
NANCY LUPIANO: Ladies and gentlemen, our meeting will beginning, and let us welcome Kurt Pritz, senior vice president, ICANN.

[Cheers and Applause]

KURT PRITZ: Thank you. Thank you for that small cadre of support. And I'm joined by Trang Nguyen, ICANN's senior manager of customer service.

Are you pointing to me for a reason?

It was a much fuller room when there were fewer chairs.

So thanks for joining us again.

The purpose of this set of slides and our presentation is to provide additional information and detail into the application process and the evaluation process for new gTLDs. And interestingly, this is the last presentation of this type before the Costa Rica meeting, and at that meeting we won't have a presentation like this because we will be in the middle of the application window.

So that's very interesting.

So like I said, we are going to go through materials that seek to provide additional material into the application and evaluation process. We have a really short video describing some aspects of TAS, the TLD Application system, for us to watch, so I hope you can see that okay.

And Trang and I are going to sort of split this up.

So Trang is going to take us through some of the application aspects, and I'll stand up here and take potshots as she describes it, and after the short video I'll describe aspects of the evaluation and then we will both answer questions. So I will give you the official clicker, and we'll start with Trang.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So, thanks.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Thanks, Kurt. Let's get right into this.

Who can apply for a new gTLD? The new gTLD program is open to established organizations, corporations and institutions from anywhere around the world. This is a serious commitment to operate a visible piece of the Internet infrastructure, and so we have very rigid requirements, eligibility requirements for the program. And those are outlined in the Applicant Guidebook.

NANCY LUPIANO:

Trang, may I interrupt for one moment? You are speaking so quickly our scribes and our interpreters are having a difficult time. If you could just slow down a little.

Thank you. I apologize.

TRANG NGUYEN:

No problem.

Not eligible to apply are individuals or sole proprietorships. Also not eligible are yet to be formed entities or applications presupposing the formation of such entities.

It is important to note that we will be performing background check on all of the applying entities as well as all of the shareholders and directors that are named in the applications.

The evaluation fee is \$185,000, that's payable to ICANN by the close of the application window. And all of the rules are outlined in the Applicant Guidebook.

So there are a few types of TLDs that are specifically called out in the Applicant Guidebook. Community-based TLDs are TLDs that are intended to serve a specified community, a defined community.

Geographic name TLDs are TLDs that represent a city or region.

Internationalized domain names or IDN TLDs are TLDs that are in non-Latin ASCII characters, and for those types of TLDs there are special rules and added requirements that are specified in the Applicant Guidebook. All others are considered standard.

So let's get into a little bit more specifics of these around the TLDs that we just talked about.

Community-based TLDs is a TLD that is operated for the benefit of a clearly defined community. So if you are applying for – So applications for a community TLD must demonstrate -- things they must do, number one is demonstrate a relationship to a clearly delineated community. Number two, the string itself has to be related to the community that the application has named.

The application has to propose defined or specific registrations or registrations and use. And, also, the last requirement is that those applications must be endorsed by one or more established institutions representing the community that it has named.

In the cases of contention for the same TLDs, if you have a community-based application and a standard application that are in the same contention set, the community-based application may elect community priority evaluation to get priority within that contention set.

And then if that community-based ccTLD is delegated into the root, then it will be required to operate within the self-specified restrictions that are described in the registry agreement that it signs with ICANN.

Do you have anything to add, Kurt?

KURT PRITZ:

Just to add that -- You can just leave my microphone on and I will try to keep quiet.

I will just add that that is the only time in the evaluation process where the community designation really comes into play, is in cases of contention.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Geographic TLDs, I mentioned, are TLDs that represent a city or region. So applications for geographic names must give appropriate consideration the interests of governments. So if you are applying for a capital city name or a city name that meets certain requirements or a national place name like a county or state or a province, or if it's a UNESCO region name, then that application must also provide documentations of support or non-objection from relevant governments.

It's important to note that country names are not available under the new gTLD program.

And when the geographic name evaluations panel evaluate these applications, they are going to be looking at the string against the U.N. and ISO list. It's also important to note that the geographic names evaluation panel is going to evaluate all applications, not just those that have designated themselves as geo names applications, but all applications.

So if they find an application that has not been designated as a geo name application but it is an application for a city, or country or territory name, it will be evaluated as a geo name application.

Anything to add here, Kurt?

KURT PRITZ:

No. You don't have to check with me.

TRANG NGUYEN:

Internationalized domain names or IDN TLDs are TLDs that are in non-Latin ASCII characters, and Section 1.3.3 the

Applicant Guidebook talks about IDN variant TLDs, and we encourage all applicants that are interested in applying for a non-IDN TLD review that section in detail because they do have to comply with IDNA protocol and IDN guidelines.

What you see below there in the little box are all the IDN TLDs that are currently in the root.

And I think the board is voting on some --

KURT PRITZ:

Yeah, I think -- Dan, is the board considering revised IDN guidelines at this meeting for approval? So you should look at that.

TRANG NGUYEN:

So when can you apply? The application window opens on January 12, 2012, and it closes on April 12, 2012, so it's basically a three-month window period where you can apply for a new gTLD. But, however, due to the number of processing steps that are involved in the application process, we are going to close the TAS registration on March 29 of 2012. And the reason we are doing that is we want to make sure you as an applicant have enough time to complete your application in TAS before the close of the application window.

So that's an important date to remember, March 29.

So where to apply?

The entire application process is going to be managed by the TLD Application System, or TAS. TAS is going to be accessible via the new gTLD Web site when the application window opens, and not before. I have gotten a lot of questions about that.

So when the application window opens on January 12th is when you can gain access into TAS and start the registration process. Not before of.

I don't want to talk to you about this too much because we are going to show a video of TAS, but one thing I want to point out is TAS is going to

hand-hold you throughout the entire application process. So what that means is, when it's time for you to complete your user profile, TAS is going to prompt you to do that. When it's time for to you put down deposit, TAS is going to prompt you to do that.

If your application -- if the evaluation panels have clarification questions for your application, TAS is going to tell you that. And it's also going to tell you when the responses to those clarification questions are due, and it's also going to send you reminders.

So really, it's going to handhold you throughout the entire application process.

Just do this.

This is a high-level view of the application process. Obviously, the first step is to register in TAS. Once you have completed your user profile, you can request an application slot.

This is also the point in time at which the \$5,000 deposit is due.

Once you have completed this step, ICANN is going to verify the user information that you have submitted along with the payment information. Once you are granted an application slot, you can then go in and start to fill out the questions. TAS is going to allow you to upload attachments as part of your answers as well. So you can do that.

And then once you have answered all of your questions, then you can pay the remaining \$180,000.

When the application window closes on April 12th, that's when the evaluation phase will begin, and Kurt is going to talk a little bit more about that in a little bit.

