

The image is a promotional graphic for the ICANN 60 Annual General meeting. It features a background photograph of a cityscape at dusk or dawn, with several tall, modern skyscrapers on the left and a large, ornate archway on the right. In the foreground, there are colorful flower beds and a paved walkway. A white rectangular box with a thin border is overlaid on the right side of the image, containing the event details in white text. The text is arranged in three lines: 'ICANN' in a large, bold, sans-serif font, followed by 'ANNUAL GENERAL' in a smaller, bold, sans-serif font, and '60' in a very large, bold, sans-serif font. Below this, 'ABU DHABI' is written in a bold, sans-serif font, and '28 October-3 November 2017' is written in a smaller, sans-serif font.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL

60

ABU DHABI

28 October-3 November 2017

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Meeting with the ALAC – Applicant Support, Community-based Applications, and String Confusion

Sara Bockey & Christa Taylor (Work Track 1)

Karen Day & Robin Gross (Work Track 3)

ICANN60

28 October 2017



Work Track 1

Applicant Support

Work Track 1 - Applicant Support

- ⊙ Issue:
 - Lack of utilization of the Applicant Support Program (ASP): During the 2012 round, only 3 applicants for ASP, 1 meeting criteria
 - The WG has identified a number of possible causes for lack of ASP use: Criteria is configured improperly, program made available too late, outreach efforts not executed well, and lack of holistic support (e.g., beyond financial)

- ⊙ Current Status – In Deliberations:
 - Discussing support beyond financial (e.g., mentoring, technical support, capacity building, annual ICANN fee relief, etc.)
 - Some consideration of expanding ASP to the “middle applicant,” or in other words struggling regions that are further along in their development compared to underserved or underdeveloped regions.

Work Track 1 - Applicant Support, cont.

- ⊙ Current Status, cont.:
 - Noted concerns with rule that resulted in ASP candidates losing initial fees when not meeting criteria
 - Some noted that the business model (e.g., RO targeting applicants in underserved/underdeveloped regions) could be a factor for consideration
 - Broad support for expanding outreach through local partners, GSE, leveraging existing workshops/conferences, etc.
 - Stemming from the AM Global Report, WG acknowledged that possible ASP candidates may not see business case or environment is simply not ready to support a registry

Work Track 1 - Applicant Support, cont.

- ⊙ Questions:
 - Broad support for expanding support beyond financial, increasing the reach and effectiveness of outreach, and improving capacity building. What if no one shows up still?
 - Should the concept of the “middle applicant” be considered for inclusion to help broaden the pool of possible candidates?

Work Track 3

Community-based Applications & String Similarity

Work Track 3 – Community-based Applications

- ⊙ Issue:
 - Concerns about Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) results – specifically about the strictness of the criteria and the way they were interpreted by the evaluators
 - Concerns about the CPE process and level of transparency (note, ICANN Board resolved on 17 Sept 2016 that ICANN undertake independent review of CPE process)

- ⊙ Current:
 - WT has considered a number of available resources (e.g., Council of Europe report, data on outcomes of CPE in 2012, GAC Advice, etc.)
 - Have determined that a definition of community, as it applies to the New gTLD Program, is a priority – have prepared strawbunny definition

Work Track 3 – Community-based Applications, cont.

- ⊙ Current, cont.:
 - Will need to review the extensive amount of CC2 feedback received (come join F2F!)
 - Some noted that perhaps the "all or nothing approach" could be adjusted
 - Concerns with consistency, cost, transparency of process
 - Etc.

- ⊙ Questions:
 - Community designation only applied during CPE – is this the right approach?
 - Is it possible to make adjustments to CPE that would satisfy both the winning and losing parties involved?
 - What type of communities do you envision receiving priority?

Work Track 3 – String Similarity (Evaluation)

- ⊙ Issue:
 - For the evaluation, concerns were primarily in relation to the lack of clarity around singular and plural strings.
 - Concern about the time required to perform analysis and release results

- ⊙ Current:
 - General support for a proposal from the RySG, which noted:
 - Policy (recommendation 2) essentially remains the same, some new implementation guidance developed
 - For singular/plurals: dictionary, on a per-language basis, would form contention sets
 - Eliminate SWORD tool

Work Track 3 – String Similarity (Evaluation), cont.

- ⊙ Current, cont.:
 - Some thought given to allowing for a very limited ability to choose a different TLD when put into a contention set

- ⊙ Questions:
 - Thoughts on the RySG suggestions?
 - Any other suggested changes?

Work Track 3 – String Confusion (Objection)

- ⊙ Issue:
 - A number of general concerns related to objections, but specific to String Confusion, concerns primarily around inconsistent outcomes

- ⊙ Current:
 - General support for existing high-level Recommendation 2
 - Some discussion around a proposal from the RySG:
 - Objector could file a single objection that extends to all applications for identical string, though each respondent would file own response
 - Same panel would review all relevant materials
 - Deliver single determination about which strings are in contention

Work Track 3 – String Confusion (Objection), cont.

- ⦿ Questions:
 - Thoughts on the RySG suggestion?
 - Other ways beyond consolidation that might address inconsistency?