Community Comment 2

Public Comment Review Tool

1.10 Applicant Guidebook		
# **Comment**	**Contributor**	**WG Response**
1 Also, the effort of having a more extensively publicized Applicant Guidebook directed to developing countries and also translating it to as many languages as possible would help in outreaching to as many prospective applicants as possible, acknowledging that Applicant Guidebook was translated to the UN languages.	NCSG	
1.10.1 - The Applicant Guidebook served as the roadmap for applicants, but also all other participants to the program. As such, there is a mixture of historical and practical information, some of which is relevant to only certain parties. Do you think it makes sense to partition the Applicant Guidebook into different audience-driven sections or by type of application?		
1 Both suggestions make perfect sense. See suggestion for categories of TLDs above.	Jannik Skou	
2 INTA recognizes that additional policy work is undecided on topics that would impact development on AGB partitions (e.g., whether there will be separate application types or a separate Registry Agreement (RA) for each TLD type). Partitioning the AGB to cater to these specific audiences or TLD types may aid in making that material accessible for those audiences (e.g., .BRAND applicants). However, INTA recommends a careful approach, as the AGB is the roadmap for the applicant process, and having different types of AGBs or partitions of the same may lead inconsistencies in differing interpretations of guidelines or applicants may receive incomplete information. INTA would be supportive of partitioning the AGB into different audience-driven sections. By seeking to address both potential applicants and third parties, the AGB in its current format is long, sometimes confusing, and difficult to navigate. It would strongly benefit from being drafted in different parts, dependent on the audience. These could include a part addressed to applicants, containing just the practical information necessary to them in order to complete their application. A separate part could contain information necessary to objection processes. Where there is historical information or other explanation of relevance to either of these parts, this could be contained in further distinct section, with clear links. The AGB would also benefit from a glossary of defined terms and acronyms.	INTA	
3 The GAC suggests that there be a critical assessment of whether the Applicant Guidebook should be used as a central document in future, or whether simpler and clearer information for applicants can be provided through a single place on the ICANN website. If the Guidebook is to be retained, the suggested partitioning appears to have merit.	GAC	
4 No – this would increase the risk of confusion for applicants and also creates uncertainty for applications that do not fit neatly into a certain category.	Nominet	
5 Yes.	BC	
6 This seems like an implementation issue, not policy.	Jim Prendergast	

7	Yes. The Applicant Guidebook suffers from a fundamental problem. It was written for two separate audiences. The first audience was an internal one of ICANN's policy-development body the Generic Names Supporting Organisation (GNSO). The guidebook attempted to explain how GNSO policy was being implemented. As a result it included history and background. The second audience was an external one, the domain name applicant who was interested only in the process of how to apply. As a result of trying to speak to two audiences, it failed both. From the applicants perspective, the guidebook is: overly long, confusing, duplicative, and poorly indexed. Our recommendations would be to (1) write a new Applicant Guidebook to remove duplication and unnecessary background information, and create a step by step guide for applicants. Number and index the guidebook consistently; (2) improve the customisation of documentation to differentiate between the registry operator, and third-party providers of registry, back-end technical and financial services; (3) define acronyms on first use and where appropriate frequently provide links to a glossary; and (4) partition sections to a specific type of applicant where relevant to that distinct type.	BRG	
8	The Guidebook needs to be rewritten per my answers above.	John Poole	
9	The Applicant Guidebook must be a single, consistent set of procedures and rules applied uniformly across all applications. Creating multiple documents or repetitive sections will only introduce communications risk, specifically, keeping content identical across multiple sections, or how to address an application that changes from a community to a generic, etc. to name just a few. ICANN's goal should be a uniform process clearly articulated in a single document.	Afilias	
10	Future new gTLD applicants will require a guiding document that instructs them on how to prepare their applications to submit to ICANN, and how to manage their applications through the various procedures in between submitting those applications and delegating their gTLDs. This document, whether it takes the form of an Applicant Guidebook or an alternative medium, should be confined to only information that is relevant to the preparation of applications and the movement of those applications through subsequent evaluation, string contention, objection, testing, and other procedures en route to delegation. Information regarding the rationale behind certain policies or the historical context for how decisions were reached should be captured in a separate, policy-oriented document that interested parties can review as desired. However, the Applicant Guidebook (or its replacement) will be most useful if geared specifically toward applicants. Information pertinent to other kinds of participants, such as those who may wish to file objections to applications, should also be consolidated into separate, targeted documents. Readers and users of these documents will undoubtedly find shorter, more targeted materials easier to read through and make use of. If the policy for subsequent new gTLD procedures determines that there should be separate application types, then the sections of the Applicant Guidebook (or its replacement) should make specific note when variation exists among application types, such as different requirements for answering an application question or providing materials to ICANN. The Guidebook (or its replacement) should make clear to readers that if no variation is noted, then all applications must follow the same process or standards outlined in that section.	RySG	
11	We see no need to fragment the Guidebook, as it may create confusion (especially when versions written for different audiences are perceived to conflict)	ALAC	