Right now, I want to show you a video of TAS, though. And for those of you who have downloaded the demo of TAS from our Web site, this video is basically a shortened version of that demo, but it's going to have voiceover from Robb Antrobus. And Robb has been integral in the

development of TAS along with another member of our team, Steve Chan.

So you see Robb's voiceover on this video.

If we can cue the video, please. Thank you.

(Video plays)

ROBB ANTROBUS:

I am going to speak to you today about the TLD application system or TAS, as we call it. We have created TAS interactive demo that allows you to walk through and see some of the main components of the application.

What you can see from the screen you are looking at here are the four components that the demonstration covers, that your registration into the system, your completion of an application profile, you're requesting new applications, and finally the ultimate step is incompleting an application and submitting it.

For purposes of this demonstration, I am going to take you through the latter three steps. The completion of a profile, starting new applications, and completion of those applications.

So let's start with the user profile.

TAS works in essentially a linear fashion, and you have to complete steps in order. The first of those steps is the completion of your profile. The profile is associated with questions one through 11 of the Applicant Guidebook. I'll show you how the screens map to that in just a second. Let me talk for just a second about your home page which is where we have just landed. This is the page where you are going to work throughout the process. It lists the steps that you have to do in the completion of your profile, as you can see here. It let's you know when you can begin new applications. And ultimately, under the "my applications" list you can see all of the applications you currently have active. And we will see that a little bit later.

Let's complete a profile. Here we are on the first page which is contact information. We want to collect the primary and secondary contact information and that's what this screen does.

After submitting our contact information, we need to capture the entity or the applicant's contact information. This is the entity that will ultimately enter into a register agreement with ICANN.

So now we are going to collect the officer or shareholder information and this is all associated with question 11 of the Applicant Guidebook. This allows the user to enter in information for your officers, your shareholders, your directors, and other people generally involved in the application process or associated with the entity who is actually submitting the application.

Once we have added items and captured the basic information for those individuals, we want to complete question 11e through h, and that's simply signing off on any issues that may be associated with those individuals.

Continuing, we then collect information regarding the payer or the individual or entity who is going to be submitting the payment for both the application deposit as well as the full application fee. So now we're going to collect information regarding the proof of establishment for the applicant. This is associated with questions 8, 9 and 10 of the Applicant Guidebook. There are required fields on this screen and many screens and you are not able to proceed until you complete those required fields.

Finally, we present you with a confirmation screen of all the information you just entered regarding your user profile or your applicant profile. Take great care in reviewing that information. Because it's used in our review process, we don't want users to change it after it's been submitted. So you should review it with great care and then submit it.

So now if we continue, you can see we now have the ability to start a new application. And you have to agree to the terms and conditions

associated with every application. These are terms and conditions in module 6 of the Applicant Guidebook.

Check off on each of the items. At the bottom of the screen, if were you to scroll down would have to enter your user name as it is in the profile, agree to the final components and then accept those terms and conditions to continue.

We have now requested an application. I have taken you back to the home screen, and I'm going to show you what it now takes to actually complete an application.

You can now see that you have your next task which is the big one in all of this and that's to complete the application.

On the left-hand side and below is essentially a grid showing all of the questions that you have to respond to.

This is questions 13 through 50 of the Applicant Guidebook. And you will access each of those from this screen. So anytime you need to respond to a question, you click on the associated link on this screen.

So in the interactive demo, we let you look at some good examples of how we're going to respond to questions in TAS.

Let's look at questions 13 through 17 which are largely associated with the string. As you can see and as I mentioned, there is an option for you to indicate whether this is for an IDN or not. If it is, and I click that radio button. The screen will expand, allows me to collect additional information.

In several processes throughout the application we allow you to provide attachments. You can see on question 15 where attachments are required.

The remainder questions 22 through 50, there's a lot of information captured there. I'm not going to take you through all of those. Simply one example. The form for all of these responses is the exact same.

The only difference as far as you are concerned is that I'm getting a different question and providing a different response.

So if we click there, you can now see what that looks like. You are given an entry field. For this particular question an attachment is not required. Where an attachment is required for questions 22 through 50 it will be indicated in the yellow box at the bottom of the entry field. And in those instances where it is, you simply click on the "Management Attachments" button at the bottom and it will let you attach documents associated with that question.

Every time you have finished entering information, you click save and close. It will take you back to your application dashboard where you can click on the next question and continue. Now we have taken you through the application process through completing your user profile and applicant profile to starting a new application, your requesting that application, ICANN's review of that request, your submitting of the deposit, and then on through to completing the entirety of the application.

Thanks for your attention. We hope you enjoyed the presentation of the TAS interactive demo.

KURT PRITZ:

Okay. Thanks, Robb.

I hope you found that informative.

I am going to transition the discussion now into the evaluation process, and then we'll take questions on both sets of information at the end of the presentation.

So the evaluation process, as you well know, tracks to the Applicant Guidebook. This is essentially one of the oldest new gTLD slides that was developed after the publication of guidebook one, but in a sense it's good to show that in a sense of consistency that, you know, we

followed through on initial planning as to how we're going to conduct applications and evaluations of these issues. So module 1 is all about an overview of the process and really who can apply. So trying to describe that earlier as the initial part of this presentation.

Module 2, module 2 is the most important part of the guidebook. It describes the -- it lists the questions you have to answer and the criteria by which those answers will be measured. And so while this is somewhat of a complex evaluation process that you see before you, it's thought that all applicants will go through initial evaluation, but most applicants will only have to go through initial evaluation; that most applications will be straightforward. They will be not controversial and they can proceed on transition to delegation.

So if you look at the big fat guidebook, really the part that all applicants need to pay close heed to is Module 2.

And that describes the questions and the evaluation processes.

Some applications, though, will be subject to extended evaluation. Those applications that did not pass initial evaluation will be given a chance to provide supplemental information in their application.

Not materially change their application, but supplement it specifically, in those areas that the evaluator said they weren't sure that the application would pass initial evaluation.

So that extended evaluation is provided with no additional fees to provide an additional chance at evaluation for those applicants.

Some applications will be subject to formal objection, and I am going to describe more about that process later. But applications can be objected to on one of four enumerated grounds in the guidebook, and only those four areas. And they can be objected to by entities or people with standing only. And that will trigger a formal dispute resolution process that will be independent of ICANN in the evaluation but, instead, will be -- will have a determination made by an independent evaluator who will take the objection and the answers to the objection, apply criteria and standards that are already determined and key find in

Module 3, and make a determination whether that application could go forward or not.

Module 4 describes the process for string contention. So if two applicants apply for exactly the same string or string so similar that they would likely result in user confusion, we have decided as a community that both those strings should not be delegated.

What's the process for resolving that contention? That's described in Module 4 of the guidebook.

But like I said, it's anticipated that most applications will be straightforward. Judging by the amount of activity in the community already, we expect a high number of fully competent applications, and those applications, after approval and initial evaluation, are anticipated to move on to transition to delegation.

