

---

DURBAN – New gTLD Program Status Update  
Monday, July 15, 2013 – 13:00 to 14:30  
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

The New gTLD Program really got its genesis from the GNSO policy, which was presented back in 2007 for introduction of new generic top-level domains. Then it was 2008 when the ICANN Board approved the GNSO recommendations for implementing new gTLDs. Later that year, we saw the first version of the Applicant Guidebook. And then between the rest of 2009 and 2010, we saw four more versions of the Applicant Guidebook. In June 2011, the ICANN Board approved the Applicant Guidebook and authorized the New gTLD Program. In January, we saw another version of the Applicant Guidebook, and we began accepting applications for the New gTLD Program.

In June 2012, a little over a year ago, the 1,930 applications were revealed for the program. Sorry, I missed that. I was here, though, for the prioritization draw last December. Some of you, I know, I remembered meeting in Los Angeles for that fund week. In March of this year, we began releasing initial evaluation results. And most recently in the last month or two, the ICANN Board approved both the new Registrar Accreditation Agreement as well as the New gTLD Registry Agreement after many months – years – of work on those documents.

Which brings us very close to where we are now. Looking ahead to the first new gTLD, clearly we signed some agreements today, which is the first step towards delegating and having new gTLDs operational. So

---

*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.*

---

we're really at the end of a lot of work but also at the beginning of a new phase of the Internet as we look ahead to the expansion and growth of the DNS.

So I'm going to talk to you today, talk about some milestones, things that have happened, give my usual update for those of you who listen to me once a month on my webinars. We'll talk about application processing. We'll talk about security, stability, rights protection mechanisms, operational support mechanisms, and then what's ahead.

So as I mentioned, in June, the ICANN Board approved the RAA. We had – I'm looking to Cyrus – we had five signatures today? Five? Five Registrar Accreditation Agreements signed today, which is tremendous news for the 2013 RAA. And then on July 2, the ICANN Board approved the revised Registry Agreement, and we had four different Registry Agreements signed for four new gTLDs. I think we are updating the press release or the announcement on the website so that everyone gets credit for those applications that signed the agreements. So that information will be out on the microsite soon.

GAC Advice has been the subject of much work, both by staff and even more so by the New gTLD Program Committee in recent months, considering all the different aspects of the GAC Advice from the Beijing Communique – 28 individual items, 15 of which were addressed, several of which need further dialogue and discussion. And the New gTLD Program Committee has met with the GAC as of yesterday, and they look forward to starting those discussions.

In terms of application processing, we started with 1,930 applications, to date we've had 97 withdrawals, leaving us with 1,833 active

---

applications. And as of last Friday – three days ago – we posted results through priority number 1,200; 31 of those applicants through priority number 50 were invited to participate in contracting. They received Contracting Information Requests on June 3, and those applicants that responded to those Contracting Information Requests moved forward. And that was the result since July 3 that we ended up with the four signed Registry Agreements. We’re just getting started, so come on in everybody. There are plenty of seats.

This is another graphic that depicts a little bit of the progress through the first 1,200 priority numbers. Over 1,000 applications have successfully passed initial evaluation. We’ve identified 13 applications which are eligible for extended evaluation. A minute ago, I mentioned 97 applications had been withdrawn, but in the first 1,200 there were 49 of those withdrawn; 43 of those applications are on hold, meaning we haven’t released the IE results yet. They have change requests, they’re subject to outreach. There are pending items open for those applications, so we’re working to finalize those initial evaluation results on 43 applications. And then there were three applications which were not approved out of the first 1,200.

We’ve been releasing initial evaluation results in batches of 100, and we intend to do so through the end of August. We expect that the majority of applications through priority 1,930 will have results posted by the end of August, but given that we’ve had a few on hold for various issues we may see a few applications straggle out beyond August 30 due to pending change requests or outreach, etc.

---

Next I thought I'd talk about objections in the dispute resolution process. There were a total of 263 objections which were filed and found to be admissible by the DRSPs. You see the breakdown here by type and which of the dispute resolution providers is supporting and working those objections. This graphic depicts the current status of those objections. I intend to update this as we go along, but the current status of objections can be found on the individual DRSP websites. So in breakdown, you'll see the majority of disputes are still in progress. As of last week – something may have been late-breaking and things are being announced every single day – but there were four disputes which had results posted last week in which the applicant prevailed on those four objections. So I'll continue to update this as we get more information.

There are a number of topics that we get questions on – I'm sure I'll get questions on today – about the objection process. The estimates of advanced fees, especially by the ICC, we've received a number of questions on. We are working with the ICC. We've requested that they provide us with more detail on the breakdown of those fees and the rationale behind the fee structure. As soon as we get that information, we would certainly publish that as well.

