

**ICANN Transcription**  
**New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG – Sub Group B**  
**Tuesday 08 January 2019 20:00 UTC**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record. The audio is also available at:  
<https://audio.icann.org/gns0/gns0-new-gtld-sub-pro-sub-group-b-08jan19-en.mp3>

Adobe Connect Recording: <https://participate.icann.org/p33ayx0ob0g/?proto=true>

Attendance is on the wiki page: <https://community.icann.org/x/5YIWBg>

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page:  
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Julie Bisland: Great, thank you. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Welcome to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Subgroup B call held on Tuesday, the 8th of January, 2019. In the interest of time, there will be no roll call. Attendance will be taken by the Adobe Connect room. If you're only on the audio bridge at this time, would you please let yourself be known now? And I already have Jim Prendergast noted. Anyone else? All right. Well, I just want to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes, and to keep your phones and microphones on mute when not speaking to avoid any background noise.

And with this, I'll turn it back over to ChristaTaylor. You may begin.

Christa Taylor: Thank you. Good afternoon, everyone. This is ChristaTaylor for the record. I'd like to thank everyone for joining us. And as you can see from the agenda, we have three items to cover. The first topic is review of the agenda and the question of are there any other items that we should add to it. And as always, if there's anything that arises during the call, we will add it to the end in the "Any Other Business."

Not seeing any typing or hands. I'd like to ask -- the next item, which is if anyone has any updates to their SOI, and, if so, please let us know now. Seeing no actions, I'm going to jump into the third topic, which is the discussion of the public comment on applicant support, which is section

2.5.4. And it's a pretty lengthy one, so I'm hoping everyone has access as well, or I guess (inaudible) to the link there to follow through. Jeff says he can't hear. I'm assuming other people can hear me?

Julie Bisland: Yes, we can hear you.

Christa Taylor: Okay, thanks. So, Jeff, you must have an issue with your audio. I'm going to just move ahead, and I'll let Jeff dial in.

So, looking at the Excel document, I'm just going to work my way from the top to the bottom. First section is the general comments on section 2.5.4 in columns E and F as we work through this, on the parking lot and suggestions actions, as well as at some point would it (ph) apply to other items. You're going to see it's already been copied and inserted in there so we can address it in relevant sections.

So, the first general comment is from the government of India. And not going to read it all, but just some of the new ideas. And they are pretty much in agreement with the new applicant support program with a couple of ideas here. So, the interested application should be provided with a general estimation of fees and costs that would be required by the whole procedure before filling out -- before filling of the gTLD application, refers to the middle applicant comprising of struggling regions that are further along in their development compared to underserved or under-developed regions, and they believe that has great merit. And then, they refer to the costs. A suggested approach can be -- extends (ph) to the middle applicants by reducing application fee of \$185,000, but not to the extent that the reduction's availed by the underserved region. And then, further down, it can be further extended to include aid in sealing (ph) and filing objections, support in post-delegation operations, and transfer of capacity-building skills in various key areas required for running a registry. And it goes on. It's saying this will make the ASP more comprehensible and result in applicants being provided assistance in every step of the application procedure.

So, this is, I think, aligned with everything that's kind of below and the overall process, so I don't think there's any actions there. Next, we have the GAC with a comment on -- I guess just more of a comment referring to taking into account the CCT-RT recommendations. We then have the CCT-RT report with the recommendation to revisit the applicant financial support program section. Then, we have the government of India submitted the .IN registry, and this part here I put into the parking area, which is addressed in the fees, because they're talking about the \$47,000 versus the \$185,000 being quite high.

Then, we have the ALAC. There's two ideas here which have been added into two other sections, which is 2.5.4.c.3, and -- in again, e.7. So,

both of those will be addressed in those sections there. Then, we have the RrSG, and that's been moved to section 2 -- I'm not going to refer the 2.5.4 for this column, just going to put 2.e.10. And that's also been moved there so we can address it in that section. Then, we have the ICANN org comment, which suggests to request for guidance concerning the overall goal and objective of the applicant support program, and goes on to say it would be helpful if the PDP working group could provide the overall goal and objective of the program. For example, is the overall goal of the ASP to lower the financial barrier for replying for a gTLD or for applying -- or for operating a GTLD? How should the risk of registry failure due to financial issues be addressed and by whom? And how does the applicant support program support the goals of a new gTLD program?