What's that? You execute an agreement with ICANN, you pass pre-delegation tests that shows you have taken substantial concrete initial steps towards the establishment of a registry, and then you are delegated into the root zone.

A gross timeline of this process is this: The application window, as Trang indicated, open and closes on April 12, 2012 respectively. To process the first round of initial evaluations, that process is expected to close on November 2012, and why that process takes precisely that long, I will provide some more detail in a minute.

And then those applications can proceed on to delegation.

We expect the first delegations to take place, you know, maybe the last month of 2012 or the first month of 2013. So that's about the time. And then delegations will occur thereafter.

So the basic evaluation path, the path that we expect most applications to follow, is that starting on May 12th, the application window will close.

The applications will be publicly posted about two weeks later. I'll get to the specific dates on that soon.

And then there will be a two-month administrative check to make sure all questions are answered and the requirements supporting documents are there. It's a little bit longer than it needs to be, but in discussions that closed out the final issues before we could launch this process, we agreed with ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee that they be provided some time to look at the applications and determine whether they could provide an early warning on some applications. I will talk more about that later, but that's why that process is two months long.

And then initial evaluation for approximately 500 applications is anticipated to take five months. And these are the different evaluations that are going to take place.

I'll tell you more about them in a minute.

And then transition to delegation is really sort of up to the registry. You know, the pace at which the contract is executed, whether the registry wants to negotiate terms different from the base agreement would add time. And then passing the preliminary checks before delegation.

Given this initial time frame, I am going to talk a little bit about the different paths that applications could go down, certain complexities that can arise that might take longer.

So one is extended evaluation. So if the application doesn't pass initial evaluation, extended evaluation could again take up to five months. And that is the same evaluation criteria but the applicant being able to provide some additional information.

So the key important issue here, and like Trang said that TAS will prompt the applicants, is that after notification that an application does not pass initial evaluation, the applicant will have two weeks to request extended evaluation.

What are the evaluation -- what are the different evaluation steps that every application will go through?

I think this is pretty well established, looking around this room, but each application undergoes seven reviews. Four that examine the string itself that's applied for, the TLD label, and three that scrutinize the applicant entity.

So the string reviews are string confusion. Is that string so visually similar to an existing string or application that user confusion is likely to recur? If that's the case, then those two strings can't be delegated at the same time. What happens there is described in the guidebook.

Is the string a reserved name? Well, if it is it can't be delegated.

Does the string itself tend to break the DNS in some way? So there's pretty clear criteria in the guidebook as to what the string criteria are, but there's also the ability for a panel, a technical panel, to review each string to make sure that it doesn't affect the DNS and return some, you know, queries to that string would return some unexpected results.

And finally, is the string a geographic name. So if that string qualifies as a geographic name within the definition of a guidebook, it must be accompanied by the approval or nonobjection by that by that government like Trang said. If that approval or nonobjection document is not included in the application, the applicant will be afforded the chance to provide that.

And how is the applicant scrutinized? Well, it's fairly well documented. The applicant is scrutinized in the -- the application and applicant is scrutinized in three ways. Do they have the technical, operational, and financial wherewithal to operate a registry as defined by the questions in the guidebook? And finally, are they proposing any registry services that would tend to either -- could raise issues with respect to DNS stability or security, or whether they would raise competition issues.

So there's a check on the registry services. If there's some unique registry services that are going to be offered, there will be a check of that.

It's very similar -- as a matter of fact, it's so similar, it's exactly the same -- as the existing process, the so-called RSEP process, the registry

services evaluation process, where existing registries can apply to amend their agreement and provide different services. And through agreement with ICANN, the scrutiny of those services is at the level where we just check if there are security or stability reasons or competition reasons for not approving them.

So in this application service, what's the interaction between the applicant and the evaluator? Well, there's a couple specific instances where that is available. And in each of the initial and extended evaluation processes, if the evaluators have questions, there will be one instance where the evaluators will contact the applicant and ask those clarifying questions.

A particular example of this is where there have been comments to a specific application. And if those comments would cause the evaluator to question the scoring of a particular question, or maybe change the scoring, in those instances where public comment plays a role, it will give the applicant the opportunity to respond to those comments.

So I think that's important.

So there's another track applications could go down and that is the objection and dispute resolution process. There's four grounds for objecting to a top-level domain application. One is that the string is so confusing with another application or an existing TLD that the string is likely to cause user confusion. Anyone has standing to object to that. Legal rights objection. Does this string in some way likely to infringe on other's rights. So this has been identified as a very important right to protection mechanism. So brand holders can object to string applications in order to protect their rights. The standards by which the objection will be tested are in the guidebook.

There's two other objection processes. One is that a limited public interest objection that a string might -- might violate principles of international law. That's defined in the guidebook. And finally, a community -- a preexisting community could object to a TLD as a misappropriation of a community label. There's another track here, too, that's been recently developed and that is that the GAC can provide

advice to ICANN and the ICANN Board and the GAC can provide advice to the applicant on sensitivities regarding national laws or culture.

So what's this -- what's this timeline look like with objection? Well, during the initial evaluation process there's also coincident with that an objection filing period. So that objection filing period lasts seven months. In fact, this is -- this is not quite lined up here but the objection filing period will close two weeks after the initial evaluation results are posted. This gives potential objectors the ability to wait to see if an application actually passes. So applicants and objectors are not spending money they don't have to until the resolution and the initial evaluation is done. Then it's thought the disputes will be resolved in five months. ICANN's retained the services of dispute resolution providers already for this.

And so how does that work with these independent dispute resolution providers? Like I said, this is a process that takes place totally outside of ICANN and the objections are filed with the dispute service providers themselves on the four objection grounds. The applicant can file a response to the objection and then the dispute resolution provider will convene an expert panel and then provide an expert panel. And that determination determines whether the application goes forward or does not.

As I described, governments also play a role through -- by themselves or through ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee during -- coincident with the comment period where comments are posted on each of the applications. So you see, the administrative check starts on April 12th. Applications will be published on May 1st and that will start the launch of a comment period. It also starts the -- starts the GAC early warning period. I don't know if I talk more about that in this in an ensuing slide. But the GAC early warning process enables the Government Advisory Committee to provide a notice to applicants that one or more governments might find the string objectionable and in fact it raises certain sensitivities. So the GAC early warning is just a notice to applicants. It does not immediately affect the application except to put the applicants on notice. It's meant to be taken seriously, however, and

applicants are encouraged to work with the government to resolve the differences. Say it's a certain type of geographical name where the government wants approval or the -- the applicant may choose to withdraw as a result of the GAC early warning and to encourage that there's actually a great -- a higher refund rate available to applicants who withdraw as a result of GAC early warning.