One other item that has come up recently is around applications which are subject to GAC Advice, specifically those applications which are going to be discussed and which the NGPC will be in dialogue with the GAC about so they're on hold in a way. We've had applicants as well as objectors ask if the objection proceedings could be put on hold until the GAC work is done and the GAC Advice is resolved. So we have provided the dispute resolution providers with our perspective. We're not

---

instructing them to act, but we've indicated that ICANN feels that it is reasonable for the dispute resolution providers if both the applicant and the objector agree and request that we would see no reason that the dispute could not be put on hold or stayed until the GAD Advice is resolved. So if the applicant or the objector in the situation requests that of the dispute resolution providers, that is something that they will certainly consider within their guidelines. And we have expressed that we believe it's a reasonable approach.

I mentioned that we initiated the contracting process. We did so on July 3. We used our shiny new CRM system to issue Contracting Information Requests out to the 31 applicants who met the eligibility criteria to proceed to contracting. We're also endeavoring to inform each applicant, each application, in that same priority range that did not receive a Contracting Information Request to also be notified that they won't be receiving the request and as to why. In most cases, if the applicant has a change request in process or some other open issue, they likely understand why. They're in contention, they have objections, etc. But to be clear, we're endeavoring to send those messages out as well. We have another contracting session later this afternoon, 4:30 in this room. We'll be reviewing in more detail the contracting process.

Pre-Delegation Testing is operationally ready. We've been in beta testing for a while. The Pre-Delegation Testing specifications were updated and posted to the website last week – Friday – and our newest applicants contracted parties who once they sign the Registry Agreement will be invited to participate in production Pre-Delegation Testing.

---

The beta testing was actually very successful. We had 45 beta tests which were conducted or are still in progress. We're seeing a much higher success rate on individual test criteria. We had 24 service providers participate. In the last month, we got feedback both from applicants as well as the registry stakeholder group on the specifications criteria behind the Pre-Delegation Testing. We adjusted our approach to anycast testing as a result of that. That has been incorporated and that will be part of the production beta testing.

I think that feedback was actually a really productive dialogue. It allowed us to improve and clarify the pass/fail criteria for the tests, and it gave us an opportunity to iterate through some issues. So thanks to everyone who participated and all the feedback you provided during the beta testing.

In terms of rights protection, Trademark Clearinghouse, I've got some new dates here – lots of people taking pictures. The verification service provided by Deloitte has been live since March. The sandbox environment for agents as well as test SMD files – Signed Mark Data files – from the Trademark Clearinghouse are also available starting today. So that's a new date.

We will be issuing the production SMDs by the end of the month, so these will be available for testing by the registries. We are also going to be making an integration testing environment available for the Sunrise Integration Testing for registries to begin work with starting on August 15, and the Sunrise service will be live starting August 23. Claims Integration Testing will follow September 4, and a testing environment

---

will be available and the Claims service will be live starting the 26<sup>th</sup> of September.

There is still some ongoing work for the Trademark Clearinghouse. We are in the process of building what we're calling a Sunrise Portal. So this will be a portal both for the registry providers to publish their Sunrise dates and their Claims periods, and there will be a public-facing portal which we will make available so everyone will be aware of the Sunrise periods and the Claims periods for each new TLD.

We're continuing to work with the providers – both Deloitte and IBM – to ensure that the enhancement to include previously abused labels during the Claims process, the Plus 50, is implemented by the time we have the Claims service ready. Then we have a team working with a number of a negotiation, a discussion team, a group of individuals who have volunteered to work through issues in the RPM requirements document, the Rights Protection Mechanism document. So that's moving forward.

We have a session on the Trademark Clearinghouse which has been changed. I want to note the new time. We only had an hour starting at 8 AM. We've moved this. We now have two hours, and we start at 11 AM on Wednesday, so we have a little more time to dive into any issues and questions around the Trademark Clearinghouse.

The URS, the Uniform Rapid Suspension System, is moving along. It's actually ready and live. It's intended to support and service clear cut cases of trademark infringement. We have a demonstration set up for Wednesday. The user interface for submitting URS claims will be demonstrated on Wednesday at 13:15 – that's 1:15 for Americans. We

---

have our two providers and we are engaged with them, so this is operationally ready.

The Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures, PDDRPs because we don't have enough acronyms, we've got three Post-Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedures: one for Registry Restrictions, one for Trademark Disputes, and the Public Interest Commitments.

The Registry Restrictions process, we had an RFP issued. The process is concluded. We are working to select service providers there, and we expect to have an MOU, a Memorandum of Understanding, in place with the first provider by the end of July. With the URS, we'll be working with the providers to develop procedures and rules, and then those will subsequently be published.

Similarly, the Trademark Post-Delegation Dispute process as well went out for RFP. We have met with and discussed presentations from multiple providers, and we expect to also have MOUs in place by the end of the month.

The Public Interest Commitments process, the PICDRP, went out for public comment and that process concluded. There is still discussion and development work to be done around the PICDRP process. The Registry Agreement Negotiating Team is working through the issues on the PICDRP, and our intention is by the end of July to post the final PICDRP process. Once that's done, then we will be able to issue the RFP for PICDRP providers once we understand the scope of the work to be done there.



