



SubPro WT 4: IDN / Technical / Operations

Meeting #16 0300 UTC 17 August 2017

Agenda

1

Welcome and
Opening Remarks

2

SOI updates

3

Application
Evaluation

4

AOB and closing

- 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
- 2. SOI updates**

3. Application Evaluation

Where we(WT4) are

- Technical evaluation to be done aggregated (even among different ROs sharing a single back-end) (With or without RSP program)
- Financial evaluation to be done aggregated by RO
 - a. Despite some CC2 comments against
- Minor tweaks expected to technical questions
- Major overhaul expected to financial questions
 - a. Straw-person yet to be developed; no clear guidance from CC2 beyond “start from scratch”
- Still to address registry services and non-scored questions
- ICANN Org still to provide detailed CQs and answers, but so far in favor of it
- Some forecasts of high number of applications ; scaling has to be thought for

Non-scored Questions

- Is that a theme for WT4 ?
 - Most non-scored questions relate to TLD usage, which could be base for objections of AC advice, not fail or pass evaluation
 - Not enforced by agreement, unless a voluntary PIC covers them
 - Can be changed after application (but need to be informed) or after contracting (and then not even needing to be informed)
- Straw-person:
 - Forward them all to WT2

Technical Questions - ICANN Program Review Feedback

- “Consider whether an alternate approach to the Technical and Operational Evaluation Capability would be worthwhile”
 - ✓ - RSP Program
- “Review Technical and Operational Capability CQs and responses to determine whether improvements to the application questions can be made”
 - Requested, pending information gathering and applicant authorization. It will take time.
 - Q30b (Security Policy) is one of the questions with large number of CQs, but those are not public and we won't get them.
 - What is reasonable to ask regarding company critical information ?

Technical Questions - ICANN Technical Services Feedback

- 11 recommendations, mostly related to RSP and PDT (to be addressed at a later opportunity)
- 1 recommendation related to application evaluation:

“Simplify the scoring framework: During the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program, most question results were binary (0 or 1), but it was possible to earn 0, 1, or 2 points on some questions. This added complexity to the evaluation process with little benefit. ICANN recommends defining the criteria such that a passing score equates to the desired amount of capability to run a registry, and removing the option for 2 points. “

 - ✓ - Seems non-controversial and addresses issues with Q32 (HA and Scalability)

Registry Services

- Mainly used as a mean to collect information to build “Exhibit A” (Approved Services) in registry contracts
- Probably less useful when technical evaluation is done in bulk or not done at all (RSP Program)
- Undergoing discussions might streamline registry service adoption (“free to deploy” services, services requiring no contract amendment)
- Straw-person:
 - Applications wouldn’t be allowed to specify registry services. List of previously approved registry services (IDN Languages, GPML, BTPPA) to be included in AGB and contract; possible new registry services available thru RSEP starting at contracting time

Financial Questions - ICANN Program Review Feedback

- “Consider whether an alternative approach to the Financial Capability evaluation” would be worthwhile”
 - ✓ Everyone agrees
- “Review Financial Capability CQs and responses to determine whether improvements to the application questions can be made”
 - But if the approach is changed, 2012 questions won’t be of much use

Financial Questions - Principles

- What are the threats being addressed ?
 - Insolvent registry
 - Lack of market performance
 - Parent company extinction or business line closure
 - Unwillingness to provide financial statements to contract due diligence
 - Applying to more TLDs that one can handle
- What other ways can we use to address those threats ? (Besides a COI so demanding that violates banking regulations)
 - Current financials - what about unprofitable companies like Uber and Amazon ? What about start-ups ?
 - Stock exchange listed companies - same questions as above

Financial Questions - Straw-person

No need to do any financial evaluation as part of the application process. ICANN Org would be allowed to eval any financial information deemed appropriate as required by usual corporate governance before contract signing (like OFAC regulations). Applicants will be provided in AGB a nonexhaustive list of likely documents to be sent as part of the contracting process, if they succeed in their applications.

4. AOB