There's a more serious type of GAC advice that can be furnished also and this is coincident with the objection process. So the Governmental Advisory Committee can determine -- can determine during that seven-month objection window that it thinks that a TLD, a certain TLD should - - might not be delegated or certain application should not be approved. It will provide advice directly to the ICANN Board. It can provide consensus advice that the application should not be approved, and then the Board would consider that advice and the advice has the weight of GAC advice as defined in the ICANN bylaws and that says that they -- that the Board should follow GAC advice and if the Board chooses to disagree with the GAC, it has to publish the specific reasons for disagreeing with that advice.

So that's that time period. What's the time period if there's a string contention, that there's two strings so similar that they shouldn't be delegated or that they're exactly the same? Well, string contention resolution occurs -- can occur during and after initial evaluation. I just want to check on something. So during -- during initial evaluation the different entities can negotiate with one another and elect to resolve the differences themselves. In fact, at any time applicants are encouraged to negotiate and resolve those -- those differences. But if they do not, there's a couple other ways that string contention can be -- can be resolved. One is community priority and that is that it's the policy of ICANN that community-based TLDs should have a preference in case of string contention. And so that process again is very well defined in the guidebook. But community-based applicants that designate themselves as community-based applicants can avail themselves of this community priority evaluation that's in the guidebook. And community applications that pass this priority evaluation are then given this preference. So if there's contention, that community application would

be awarded the TLD. That evaluation costs money. The community TLD will have to pay a deposit. If it prevails in the community priority evaluation it gets its money back. And the evaluation is based on this four set of criteria that are again better described in the guidebook and the scoring is described in the guidebook. But it has to be a community based -- you know, it has to be a community of long-standing and of some significant size. It doesn't have to be giant. There's higher scoring for a nexus between the community and the string applied for. So if you think about Boy Scouts of America applying for a string, you know there's more of a nexus between dot Boy Scouts and that org and that community than there is between dot scouting and that community.

So there's a nexus test that kind of says if that's your string, you're more likely to get it, if it's clear just on the face of it that that's your string.

The other criteria have to do with the restrictive registration policies. Are they in place for that community and does the community endorse your string. So do you have the support of that community?

So that's the test for community priority evaluation. As I mentioned, the parties could just agree to resolve the contention some way. And then finally the resolution of last resort is an option.

So what's the timeline after all the contentions are resolved, the objections are resolved, if either of those occur and after initial evaluation is over? It's anticipated that transition to delegation will take two to five months in most cases. Pre-delegation is required and an executed agreement with ICANN is required. I'll say that agreements that are the base agreement will be processed immediately. Deviations from the base agreement will require some negotiation and therefore take longer.

So here are some key dates for everyone to know. But I think I've described each one of them. The application window opens January 12th. As Trang described, a slot has to be reserved by March 29th. So it's in the guidebook but it's very important that you recognize that and the application window closes April 12th. Two to three weeks after that applications will be posted. Simultaneously with that we open the

application -- the comment process, the comment window. The GAC early warning process and advice process and the -- and the objection processes all launch with that date. And then initial evaluations will begin right after that.

The application comment process window closes after 60 days and on November 12th it's anticipated that the initial evaluation results will be posted. So all the evaluations for all those initial evaluations will be posted at the same time.

For those that don't pass initial evaluation, November 29th will be the last day to elect extended evaluation. And then that will trigger the beginning of extended evaluation for those who did not pass initial evaluation. We'll launch transition to delegation for those who did, but there is no -- no objections or contention and the launch of the string contention process.

So somewhat varying on how all that proceeds, April 30th, 2013 will be the close of extended evaluation and dispute resolution processes. And then we'll open string contention just in those cases that had to go through objection process. So that gets a little bit iterative there. Oops, sorry. So those -- that's the key dates. And then -- and that provides an overview of the process. So I invite you to look at all those dates and like -- look at all those procedures. If you have questions, send them to newgtld@icann.org. Trang runs that mailbox. It's run pretty routinely. She has a team of people answering questions. Those questions that we -- they can elevate -- they can't answer are elevated to a team. That team includes Dan and I and others and we sit around the table once a week routinely and answer the questions so that answers to the questions are posted. The Applicant Guidebook is surely posted. And ICANN recently, as described elsewhere, just launched a micro site that has the new gTLD application program. That's all I have. Thanks very much. And Trang and I will stand up here and answer what questions you have and ask ICANN staff to answer the ones we can't.

>> Morning. (saying name) from dot br. There is part of the code of conduct that allows a registry operator to request exemption for the code of conduct to the rest of the domains (indiscernible). So we won't allow to sell it to anybody else.

If that exception is granted by ICANN, those domains need to go to an ICANN-accredited registrar even then or can just be directly connected to the registry?

KURT PRITZ: Dan's going to answer that. Dan Halloran.

DAN HALLORAN: Thanks. Yeah, this is Dan Halloran from ICANN staff.

So that -- we're happy -- we'll answer it here. I think the quick answer is every registration has to go through an accredited registrar. So the answer is yes.

But that's a perfect kind of question. I don't want to cut short anybody's questions here. We will try to do our best. That's the perfect question to put into the newgtld@icann.org. We will get you as quick as we can a response and we will publish it for everybody else so everyone is working with the same information.

So the answer is every registration has to go through an accredited registrar, period.

KURT PRITZ: And I think if Dan had another minute at the microphone, he would say we are doing our best to answer the questions verbally. But the best answer is by writing to that mailbox.

The purpose for that mailbox is so that ICANN can publish questions and answers so that all applicants are on the same page with regard to information. And when questions are posed to that mailbox, Trang will tell you, we don't publish the question verbatim but we synthesize it in

a way that protects confidential information that might be in the question and makes it a more general question so it is helpful to all applicants.

PAUL McGRADY:

Paul McGrady from Greenberg Traurig. This is probably a similar question that I should send in to have answered. In terms of similarity analysis, you mentioned there would be visual similarities is the primary issue.

The issue of meaning has come up several times with clients asking questions about that. So, for example, will the meaning of the word matter for confusion analysis? So if somebody applies for dot pants and somebody else applies for dot slacks, are those confusingly similar to each other?

KURT PRITZ:

Right. And so I can answer part of your question anyway.

During the evaluation process, that panel looks at visual similarity only. During the objection process, an entity can object to a string for user confusion reasons on any grounds, whether it is visual similarity or meaning or sound and the like.

The standard is still the same, that there a likelihood of user confusion would result from the delegation of those two strings. But that's how the types of evaluation and objection differ.

PAUL McGRADY:

Thank you.

KURT PRITZ:

Carole? We want to make sure Carole gets to the microphone.

Go ahead.

ANNALISA ROGERS: Hello. This is Annalisa Rogers. You mentioned about the role that the GAC is playing. And while there is the early warning opportunity for them, you also mentioned something about how they could inform applicants. It almost sounded like there was a dialogue maybe for applicants, and then we could answer back. Can you talk a little bit more about that, when that would come? And if that's the same thing as early warning?

