



CC2 Discussion: Registry Agreement

WT2 | 13 July 2017

Agenda

1

Welcome and
Introduction

2

SOI Updates

3

Discussion Recap

4

CC2 Comments

1. Introduction

- ⊙ Goal: To move towards deliberations and proposals for steps forward for the initial report.
- ⊙ Schedule:
 - ⊙ 13 June 2017 15 UTC Meeting: Review CC2 Comments for Base Registry Agreement
 - ⊙ 27 June 2017 21 UTC Meeting: Work towards deliberations for Base Registry Agreement

2. Discussion Recap: Where are we at now?

- ⊙ Only one item captured in regards to Base Registry Agreement. **Single Registry Agreement vs. Multiple Registry Agreements.**
- ⊙ Discussion is dependant upon other discussions such as whether or not to have multiple categories.
- ⊙ Looked at pros and cons of Single Registry Agreement vs. Multiple Registry Agreements:
 - ⊙ Single RA: predictability, fairness, efficiency, lack of clear and definitive boundaries around potential categories for different RAs.
 - ⊙ Multiple RAs: need for ICANN to recognize and support different TLD business models, difficult to obtain exemptions in 2012 round therefore different versions of RA may have been best to begin with
- ⊙ Possible Compromises introduced:
 - ⊙ Scaled back “core” Agreement with additional specifications per category
 - ⊙ Single agreement with a more clear, structured, and efficient method for obtaining exemptions

3. CC2 Questions

- ◎ 2.1.1 - The question of whether or not a single Registry Agreement is suitable is tied into the subject of different TLD categories. Throughout the working group's discussions, there has been support for a model similar to what is currently in place: a single Registry Agreement with exemptions that allow for TLDs with different operational models (e.g., Specification 13 for Brand TLDs or Specification 12 for Community TLDs). There is also support for different Registry Agreements for different TLD categories, centered around a common, core base set of contractual requirements. Which of these models do you think would be most effective for recognizing the different operational requirements of different TLDs? Which of these models do you think would be most efficient in terms of development, implementation, and operational execution (e.g., contracting, contractual compliance, etc.)? Do you think there are any alternative options that could effectively facilitate TLDs with different operational requirements?

3. CC2 Questions

- ⦿ 2.1.2 - Should further restrictions pertaining to sunrise periods, landrush, or other registry activities be developed? If so, do you have suggestions on attributes of these restrictions? Should they be incorporated into the base agreement? Should there be any restrictions established on registry pricing?

3. CC2 Questions

- ⦿ 2.1.3 - Should the entire application be incorporated into the signed Registry Agreement? Should portions of the application, explicitly identified, be incorporated into the signed Registry Agreement? If changes are made between applying and executing the Registry Agreement, how should this be handled? If changes are made after executing the Registry Agreement, how should this be handled? If changes like these are contemplated, how can the needs of the community to properly consider the contents of an application be weighed against an applicant's need to make either minor adjustments or fundamental changes to their registry?