I would suggest that we maybe take this part to the full working group, and noted that in the comments. I'm going to do one more here, and then I'm going to revert to your comment, Anne. Finally, we have the NCSG, and I'm going to suggest that we move this to section e.9 regarding the exclusive round part of that. And comments, question? Is there some agreed much lower rate for underserved region applications? And sorry, I don't know the answer to that question. So, from my understanding from before, Anne, I don't think it was set, and it was raised earlier of whether it would still be at the set \$47,000 or whether it would be at, say, a percentage. So, for instance, is it the \$47,000 out of the \$185,000? Would that same percentage still be applied to the future application cost? So, if that was \$100,000, would that same percentage still be there? And I don't have that answer. Does that help? And Kristina, I see you have your question. Just one second. I'll see if Anne replies, and then I'll turn it over to you.

So, Anne says, so, if no change, does it stay at \$47,000? That would be my guess, but if anyone would like to confirm that, that would be great. Jeff, I see your hand is up, so I'm guessing you might be replying to that, so I'll let you go ahead of Kristine. And my apologies, Kristine. Jeff, please go ahead.

- Jeff Neuman: Yes. Thanks, hi. I think -- and Rubens actually just put it in the chat -- I think the \$47,000 was a percentage. It was 25%. And so, I think the guidance was a certain percentage. So, if the fee is the same, \$185,000, I would foresee it staying as \$47,000 if there's no change. But if the fee is lower or higher, I would assume a no-change default would mean the same percentage. Thanks.
- Christa Taylor: Great. Thanks. And Kristine, sorry, over to you.
- Kristine Dorrain: Thank you. This is Kristine, and no problem. Mine was in reaction to the ICANN.org -- or the ICANN statement. I think I just wanted to comment

that I don't have a problem with sending it to the full group. However, I think that we might want to table send to group, because I know what we're doing is kind of sending these things to the group periodically for the plenary, when we meet as plenary, because I think there's another section, and I want to say it's 2.7 or 2.8 (ph), where we talk about the various ways the registries have to -- various things the registries have to implement to avoid failing, such as the continued operations instrument or the EVRO (ph).

And so, there's a discussion in there about whether or not the ICANN -- the applicant guidebook should keep one or both of those. And this question I think relates generally to that as well, so it might be helpful to discuss these together. So, if registries fail, what's the mechanism? And specifically, if registries that had to rely on applicant support might be -- might or might not be more or less likely to fail. That might be grouped as part of that discussion. So, I was thinking perhaps we would want to link those conversations. Thanks.

Christa Taylor:

Perfect. Thanks, Kristine. I made a little comment also in the parking lot, and -- actually, I put it in the wrong one, but I'll make sure we capture that so, when we get to those two sections as well, we can -- it'll be there for our review, as well. Other comments? Or I'm going to jump into kind of the real first question. All is quiet. Okay.

So, we're on c.1, and the question is, "In the 2012 round, although anyone could apply, applicants that operated in a developing economy were given priority in the applicant support program. The work track generally agreed that the applicant support should continue to be open to applicants regardless of their location so long as they meet other criteria." The first comment is from the Registry Stakeholder Group. They agree. We have the Brand Registry Group. They agree. We have the ALAC. They agree, and they add another comment, adding to kind of the same sentiment, that they -- it should be reinforced that the location the communities propose to be served by an application rather than the location of the applicant that matters.

We then have Neustar. They have a couple different points here, and we're going to see the same comment several times throughout the document. So, one part of it seems to apply to the applicant evaluation, which is the section 2.7.7, so suggest we add that to that parking lot. And then, the criteria points, I'd also add that to the section 2.5.4.e.3. And just a couple parts of this, and I won't repeat any other ones. So, they disagree with the preliminary recommendation except for -- Neustar does not disagree with the preliminary recommendations except where explicitly stated, but we do strongly believe that any application needs to demonstrate a business case for a TLD, including how the TLDs will be

reserced in the long-term and an adequate understanding of what's involved in the management of a Registry/TLD.

Then, they go on. Expression of interest that outlines a synopsis of the business idea. In the event the idea is deemed to have merit, seed funding could be provided for the development of an application, and, if the subsequent application passes initial evaluation, the application fee is waived. And then, they go on. There should be a cap on the number of applications. So, we're going to see those -- a couple of those areas addressed further on, as I said, by just -- because we see this one, multiple plans, just thought I'd spend the time on it now.