KURT PRITZ: We have been working with the GAC. We've encouraged the early warning notice and that process to include a path for applicants to work with the government to ameliorate concerns so that if there's an GAC early warning, there is also a way for the applicant to get back to the government and resolve the problem.

So there's not -- I can't provide more information than that except that we've asked the GAC to include that. The Government Advisory Committee members that I spoke to are also interested -- they're very interested in providing a methodology where the applicant can cure the concern of the government.

ANNALISA ROGERS: So that's still in development? We'll hear more about that?

KURT PRITZ: Yeah. But regardless of development, the applicant's encouraged to work with the governments and amend the concern.

ANNALISA ROGERS: Okay, thank you.

KURT PRITZ: Carole is going to from time to time stand up and read one or two questions from the online forum.

CAROLE CORNELL:

Okay. The very first one is from Jenik Skow.

The first question: During the new gTLD program session yesterday an updated timeline was published. It states that on May 15, 2013, string contention opens for the application with variables. And on 30 May, string contention closes for clean application and the results are posted. Could you please explain what this refers to? Is it referring to auction processes?

TRANG NGUYEN:

So the string contention actually happens -- is the last step that happens in the evaluation process. Only when an application has passed all evaluation does it enter into string contention. So the earlier date for string contention that you saw are for those applications that, as Kurt said, passes all initial evaluation, doesn't have any objections filed against it. So that's the earlier contention stage.

The later date for string contention is in cases where an applicant has to go through extended evaluation. So, for example, if you have application A and application B, application A finishes. Initial evaluation doesn't have any objections. Everything is clean. It is ready for pre-delegation.

Application B, however, fails initial evaluation so it has to enter into extended evaluation. Application A has to wait for application B to finish extended evaluation. And only if application B passes extended evaluation and only then would the two enter into string contention process. So that's why you see the two different dates.

KURT PRITZ:

So admittedly, it is a little confusing. If you look at May 15th, string contention opens. Those are for applications that went through objections or went through extended evaluation.

Dan wants to say something that's going to clear this all up.

DAN HALLORAN: No. I just want to -- This is Dan Halloran from ICANN staff. Thanks, Kurt. This is Daniel Halloran. I wanted to put another disclaimer or caveat on this. People shouldn't be setting their calendars for May 15th, 2013 at this point. That's a plan, a timeline kind of a -- I don't want to say it's total speculation, but that's an estimate at this point, just to clarify that.

KURT PRITZ: Especially because a resolution of an objection depends partly on the behavior of the applicants and the objectors, not just ICANN processing.

DAN HALLORAN: Exactly.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Dan.
Okay. You get one more.

CAROLE CORNELL: The second half or the second question by Jenik:

When will the auction provider be elected? And when can we be expected to be able to read the final rules for auctions? Will it be published how much each applicant pays for deposit in each of the auctions?

KURT PRITZ: I think the rules around the auction in Module 4 are fairly detailed and have been worked out with a potential auction provider. We still have to release a RFI for an auction provider and settle on that. But I think the rules are pretty clear and won't change.

Antony?

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Yes, I would like to ask questions about the TAS, if I may.

First of all, I would like to understand the reasoning -- as I -- from what you said yesterday, there will be a single evaluator looking at the entire application. First of all, is that correct? I mean, there will be -- it won't be chunked into different parts. There won't be one evaluator doing financial, another doing technical? Is that correct?

TRANG NGUYEN: Correct.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: So, you know, as some of us begin to work on the application, we're obviously doing it in Word or in some sort of word processing program. And the challenge then is to take that, convert it into text and put it in little boxes one by one, 50 of them.

If it's a single evaluator, why can't we just submit it as a PDF?

What is the purpose of the TAS?

KURT PRITZ: Well, one purpose is to have the evaluators look at applications consistently. So if we -- we're receiving PDFs, they are going to vary from application to application.

Also, evaluators will probably, in some cases, examine questions on their own, just look at a series of the same question from application to application. Sometimes they're grouped.

In fact, we have one evaluator -- one evaluation team providing both financial and operational evaluations just because those two different sections are so interrelated. But we really want to provide a standardized form and format for the evaluators.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: So to follow up on that, obviously it increases the workload on applicants a great deal, I would say.

And one of the particular issues that I've come up with is the issue of attachments. Very often it's very much easier to provide an illustration of what you're doing in a figure or table or what have you. So my specific question is although the video noted that there are areas where attachments are required, it's unclear to me if there are areas where attachments may be given even though they are not required.

TRANG NGUYEN: Yeah, so I believe questions 22 through 50 will allow you to attach -- provide attachments. Now, there are some questions that will specifically require attachment. So you won't be able to submit the answer to that question without providing attachments. For all the other questions that do not require attachments as specified in the applicant guidebook, you will be provided a chance to upload attachments anyway.

The caveat there is that your answer should fall within the allotted space in TAS, and you should not rely on attachments to supplement your answer in any way as attachments may not be considered by the evaluation panels if it wasn't specifically asked for in the applicant guidebook.

Does that make sense?

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Not really. Your explanation made sense. The reasoning behind it doesn't make sense. If you want to illustrate your point with an attachment, why would that not be considered by an evaluator?

KURT PRITZ: Yea, so certainly the evaluators will really all the attachments, but the spirit of what's going on here is that the answer -- the justification for the evaluators' result should reside within the text box and that space

limit. But you are afforded the opportunity to attach documents, and those will be looked --

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: I think specifically figures and tables particularly in the technical section, it makes a lot more sense.

So one final question. Is ICANN going to provide a standard way for you to identify where the attachments go in? For instance, should I number them question 25.1 or should it be attachment A? This can get very confusing in a text-based area where you're not allowed to sort of insert it in line. So you need to identify it.

TRANG NGUYEN: Yes. So one of the recommendations that we make is that you do name the attachments appropriately and then reference to them specifically in line within your answer. So we can issue some recommendations as to how, you know, files should be named and referenced in your answer.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: I think actually that will be helpful for many people. Thank you.

KURT PRITZ: Chuck?

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes from VeriSign. I have two questions that are quite different. The first one also has to do with the TAS. In the user profile that was on the video -- and you can see online -- is that a profile of the applicant or a profile of the individual that's entering data?

TRANG NGUYEN: It is one and the same.

CHUCK GOMES: Okay. That leads right into a follow-up question then. Is it possible for one applicant to have multiple individuals entering data in the TAS system for the same application?

TRANG NGUYEN: No. So we -- for security purposes, we only have one user profile for each account or application. And so if organization A has ten people that would like to provide answers to different questions, like one person answer question Number 10 and another person provides answer to question Number 22, our recommendation is that you organize all of your answers outside of TAS ahead of time and then just have one single person go in and input that information.

