GAC UK, and RySG, and Jannik Skou generally support prioritization draw.

Sample excerpts:

"We would concur that the prioritization draw used in round 1 was appropriate. It is hard to see how that could be implemented outside of a 'rounds' concept though. IF the application process is a lot faster and more streamlined in future then priority for evaluation should not be such a problem. Do not consider digital archery again!" -- Nominet

"The prioritisation draw of the current round appeared to work well. If a round mechanism is not adopted next time, it should nonetheless be possible to inaugurate the next process with a prioritisation draw or similar mechanism." – GAC UK

"We recommend the simplest approach: retaining the lottery-style prioritization mechanism that was ultimately used in the 2012 round. While prioritization did not yield such significant advantages or disadvantages as anticipated, given varying applicant timelines for bringing TLDs to market and other delays in decontention processes, the lottery was lightweight and effective, and does not require change.

One minor modification to consider would be to allow applicants to choose which of their applications to prioritize within the queuing process. For example, an applicant with five applications in a particular launch window would get five lottery numbers, but could choose which of its TLDs to associate with each launch slot it was awarded within the lottery." – RySG

"Prioritization Draw is fair and works." – Jannik Skou (staff note: quote is from response to 1.7.2)

John Poole opposes prioritization draw.

Excerpt:

"THIS IS A MISTAKE. THE WG IS WRONG. This is, in fact contrary to the first submitted first processed/evaluated guidance provided in the 2007 Final Report." – John Poole

Sample excerpts:

"Any selection mechanism should be simple, straightforward, easy to use AND decided and communicated to applicants prior to the application window opening. It is not acceptable to move the goal posts half way through the process." – Nominet

"To avoid the issues encountered during the 2012 round the 2 prioritization mechanism should be established in advance of accepting applications and described in the applicant guidebook." -- RySG

1.7.2 - Should certain subgroups of applicants/application types be prioritized over others? For instance, from the 2012 prioritization draw, IDNs were moved to the front of the queue for application processing. If you think IDNs or some other category of applications (e.g., Brands, communities, etc.) should be prioritized, do you have suggestions on how to determine the prioritization?

Jannik Skou, Nominet, ALAC, Demys, and GAC UK favored prioritization of specific applications types (see quotes for details, emphasis added).

Sample excerpts:

"Priority should be given to **Category 1 and 2 applications**; "GEOs by public authority TLDs" and "non-for profit TLDs" Priority should not be granted to IDNs as those can be from Europe/North America (or .Brands) And not to specific Regions (this can easily be gamed by setting up a local company)." – Jannik Skou

"We would be happy for the same process as last time to be followed - **IDNs should be prioritised** and encouraged as the process did not generate much language diversity last time. Arguably other categories where contention and controversy issues will be low such as **geo/ community names and .BRANDs** should also be prioritised behind IDNs but before general applications." – Nominet

"Applicants asking for **Applicant Support and community evaluation** be given priority." – ALAC

"During a continuously available application system **brands and communities** should still be prioritized if applied for within the application window as of the first received application for that TLD." – Demys (staff note: quote is from response to 1.7.1)

"With more effective communication of the opportunity and building on current experience of successful IDNs, **prioritisation of IDNs** should help to increase the number of IDNs to a level of take-up exceeding the disappointing low percentage level of the current round." – GAC UK

Aflias and RySG and John Poole do not favor prioritization of specific application types.

Sample excerpts:

"The implementation of a continuous period obviates the need for queuing. Else, randomization with no prioritization of categories is clear and fair." -- Afilias

"There is no consensus within the RySG about whether prioritization should occur and which applicant categories should be prioritized. We believe that the default position, in the event that consensus cannot be reached, should be to avoid prioritization of particular categories over others." – RySG

BRG suggested grouping applications by common characteristics.

Excerpt:

"Consider grouping applications by common characteristics while establishing priority numbers, in order to increase processing efficiency. If there are more efficient processes that could be introduced by segregating type, we could see the application-to-delegation timeframe reduce, where absent of contention sets. . ." -- BRG (staff note: see full text for examples and additional detail)