Then, we have another comment from ICANN org. It's unclear how the preliminary recommendation 2.5.4.c.2 aligns with the preliminary recommendation 2.5.4.c.1. and then suggests defining the goals and key success factors for the program, which would then guide the implementation and operational activities to support these goals. And then, they give an example which is -- kind of relates to the metrics which we're going to see in another section, as well.

Then, we have the BC, which has kind of more of a general comment on wanting metrics, both ex-ante and ex-post. We should track users and other sustainability measures, as well as the number of new TLDs that are returned or not activated. Again, you're going to see something similar in the metrics part. And for mentorship, we need a much more clear and more visible process for activating community volunteers and other resources, as many global south applicants had no idea that resources were available where they were. Comments on this section? I'm reading the comments. No problem, Donna. Okay, no comments.

I'm going to go to the next section, which is on line 19, 2.5.4.c.2, geographic outreach areas should not only target the Global South, but also consider, quote, the "middle applicant," which are struggling regions that are further along in their development compared to underserved or underdeveloped regions. And for the most part, everyone -- the ALAC, the Brand Registry Group, the Registry Stakeholder Group, and the BC agreed with it. Not much to read on those. The BC added a comment with a clarification request that this term been formally defined, and is there a reference list of these countries.

So, in prior discussions, we didn't define what these countries were. We just had more of a general part of it on anywhere in the world, if they were considered suitable for the applicant support program, they should be able to apply. And for the definition, the definition that we used before for the middle applicant, and you'll see we added that into the parking lot on line 23, and it was defined as struggling regions that are further along in their development compared to underserved or underdeveloped regions.

It's intended to be an expansion and not intended to be the exclusion from applicants in underserved or underdeveloped regions. And the middle applicant provided a balance between opportunities while considering the economic development realities and priorities for potential applicants. So, hopefully that helps in that area there. And we can always refine that I guess further. We'll bring it to the full working group if we would -- we think that would be beneficial or helpful.

The next comment is from Neustar. Doesn't really have any new insight directly related to that question. And as I already read it out, I won't read it again. And then, we have the ICANN org, which I've added to (inaudible) section e.1, which we'll address further down. Any comments, suggestions, any other items to section c.2? All is silent, or everyone's falling asleep on me.

Moving on to the next section, which is line 26, the question is applicants who do not meet the requirements of the applicant support program should be provided with a limited period of time (that does not unreasonably delay the program) to pay the additional application fee amount and transfer the relevant application process associated with our application. And we have the ALAC, the Registry Stakeholder Group and Neustar agreeing with this. The ALAC added a comment that there should be sufficient time to pay the balance of the full application fee amount unless the support application review panel determines that an application has been the subject of willful gaming. And gaming is addressed in e.7, so that's been added there, as well. We have the Registry Stakeholder Group saying there should be a reasonable period of time to pay the additional application fee amount. Neustar has the same comment as before. And then, we have ICANN org, and this same comment's been added to two other sections, which I think are better suited to the response, which is e.7. and e.10 for cost. Any comments to 2.5.4.c, subsection 3? No comments. Okay.

On line 31, we have section 2.5.4.c.4 with a question, ICANN should improve the awareness of the ASP by engaging with other ICANN communities and other suitable partners that include, but not limited to, focus on technology and communication industries, especially in underserved regions while improving awareness through extensive promotional activities. We have the ALAC, the BC, Neustar, and the Registry Stakeholder Group all agreeing with this comment. I don't think there's really anything to add except the Registry Stakeholder Group goes on saying that they support the outreach to partners and other suitable parties to increase awareness but believes extensive promotional activities are unnecessary. The Registry Stakeholder Group believes ICANN's outreach to ICANN partners and other suitable parties to increase awareness of the ASP, and they, however, believe extensive

promotional activities are unnecessary to supplement direct outreach efforts.

Then, we have the ICANN org, again requesting to provide clearly defined goals and key success factors. And they like to note that mentorship on running a registry does not guarantee success. Further on, they have the other idea, in order to ensure the efforts and resources on engagement and support our spend appropriately, it would be helpful if the PDP working group could provide clearly defined goals for the ASP program. Similar to the example provided above, if the goal of the program is to encourage and assist new entrants regardless of geographic location, then the engagement activities with partners and communities to raise awareness and support potential applicants would be done globally, whereas if the goal of a program is to have more detail, the operators in underserved regions, then outreach and engagement activities would be targeted in underserved regions.