CHUCK GOMES: If that person becomes incapacitated?

TRANG NGUYEN: There is a secondary contact information profile that we collect during the registration process, and that secondary contact person would then take over the user profile or the account.

CHUCK GOMES: So considering the amount of data entry that's involved in an application, it really doesn't seem wise to limit that to one individual to do that. That seems very constraining to me. First of all, keep in mind that the application may be entered over -- it could be entered over a period of -- the full application period, right? The three months.

I certainly would encourage you to take a look at that, and maybe there are other ways of handling the security there because that seems like a serious limitation from a practical point of view.

TRANG NGUYEN: Yeah. Our primary concern there, again, was with regards to security and not wanting to have that set of credentials passed around several individuals within the organization.

KURT PRITZ: Dan?

DAN HALLORAN: Thanks. This is Dan Halloran from staff.

So I'm just kind of wondering out loud. We have the newgtld@icann.org question box. And this is kind of like a feature request or a comment on the functionality. So I think that same mailbox can accommodate that kind of thing. Thanks for the feedback here. By all means, put that in.

I just want to clarify and make sure -- And, again, maybe this is why this is a lot more fun. It is a lot easier to do this when we get ten questions and we can sit around a table and go through it.

The question about user and applicant, I think it is possible to have one user that's associated with multiple applicants.

TRANG NGUYEN: Profiles, yes.

DAN HALLORAN: One user profile doesn't have to be the same applicant profile. A user can go in and work on multiple applications -- you can have multiple applicants per user.

TRANG NGUYEN: You can create one user account. And under that one user account, you can create multiple applicant profiles. Under each applicant profile, you can apply for multiple application slots.

CHUCK GOMES: That's good information. That doesn't solve the other problem I was talking about, but I understand that. And thanks, Dan.

The next question I have has to do with security. Some of the technical questions involve highly sensitive information, and I'm fully aware of the fact that you're going to keep that information confidential. But the bottom line, because of the multiple players that are going to access this information over the full evaluation process, whether it be initial evaluation or extended evaluation or dispute resolution and then string contention, there are going to be a lot of people, a lot of eyes that look at this very sensitive information.

Have you considered some sort of a document control process that would allow auditing and limited exposure? There are services that are available in that regard. So my question is: Have you considered that in addition to? Now, my own opinion is that could be an optional choice by an applicant that maybe even the applicant funds in part or in whole if it's a concern on their part.

KURT PRITZ: So, yes, it's been very seriously considered. And did you ask a similar question yesterday? Or someone asked a similar question. Anyway --

CHUCK GOMES: We submitted a similar question with more detail than I would give here.

KURT PRITZ: When I woke up this morning, I opened my mailbox and there was a long, detailed answer about security protocols and who gets what information and A process that's not developed yet for disposing of all this information when we're done.

I really want to answer that question very carefully because it's a really important question. There's other questions about the type of

information that ICANN's going to handle that's confidential. And so I want to answer that question very completely.

CHUCK GOMES: As you know, I wasn't asking for an answer here because it is a complicated question.

KURT PRITZ: Yeah.

CHUCK GOMES: But I thought it would be good if others hear this in case they don't look at the questions that have been submitted online.

Thank you.

KURT PRITZ: Did you have anything to add?

TRANG NGUYEN: I just want to reiterate that TAS does provide a real base security feature. And we are fully taking advantage of that. So the evaluation panels will only get access to the pieces of the applications that they absolutely need to view in order to do their jobs. Same with ICANN staff. Obviously we'll have restricted access into TAS as well.

KURT PRITZ: I thought if I moved away, I get rid of the feedback but it doesn't work.

ELLIOT NOSS: Hi, Kurt, Elliot Noss, Tucows. I'm a little bit concerned about the May 15/May 30, 2013 dates there. Specifically there will be a clear set --

KURT PRITZ: I'll take care of that.

ELLIOT NOSS: Thank you. There will be a clear set of strings that will be objected to. You know, pick a Number 50 -- sorry, not objected to, whether there is string contention that have come out of the evaluation process. Let's say 50. It's pure speculation on my part, but my guess is that probably those will be the more generic strings that will be less prone to objections post that process.

I fear that that means that, you know, again, pick a number, 40 or 45 of those strings, will not have objections between evaluation completing in November and that auction in May. And by giving the -- that extra five-or-so-month period at a very critical juncture, I think what you have done is significantly increased the value for people who want to game the system to put in speculative applications with the sole goal of getting bought out.

And what I would suggest to you as a very easy fix to that is to potentially have either two or -- running auction processes where as soon as -- if there are no objections, auction; if there are objections that are dealt with, auction; and so on so that all you have happening in that last period is the auctions for places where there has been very clear objections to that small set of strings.

I think, by the way, it will also give you the advantage -- two other advantages. One is that it will allow you to stagger those auctions, which is goodness, although I see that as a fully televised global event that would be well attended. But, you know, the other thing is, there can clearly be no issue from a -- you know, let's call it a delivery perspective because we're talking about some small number of auctions that will be a subset of what takes place in a single second on eBay any day. Thoughts?

KURT PRITZ: Thank you. I think that's right. I'm not sure that's not in the process, if I understand it. So auctions should take place as soon as they can. So

the parties should be afforded an opportunity to resolve their differences, and there is the opportunity for that community priority. But for cases where they both pass initial evaluation, that contention should be resolved right away and then that process should be continuously running to take -- to address whatever contention pairs are all ready to be addressed.

ELLIOT NOSS: That's fantastic and comforting. I would suggest that some of the communication may not be clear on that point because the way the dates look, they look very hard.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Jim Prendergast, Galway Strategy Group. It says the applications will be posted two weeks after the close of the period, so that's April 26th. Now we are seeing a date of May 1st.

I will be one of those people that will be refreshing the Web site when they come out. I want to know which night I need to stay up late.

TRANG NGUYEN: I think in the guidebook we say applications are applied-for strings and all of the public information of the application will be posted approximately two weeks after the close of the application.

JIM PRENDERGAST: So May 1st is --

TRANG NGUYEN: Approximately.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Second question is related to the back and forth with independent evaluators if they do have a question. How is that communication going to take place? Is it via e-mail only, or will there be an opportunity to have a conference call since some of the answers may be nuanced and not best communicated via electronic form?

TRANG NGUYEN: So the clarification process is going to happen through TAS. We'll gather all of the questions that an evaluation panel may have on an application and send them to you in a batch. For example, all of the financial clarification questions will come to you in one batch. All the technical will come in another batch. If the geo panel has a clarification, that will come in a separate batch.

You will have approximately two weeks to respond to clarification questions that come from the evaluation panels, but you will be prompted by TAS that you have the clarification questions and you can go into TAS and upload your answers.

