

At-Large RySG Alternative Proposal for Continuity Operations Instrument Workspace

Comment Period	<p>Important Information Links</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Comment Announcement To Submit Your Comments (Forum) View Comments Submitted
Open Date:	17 November 2011
Close Date:	2 December 2011
Time (UTC):	23:59
Originating Organization:	Registry Stakeholder Group
Purpose:	<p>Public comment is requested concerning the recently received from the proposal for Establishment of a Continued Operations Fund. This proposal comes from the Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) and is accompanied by an addendum (Proposed Continuity Operations Instrument) produced by the Afilias and PIR, supported by some other registries, registry applicants and other interested parties. The RySG proposal offers an alternative approach to the existing Continuing Operations Instrument that is part of the New gTLD Program. Here are some questions that public comment respondents could consider regarding the RySG alternative proposal as well as the existing continuing instrument model offered by ICANN.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considering ICANN's Mission, what is the appropriate role for ICANN to create a fund or act as an insurer? Under which circumstances?#* Can the same end be accomplished through a third party?#* #* Will an insurance company underwrite this? 2. The current COI model outlined on the Applicant Guidebook (see:http://newgtlds.icann.org/applicants/agb) is designed to provide some safeguards regardless of the number of gTLD registries that fail.#* For the existing COI model.#** There will be an incentive to underestimate the projected size of the new registry, and therefore lower the cost of the COI to below what it should be to protect registrants. How could this be addressed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the COF model:#** Who should determine how much reserve must be set aside? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What criteria should be used to ensure sufficient funding and a mechanism to provide registrant protections? 3. In the estimates shown in the addendum (Proposed Continuity Operations Instrument), what are the assumptions can be made in creating the basis for the proposed fund? 4. How should the both the existing COI model and the newly proposed COF model ensure that it appropriately meets the needs of multiple registries sizes from small to large? 5. Will the allocation of costs need to be adjusted over time if new registries enter the pool after the target balance is achieved? How can this account for some level of predictability and fairness for all registries? 6. What appropriate level of internal resources should ICANN have for collections, tracking of deposits and outlays from the fund? 7. What are the foreseeable challenges to move funds in timely manner to various parties as required responding to emergency situations?
Current Status:	The current model proposed by ICANN is outlined in the Applicant Guidebook, in particular the module 2, evaluation criteria attachment and the spec 8 of the Registry Agreement. Respondents to the public comment that wish to learn more about this topic are also encouraged to read the gTLD Registry Transition Process Memorandum (http://www.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/registry-transition-processes-clean-30may11-en.pdf [PDF, 747 KB]) and the recently posted Emergency Back-End Registry Operator Request for Information (EBERO RFI): http://www.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-2-14sep11-en.htm .
Next Steps:	Those interested in the topic, in addition to submitting public comments, should try to attend the ICANN Dakar "Continuing Operations Instrument (COI) - Discussion on RySG proposal" session. In this session, experts from the Registry Constituency and ICANN community will discuss the proposal as well as some of the questions outlined. The session will have remote participation for those unable to attend. Click here for session and remote participation details. The session will be recorded and the recording will be available soon after the Dakar Meeting ends.
Staff Contact:	Karla Valente
Email:	karla.valente@icann.org