Then, they go on to say, including ICANN, if that is the adopted recommendation, should not be held accountable and responsible for the registry operator's failure. And then, finally, they have some metrics, which I've added section 2.5.4.e.2 on the goals. So, that is section c.4 if anyone has any comments or suggestions, ideas.

Seeing nothing, I'm going to jump to section -- to line 37, which is section e.5, with a question, ICANN should employ a multifaceted approach based on pre-application support, including longer lead-times to create awareness, encouraging participation of insightful experts who understand relevant regional issues and potential ramifications on the related business plans, along with the tools and expertise on how to evaluate the business case, such as developing a market for a TLD. We have the ALAC, the BC, and Neustar all agreeing with these. ALAC has the additional comment that resources be applied to systematically identify and address barriers to applications. The BC has an additional comment that efforts should be redoubled in attempting to connect actors who can speak the native tongue of a given region. Neustar is the same comment that I initially read out to everyone. And we have the ICANN org comment, which is the same identical one that I read in the prior section. And then, we have the Registry Stakeholder Group, which has concerns, which they say they support -- it supports better understanding original issues, but cautions against evaluation of business plan. The Registry Stakeholder Group supports ICANN's actions to better understand relevant regional issues but cautions against ICANN's evaluations of business plans to make a determination on the value of a business plan. Ultimately, the best evaluator of our business plan is a registry operator proposing such a plan, simply due to the fact that an applicant, as part of the ASP, should not empower ICANN to determine the viability of a plan.

That is the end of section c.5. I'm not seeing any comments there, so going to jump into c.6, which is on line 43, with a question, should -- support should continue to expand beyond simply financial. ICANN's approach should include mentorship on the management, operational, and technical aspects of running a registry, such as existing registries/registrar within the region to develop in-house expertise to help ensure a viable business for the long-term. We have the ALAC, the Council of Europe, the BC, Neustar all supporting this idea. The Council of Europe adds an additional comment, that other non-financial support, such as mentorship on management, operation and technical aspects of running a registry would also be a great help to many of the -- great help to many communities.

The Neustar comment is the same as before. And like to note, the TLD should be resource and long-term with an adequate understanding of what's involved in the management of a registry TLD. The ICANN org is the same response as the prior comment, noting that they shouldn't be held accountable for responsible -- or responsible for the registry operator's failure. We had the Registry Stakeholder Group, which has a divergent point of view, which says it should be limited to the financial support for the application fee only. Further involvement in the operational, technical and business aspects of the registry/registrar will only serve to unnecessarily involve ICANN in the operations of a registry/registrar and will not serve as a de facto endorsement of certain registry/registrar and set a negative precedent for future entities that want to enter the registry/registrar business.

And finally, we have XYZ, who says they oppose to the financial support, and they believe, if the applicant is unable to afford any reasonable application fees, then the applicant is likely to be unable to afford to operate a TLD. And they recommend against a financial assistance component of the applicant support program. And then, from the above section, or from another section I think that was from below, I've moved it up, and it was a comment from Neustar -- and you're going to see it on line 51 on the online worksheet -- that says -- has the concern that experience from the 2012 round has shown that the success of a TLD is measured in many ways, but regardless of ongoing financial support is required to maintain the infrastructure, or pay third-party vendors, implement promotional and marketing services, engage with the registry services and pay ongoing ICANN fees. So, we're going to see that again later on, but I thought it fit in here, so I thought I'd add it in, as well. Any comments to section c.6? Okay.

Moving to c.7, which is on line 52, with a question, additional financial support should go beyond an application fee, such as including application writing fees, related attorney fees, and ICANN registry-level



fees. We have the ALAC, the Council of Europe, the BC and Neustar all in agreement with this. I don't really have too much to add in any of those. The Neustar comment, same as the prior one. We then have the ICANN comment, which is also the same as the prior comment. And we have the Registry Stakeholder Group, which similar to the prior question for the same reasons noted in c.6. They are not in favor of ICANN support that exceeds simply financial support through the applicant support program.