If you have -- you know, there is no provision in the process to allow a back and forth between the evaluator and the applicant during this clarification process. But what our recommendation is that if an applicant receives clarification questions and does not understand the basis of the question, we ask that the applicant tell the evaluation panel how the applicant is interpreting the question and then providing the answer based on that interpretation.

JIM PRENDERGAST: So stipulate this is how you understand the clarification request?

TRANG NGUYEN: Correct.

JIM PRENDERGAST: What if you misinterpret it?

TRANG NGUYEN:

We take that into account obviously. You know, one of the one of the things we are putting in place is that clarification questions are going to go through at least one review process before they are issued to the applicant just to ensure that the question itself is clear and it makes sense. That's one thing we are putting in place. Currently there is no provision in place for have a back and forth between applicants and panels.

KURT PRITZ:

So the reasoning behind that is the application itself is just communicated in writing, one. And two is that there's really four bites at that apple. There's -- you know, there's one in the middle of initial evaluation. There's one at the beginning of extended evaluation. There is another one in the middle of extended evaluation. So there is quite a bit of opportunity for iteration, and that -- if you think about the number of applications and trying to process them somewhat efficiently, you know, having meetings for applications would, I think, significantly increase costs and time.

We have a presumption that -- you know, the presumption is that this whole process is meant to encourage -- the whole applicant guidebook is meant to be a guide to operating a TLD and be a guide for how to pass the evaluation. So there's a presumption that most of the applications are going to be competently done and that the evaluators will be able to read the applications and interpret them.

So we don't want to build an additional process, and we think we will markedly increase the time to evaluate and cost. So that was the balancing that took place. But I understand your concern, too.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Finally on the timing of the posting of objections, the guidebook says the DSRP upon receipt of an objection filing shall post it to their Web site. I'm assuming that's in real-time. And then ICANN at the end of the objection time would then post all the objections on their Web site.

When does the notification go to the applicant on when an objection has been lodged, and when does that 30-day clock for them to have to respond actually start?

DAN HALLORAN: Please, that one we will have to take in writing later. It is too much to chew ON right now. Okay, it is in. We will try to put some more detail to that and respond to that and get it on the Web site.

KURT PRITZ: Thanks, Jim.

TRANG NGUYEN: You know, we'll answer the question with regards to when the applicant will get the notification. But the notification will come via TAS as well.

KURT PRITZ: Antony?

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Yes, I am struck by the difference between the careful consideration of the workload that's put on panelists and ICANN and the absolute lack of consideration of the workload that's put on the applicant. So to put this in perspective, imagine that in answering these questions that are coming in or in evaluating the applications, you're limited to one user for security concerns.

Given the complexity of the guidebook which is considerable and having explained it to a number of people and watched their eyes glaze over, as I'm sure, Kurt, you have -- we have these sessions all the time because it's complex.

You are asking one person to fill in the entire guidebook, and you are asking for those of us who are representing clients to do it for multiple clients. And the idea that somehow it's a good thing that one person

can do multiple applications, I would like to meet this superman. I think you really need to allow more than one person, especially for those of us who have disbursed geographical locations that serve clients. I mean, effectively what you're asking to do is have one room with three people sitting on standby so they can go in and do the next one. It really needs to be reexamined, and I urge to you do that.

I'm sure there are ways around security issues, for instance, if you use I.P.-based security, you can have more than one I.P. address. This is done, for instance, with -- VeriSign does that when you are a registrar. You have to communicate via secure I.P. I mean, you have to give them what the I.P. address is and you are allowed to work with that. I think this is solvable.

And the burden on applicants right now given what I've just heard will be extreme.

KURT PRITZ:

And your comment about that is very well-taken. But I think an important point regarding the rest of it is that our primary goal is to have consistently done timely evaluations so that the evaluations are fair, consistent and the results are predictable. And so we want to make the task also very -- as straightforward as possible for the evaluators because we want them, you know, concentrating on content and being able to evaluate the applications in a consistent way --

ANTONY VAN COUVERING:

Surely the same consideration should be given to applicants because we have the same issues. We have multiple applications to fill in for clients.

KURT PRITZ:

Right.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING:

And you're asking one person to do that. It is as if you are asking one panelist to handle all this stuff.

KURT PRITZ: I said the comment on multiple people entering information is well-taken. But other than that, like, for example, Jim's question, we have striven to make the evaluation process very consistent because that is the risk -- one of the risks in that for all of us is that, at the end, the evaluations are evaluated consistently.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Yeah, thank you.

CAROLE CORNELL: Kurt, just a reminder that we have to stop the question and answer session which is only 10 or 15 minutes.

KURT PRITZ: You are going to read one question?

CAROLE CORNELL: I'm reading two here, but I'm just asking people to be brief, if they could.

The next question: Are country names blocked in all languages or only in the six U.N. languages? Would Deutschland be allowed versus dot Germany?

KURT PRITZ: Country names are not going to be delegated in any language. All translations.

CAROLE CORNELL: Thank you.

The next question came from David Cohen who said thank you for the opportunity to remote participate. In the event that ICANN receives several applications for a TLD that can possibly be considered confusing

to an existing gTLD, e.g., an IDN transliteration, can you help make more clear -- can you make more clear rather than any other than currently registered running an existing gTLD that has a valid and equal opportunity in getting that string which would also be applied for by the registry which runs the existing gTLD, or is it pretty much a string that can only be delegated to an existing registry?

KURT PRITZ:

So the answer to questions like that are to go back to basic principles, and that is that strings will be evaluated for visual similarity as part of the evaluation process but that others can object to a string that's not visually similar if they think that the two strings that are so similar that they would cause user confusion.

So would a transliteration of a string cause user confusion? In which case, you know, it would cause user confusion no matter who the applicant is, I would think.

Werner?

WERNER STAUB:

Thank you. In the interest of transparency and openness, which is a principle that we all treasure here, does ICANN have intention to provide an open testing capability for the TAS so that people could actually try it out as early as possible? And those who do not have a slot can also see what it is like? I think it would be very useful in many respects, also in preventing errors or downtime or getting useful comments.

KURT PRITZ:

There is testing of TAS going on right now, you know, internally. I want to think about your comment some more, but the idea that the application window is open for three months allows you to enter information in TAS without submitting an application. You can view that input, right?

TRANG NGUYEN: Correct.

KURT PRITZ: So you can see how your input could look.

WERNER STAUB: Sorry, I didn't understand. You say only during the application period? Would it be possible to even have an idea of what the questions -- the formats look like for each of the answer fields? Before that, it would not be possible to see it.

TRANG NGUYEN: We do have a recorded demo on the Web site, and I think there are some comments that shows you basically what the screens look like in TAS. That's exactly what they look like.

WERNER STAUB: I have the privilege to have done – have participated in the process that ICANN has had with Web-based forums. And I think it was a very good progress with respect to the earlier approach of sending Word files or whatever.

