## CC2 Themes – Work Track 2 TLD Rollout

2.7.1 The Applicant Guidebook specified timelines by which applicants had to complete the contracting (9 months) and delegation (12 months) steps of the process. However, this requirement only means that the contract needs to be executed and nic.TLD be delegated. Are these timeframes reasonable? Is there still a need for these requirements? Please explain.

<u>Jannik Skou, Nominet, John Poole, Afilias, RySG and BRG agreed that these timeframes were</u> reasonable.

## Sample excerpts:

"Yes these are **reasonable**. We would also agree **that there should be some longstop date by which contract execution and first delegation are to take place**." – Nominet

"Yes. ALL gTLDs are supposed to be for the benefit of registrants and the global internet community, not registry operators (I know that comes as a surprise to the GNSO, the GDD (Global Domains Division), and others within ICANN. A registry operator that fails to timely operate the registry should be terminated." – John Poole

"Yes, we believe that these requirements are reasonable to avoid speculative applications. We further believe that the extensions provided and the criteria applied by ICANN in evaluating/granting those extensions have been reasonable and continued to serve the intended purpose." – RySG, BRG

Afilias, Jannik Skou, and BC provided additional input on aspects of TLD rollout.

## Excerpts:

- . . . the requirement to begin escrowing data for only a nic.TLD site seems premature." -- Afilias
- "... once evaluated TLD applicants should be GUARANTEED contract/delegation (in other words contention set /clarifying questions etc.) within a certain time frame (say 1.5 years, otherwise an option to withdraw and get full application fee back)." Jannik Skou
- "Applicants and ICANN both need to adhere to the specified timelines. During the last application round, ICANN often took weeks and even months to respond or send acknowledgement of applications and inquiries. When they did respond, applicants were provided with a very short "response due date" otherwise the issue would be closed. This resulted in a very one-sided process." BC