And then, in -- that's it for that section. Any comments? I think everyone's fallen asleep. Okay, maybe this will tweak some kind of comments. We're on line 59. The question in c.8 is ICANN should evaluate additional funding partners, including multilateral and bilateral organizations to help support the ASP. We have the ALAC, the BC, and the Registry Stakeholder Group all agreeing with this, and then we have one comment with the Registry Stakeholder Group adding that they strongly disagree with any attempt to earmark or limit the use of funds for specific applications or regions or exert any undue influence as a condition of any additional funding provided. Additionally, funding providers should not include existing contracted parties, new gTLD applicants, or entities otherwise operating under contract with ICANN in order to avoid the appearance of any undue influence on ICANN as a result of the funds provided for the applicant support program. And we have one divergent point of view from Neustar, that they do not believe this should be ICANN's responsibility and does not support this preliminary recommendation.

And then, I had line 64 included, one from the general recommendations from the very beginning, which is that from the top -- from the RrSG with a question of -- about funding for the ASP. The registry -- the RrSG would like to better understand how the applicant support program is funded, or, specifically, where the money comes from for the reduced fee. Any comments on section c.8? Nothing. Okay.

Moving to c.9, which is on line 65, question is ICANN should consider whether additional funding is required for the next round of -- sorry -- the next round opening of the Applicant Support Program. We have agreement from the ALAC, the BC, and Neustar. The ALAC adds in some amounts, which I think would be better addressed in section e.10, and they would argue -- would arguably not adequately support an anticipated increase in the number of successful applicants based on an increase in ASP applicants. And that's referring to the sum of the \$2 million that was there from the 2012 round. We have the Neustar comment here which I thought (ph) was added, and again, was that there should be a cap on the number of applicants to be supported. And then, we have the Registry Stakeholder Group suggesting that ICANN should quantify additional financial commitments and corresponding benefits this

can be evaluated with. And this ties in with the goals and metrics that we've seen before. Any comments? Okay.

Moving to line 70, section e.1, work track 1, generally agreed that the applicant support program should be open to applicants regardless of their location. See recommendation 2.5.4.c.1 and 2.5.4.c.2 above. How would eligibility criteria need to be adjusted to accommodate that expansion of the program? The comments here, the first one is from the ILAC -- or the ALAC, apologies -- suggesting that the ASP should benefit underserved regions and community regardless of the location. And they go on to say to effect this, the eligibility criteria will need to be adjusted to require applications to demonstrate how they will serve in underserved region and/or community and may not nearly serve in the public interest. The BC suggests that eligibility criteria should take into account the benefits of the community region that the application hopes to provide irrespective of the region.

And then, we have the Registry Stakeholder Group that has the concern that it's still unclear on how the eligibility criteria would need to change to implement these recommendations. For example, while the proposal of the middle applicant category could afford greater access to the ASP, it could also increase costs of the program. The Registry Stakeholder Group would be curious as to how this expanded category would be defined, how eligibility criteria would be defined, and those specifics of the proposal implication, such as overall cost and anticipated number of potential recipients, and would suggest that we bring the anticipated number of potential recipients to the full working group to get some feedback and some ideas on and how we can address that.

And then, we have some criteria. Prior discussions all had applicant support, applicants meeting some criteria regardless of location, so I think that still stands. And then, I think I missed one comment, which I added in, which was the same on as the ICANN org comment from above, where they have the concern, if location is no longer a criteria for qualifying to the Applicant Support Program, how the recommendations in 2.5.4.c.2 aligns with the preliminary recommendation in c.1. Any -- oh, there's a comment, yay. Justine Chew says -- agrees with Anne that question e.10 may provide some answers. And Vanda says Annie (ph), really a great question, and do not see how to support the -- trying to find -- oh, Anne's comment. Sorry, Anne. (Inaudible), just wondering where the money will come from for the additional support. Wish we could figure this out from auction proceed. We're going to see this further on, where in another section we actually talk about the funding of it. And I'm not sure that exact subcategory coming up, but it's near the end of this. It might be e.10. It is. So, we will get there in a couple -- well, a few more sections. So, hopefully, if I don't remember to bring it up, please remind me.