But, still, I do not see any reasons why the outside world other than those applicants who have paid \$5,000 should see this.

It is actually probably the best promotion that you could do to get really people to understand what it is about and try to do so as early as possible, specifically in a way to have real testing because the internal testing is bound to be somehow limited.

I think it would be a good opportunity.

KURT PRITZ: Go ahead, Dan.

DAN HALLORAN:

This is Dan Halloran from staff.

So I'm not sure -- I'm sorry to step on you, what you were about to say. That to me sounds like -- Werner, thank you -- to me, I would lump them into the category of the other kind of question which is sort of a feature request for TAS. It sounds like kind of let's have an open basic beta of how it's used and people can type stuff in and flush it out to just to let people see how it works without actual applications. I would appreciate it if we could take good requests like that, put it into newgtld@icann.org. And we can go back.

Kurt and Trang and I aren't the ones who are running security and developing the application. We want to talk with the people that are doing that and ask them what they think about it or the idea of let's let multiple users work under one user account, basically.

Those are good questions, good ideas. We don't want to dismiss them or accept them on the fly here. We would rather go back and talk with our experts on that. Thank you.

WERNER STAUB:

The comment I just got from a colleague is we would like not to be the beta testers at application time, but be happy to be that before.

KURT PRITZ:

Thanks.

Bret?

BRET FAUSETT:

This may be a bit -- Sorry, I'm losing my voice after five days. This may be a bit of a carryover from the last session. But I think this is the right session in which to bring it up. And that's one of the open issues that ICANN is still looking at, which is the selection of the emergency backend registry operators.

I know that the RFI that's currently out has some vague language. I don't have it off the top of my head. But it talks in terms of maybe picking two. I would suggest to ICANN that maybe a better methodology is to figure out what the minimum standard is for the selection of an EBERO and then select all applicants that meet that standard rather than just trying to get two.

So I think with everyone who meets the minimum standard, you are going to get a more diverse base of cost and probably talents as well.

KURT PRITZ:

Yeah. And actually Dan and I were talking about that during the previous session and about maybe there's -- So, again, we'll take it under advisement and it is a good suggestion.

But perhaps, you know, there is a base of smaller EBEROs that would address the needs of smaller registries, and that would promote diversity among EBERO providers rather than just accepting the ones that can accommodate all registries which would limit it to larger ones.

So the answer is I don't know. But it is a good suggestion.

>>

Hello, I'm (saying name) from dot RU. Could you please clarify a little bit more on community-based applications? Like, first of all, which group of people or legal entities can be defined as community? And is there any certain criteria which mean that this concrete application should be submitted as a community-based TLD?

KURT PRITZ:

The only time community-based designation comes into play in the entire process is when there's contention between strings, when there's application for the same label. One way that contention can be broken is if one of the applicants is a community-based applicant.

>> No, I mean, but --

KURT PRITZ: Right, right, so I want -- first, I want to establish that. That's the only time where the community designation comes into play.

And then when you get your -- when you sign an agreement with ICANN, those community-based TLDs will be -- have registration restrictions as part of the agreement that labels that.

So, there's a test that's fairly well -- well, I think it is well- defined in the guidebook that lists four sets of criteria for determining whether an application is a community-based application, you know, whether there is a strong nexus, meaning that label is really clearly tied to that community, like a verbatim example, to whether it represents a community that's firmly established, that's been in place for a long time.

Three is whether that community supports that TLD application.

And, four, whether you as the promoter of that community TLD are specifying certain restriction or registration policies that are in place.

Each one of those four tests really have some questions to it that are each scored. So those are outlined in the guidebook. I'm sure you've read those. But if you have specific questions as to how those work, that would be a great question to submit to the comment forum.

TRANG NGUYEN: And to add on to what Kurt just said, during the application process, the designation of the community-based application is entirely at the discretion of the applicant.

>> Thank you, the second question refers to the financial issues we have raised yesterday. Some countries will have issues with currency payments and there will be some people work around that, like contract

arrangements. Will you provide a contact person to coordinate to have this paperwork done properly?

KURT PRITZ: Right, and, again, this is a great forum because we get to talk. You are asking a very important question, and you need to write that question in because we need to capture that issue and resolve it.

>> Thank you.

KURT PRITZ: Ray?

RAY FASSETT: Hi, Ray Fassett, dot jobs. Just a quick point of clarification on the community aspects. I'm not sure it's completely correct that the community aspect only gets triggered in case of contention. I think unless it's changed -- or if I'm not understanding correctly, please help me -- if you check the community box and you are not even in contention, as it turns out, you will still be held to the community contract.

KURT PRITZ: Right. So those restrictions will be put into your agreement in every case.

RAY FASSETT: Right, yeah.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Hey, Kurt, Jim Prendergast again. Just to pick up on what Werner said, when you do the testing of the TAS, I suggest you maybe go back and look at what happened about three, four years ago when the U.S.

Department of Commerce ran the BTOP program which was \$7.2 billion for broadband infrastructure. The system crashed.

It went down. They did not anticipate the response that they got.

I'll find out, e-mail to you, Dan, who the subcontractor was on that. If it is one of your evaluators -- No, no, if there's lessons learned there. You may want to pick up on that.

KURT PRITZ:

That's one of the concerns with furnishing a test environment for the community because if that were to crash, you know, that has reputational impact to ICANN even though we could say, here's a play environment. Let's test it out. If that proves not to be resilient, that requires just as much work.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

I wouldn't test 400 or 500 applications plus or minus a 100. Go to 5,000 just to be absolutely sure.

KURT PRITZ:

We have two more questions. One Carole.

CAROLE CORNELL:

(indiscernible). There is more in the queue. I think what I would like to do is suggest we send those to the new gTLD link and that we can find the answers there for those that have not yet been answered today.

This one is from Mary. Please clarify if I understand right, that the perspective registry of a new gTLD should elaborate its own agreement with perspective ICANN registrars. The only limitation is that this agreement should include a few specific terms pointed by ICANN or should it use a standard agreement elaborated by ICANN?

DAN HALLORAN: The answer is -- it is up to each registry to make up their own registry/registrar agreement. We did not specify a one size fits all RAA for all imaginable TLDs. There is a provision, though, that once the registry has its registry/registrar agreement and has signed up registrars and has registrants, any changes afterwards to that RAA would have to be approved by ICANN.

But up front, it is up to each registry to make up their own and try to obviously make it attractive to registrars if they want to do business.

CAROLE CORNELL: Dan, stay there, please.

The second question tied to that is, if the registry wants to register domains for internal use only, it should become an accredited registrar and paid to ICANN two times as a registry and as a registrar?

DAN HALLORAN: The answer I gave earlier. Every single registration has to go through a registrar. And as a result of separate debates we've had, it may in circumstances be possible -- (incomprehensible audio.)

(Audio is all static).