Okay. So, I'm going to continue on while Vanda is typing. In section -- on line 75, e.2, we have the metrics question, which is Metrics: what does success look like? Is it the sheer number of applications and/or those approved? Or a comparison of the number that considered applying versus the number that actually completed the application process, i.e. developed its business plan, established financial sustainability, secured its sources of funds, and ensured accuracy of information? The first comment is from the registry stakeholder group, which says the preliminary purpose should increase the number of applications -- applicants that actually completed the application process. And the goal is to increase the number of TLDs serving underserved populations and locales, not just raising interest in new TLDs for those populations and locales. We had the government of India suggesting that the success be measured by its use, i.e. the applications (sic - applicants) that considered applying for a new gTLD, how many completed the application process, and the metrics should also take into account the extension of support for applications beyond a financial aspect.

Then, we have the ALAC, that success be based on the number of applications which qualified for ASP and which were ultimately approved. And they also suggest that the element of diversity be considered in terms of application versus approval numbers from outside the U.S./Europe region and the geographic spread and for IDNs. And then, they have a comment here which I'm not sure if somebody has a different interpretation, but I thought it was a little confusing. It says, as for question 2.5.4.e.2.1, the realistic expectations under said circumstances would -- at least some successful applicants (new operating registries) assisted by the ASP, but not many. So, I'm not really sure with the -- but not many, so if anyone has any clarification on that, that would be appreciated.

Then, we have the BC, that metrics should be -- should not only be focused on application process, but also the success of the gTLD once launched. And then, we have a Neustar comment, which I suggest we also move to section 2.5.4.c.6, regarding the implementation of promotional and market seeding services and engage with registrar services and pay ongoing ICANN fees. And that's in regards of ongoing financial support if it's required to maintain the infrastructure or pay third-party vendors.

And Justine Chew comes back with C should be moved or replicated under section 2.5.4.e.2.1. Okay. We'll add that in there, and then I guess I'll go back and say, if we consider that for e.1, do we have any additional comments when we take that into consideration? And then, at the same time, actually I'll wait on -- well, actually, I'll do that one right now, if anyone wants to add anything that we should consider now based on

that. I see Steve's typing, and Steve's already copied it there. And then, I'm going to add two comments to section e.2, which is the CCT-RT report recommendation 29, set objectives and metrics for applicants from the Global South. And then, we're going to see one from below in section e.2.1, whether or not generating from the BC, whether generating awareness about new gTLDs, could there be maybe some overlap with the applicant support program as well, which we'll see in a second. And Kristine, I have -- see your hand raised, so please, go ahead.

Kristine Dorrain: Thanks, this is Kristine. This is just maybe a procedural comment, but I'm looking at the -- you just mentioned the CCT-RT comment, which looks to me like I think we're on row 89, but maybe I'm reading ahead, or 81, but maybe I'm reading ahead. But my question is, is there's nothing on here that says that this is a new idea or something that discussed with the bigger working group. I'm wondering if we need to make that flag here as well so that we don't accidentally pass by and miss the CCT-RT bit. Thanks.

Christa Taylor: Yes. Thanks, Kristine. It's line 81, and your point is perfect. I think we can maybe review this further to see how it -- if it has any implications on the metrics. And (inaudible) they haven't done that yet, so I'm going to add that to the action plan to make sure that we review and then determine any implications on it, if that works. Okay. I'm going to keep going a little bit further.

Moving to the next section, which is on line 83, section e.2.1, what are realistic expectations for the ASP where there may be critical domain name industry infrastructure absent or where operating a registry may simply not be a priority for the potential applicants. And sorry, these aren't just simply agree or disagree, so they're a little bit more painful to read and go through.

But the first one is through the BC, which I was just mentioning, where it says focusing on awareness might make sense. In such cases, generating awareness about new domains might be more important than producing an expressive volume of applications. And then, we have the Registry Stakeholder Group, which one part of it I suggest we add to the parking lot, on the evaluation of applications, which is section 2.7.7. And then, the second -- and that's relating to the intent is to raise revenue, that there's an actual market that the TLD will serve, and that the infrastructure and people with the knowledge and the skills to operate the TLD in (inaudible) -- I'm not even going to say it. Sorry, guys -- are accessible. And they go on to say the Registry Stakeholder Group supports the eligibility of IDNs for applicants who meet the other criteria for the ASP. We do not believe the IDNs would require a specific or special category of support, and the registries feel that the ASP, with well-defined criteria and increased awareness, has the potential to serve the

full community of potential applicants. I think Justine comments line 78, the ALAC comment, a realistic expectation for the ASP is for at least some but not many successful applicants. Okay.

And then, one comment on line 86, which was added in from the ALAC, was the ALAC opines that success should be based on the number of applicants which qualify for ASP and which were ultimately approved as we're not (sic - we) believe the number of applicants -- applications for ASP is merely a contributing factor measuring the success of the program communications strategy. Any comments? Okay.

Line 87, section 2.5.4.e.3 with the question, if there are more applicants than funding, what evaluation criteria should be used to determine how to disperse the funds by region, number of points earned in the evaluation process, what type of application, or the communities they represent or other? The ALAC suggests the dispersion of funds should be based on the number of points earned in the evaluation process, assuming that all other considerations are included in the eligibility criteria. The BC says to use points but not the only factor. And the Registry Stakeholder Group says focusing on the most viable applications, where the viability of applications is equivalent, the secondary purpose should be increasing the number of applications from the Global South. And that's all we have for section e.3. Comments? Okay.

Seeing none, next section is on line 91 on e.4, did the ASP provide the right tools to potential program participants? If not, what was missing? The ALAC suggests that there was insufficient outreach to potential program participants and the more realistic eligibility criteria should be adopted for evaluating ASP applicants. And the -- sorry, that's a concern. And then, we have the Registry Stakeholder Group also with the concern that it seems that primarily -- the primary hurdles to use of the ASP awareness, timing, and education (inaudible) that was particularly burdensome for applicants from underserved and middle-served regions to provide required financial documents for continue -- for the COI and reconsidering the ASP requirements to account for this may be beneficial. The -- they support improved outreach and publication of ASP and the resources that it provides, and we said the ASP with well-defined criteria, clear engagement processes, and increased awareness has the potential to serve the full potential -- the full community of potential applicants. Any comments to section 2.5.4.e.4? I see Vanda's typing. And I know we're almost timed up, so I'll see if I can't do one more section here, and then I'll do a quick wrap-up for any other business. And Vanda says agree with the registries. The first window in 2012 really had a lack of information and outreach in the southern hemisphere. Thanks, Vanda.

Okay. Section 2.5.4.e.5, so question, how can we best ensure the availability of local consulting resource? The ALAC suggests that the

ccTLD operators be tapped to ensure the availability of local consulting services. The BC suggests contacting community members and partners who have proven knowledge of the ICANN environment and act as a conduit to involving them in the process. And we have the Registry Stakeholder Group saying we cannot ensure the availability of local consulting resources, and what can we do is -- opportunities for consulting resources in the community to offer free or reduced-price services. And I think I'll squeeze in one more quickly, and then we're done.

So, last one is e.6, with the question, how can we improve the learning curve, and what ideas are there beyond mentorship? We have the ALAC saying -- suggests devoting resources to identifying and addressing barriers to applying. And the -- address systematically identify and address barriers to application. We have the BC to develop regional discussion hubs, fostering discussion hubs composed by regional players in which collective strategies can be devised and common concerns gathered. We have LEMARIT suggesting creating mailing lists and webinars that would be useful. And finally, the Registry Stakeholder Group suggesting to improve outreach in publication of the applicant -- the ASP, including timely outreach to business association. And they have the concern that, in the 2012 round, the ASP was rushed and not well-publicized, so those that may have benefited from the ASP might not have been able to take part due to time constraints or a lack of knowledge about ICANN and the gTLDs in general. And they go on to say that national and regional Chambers of Commerce be reached out to in a timely manner so they can disseminate this to their members and to raise awareness.

Any questions or comments to sections e.6 and/or e.5? I see Vanda's typing. In the meantime, obviously I didn't get through the entire section, so the next call we'll pick it up from there and hopefully finish this section up. And an agenda will go out. So, for now, I'm going to ask if there's any other business. Thanks, Donna. I was a little unsure if I was actually still on the call. Vanda comments we're continuing to do awareness here together with local country ICANN, and I believe this is more effective. Great. And Rubens says he suggests same time next week. And any other business? Julie's reminding me on the time. Next call, January 15th at 2000 UTC. Just going to wait for any other comments, and -- thanks, Kristine. Yes, and I apologize if I put anyone to sleep.

So, thanks, everyone, and hopefully next call will be not as boring. So, thanks, everyone, and see you next week. You can stop the recording.

Julie Bisland:

Great, thank you. Thanks, Krista. Thanks, everyone, for joining. You can disconnect your lines, and have a good rest of your day.