---

Operational support mechanisms, I'm starting to look very much ahead to the day when we have many new gTLDs in operations and we need to be on the lookout to make sure that they're operating well. A key component of that operational platform is our service level agreement monitoring. We have two key dates. The first is in September. We will have the SLA monitoring platform with full DNS testing will be operational. It will also include the WHOIS and EPP testing. The second release is scheduled for November, so we will be expanding the capabilities of this SLA monitoring platform, something we don't have today with the existing gTLDs. This monitoring tool, we will be engaging a third-part network operations center provider to monitor the results of this tool, and we are developing internal operations procedures to address the results of that monitoring work. The platform is being developed by Zabbix. We've outsourced that, and the monitoring nodes are in place and will be deployed across all ICANN regions. To date, 27 of the planned 36 nodes have been deployed.

Another important component that the New gTLD Program described for ensuring the ongoing continuous operation of new gTLDs is the emergency back-end registry operators, or EBRO. We are still on track for a September launch there. We are working to finalize master agreements with each of the identified three EBRO providers. We are finalizing the common transition process documentation as well as our own internal readiness procedures in case of an emergency transition. We are working with each provider to go through a readiness test as well as an emergency transition simulation by the end of the calendar year. One of the key items that we agreed as we've been working with the EBRO providers was ICANN will be taking on the effort to build and

---

maintain a repository of centralized zone file data, and we will have data escrow for that. So that will be available. We will be taking on that function in support of ongoing EBRO operations. As we have more data and more details, we'll certainly publish them along the way, but certainly by our next meeting in Buenos Aires we will have much more detail to share with you then.

Data escrow, we did extend a call for data escrow agents. We announced the first two ICANN-approved data escrow agents, and we have last month published the data escrow agreements. The templates have been published, so those are available for use by the applicants as they move towards contracting. So each new gTLD registry operator is expected to enter into an agreement with one of these approved data escrow providers. We have at least one, maybe a couple of applications for additional data escrow providers, and we will continue to process those applications and make those announcements as those data escrow providers are approved.

The Centralized Zone Data Access Program, this was also a component, one of the operational support mechanisms provided for by the Applicant Guidebook. So there is a demo of this, a live demo of the tool happening on Wednesday at 11 AM as well. You see a screenshot here. So it's really a tool that allows a new model for zone file access. So that will be demonstrated. I think Wendy – where did Wendy go? I think she'll be hosting that demo for us.

I want to talk about some of the next phases of the program. I keep talking about initial evaluation, but it's time to begin to look ahead at the upcoming phases of the program, extended evaluation. Previously, I

---

had announced that we expected to be operational and ready to support extended evaluation in October of this year; however, we have been able to expedite our operational readiness and work with our service providers to expedite this.

So after the Durban meeting, we will be notifying all of the applicants who are eligible for extended evaluation to date that they may begin to elect extended evaluation. Each applicant has 15 days to elect to participate in an extended evaluation, and we expect to start that evaluation in August. Right now the timeline, the plan is that extended evaluation may take up to 12 weeks. That includes issuing CQs and response time, etc. That would put us to finalizing extended evaluation results as early as late December or January of 2014. So we would have the 12 weeks of evaluation and – similar to how we were working with initial evaluation – the results and the reports are published typically within three weeks of the panel’s work being done.

For anyone who is interested in a little more detail on the extended evaluation process, it’s really three steps. First, the applicant elects extended evaluation. Secondly, the panel issues clarifying questions to the applicant to receive a response similar to initial evaluation. And then finally, the panel delivers their evaluation recommendations to ICANN for us to synthesize and post the results.

One of the differences between the way we anticipate extended evaluation working from the way initial evaluation has transpired is we anticipate it to be more of a dialogue, more interactive. So before the applicant has to elect extended evaluation, they will have the opportunity to ask questions, have a little Q&A conversation if they so

---

choose with ICANN so they can make an informed decision about electing extended evaluation. And then the clarifying question process we expect will require really more of a dialogue to enable the applicants to respond successfully. Also, extended evaluation in the Guidebook doesn't specify a timeframe for those clarifying questions, but we anticipate this overall process taking 12 weeks.

Moving on to string contention, one of the upcoming phases as well. we started with 234 total contention sets when the string similarity panel results were published. Currently, we have a total of 218 contention sets. That's as of July 8, so we've had a few more withdrawals since then; 27 of those contention sets include a community applicant. So those contention sets with community applicants, those applicants could elect to proceed through Community Priority Evaluation. There are two mechanisms specified in the Guidebook for resolving contention: the Community Priority Evaluation and the ICANN auction. That said, as we've said in the past, ICANN encourages applicants to resolve contention amongst themselves. The way we see that contention being resolved is we receive a withdrawal request. And once we receive the withdrawal request, we update our contention results. And you can see that the contention set is then eliminated when all of the contending applications have withdrawn and we're down to a single remaining application in the contention set.

So let's talk a little bit about Community Priority Evaluation, or CPE – another acronym. So I'm sharing a few dates and the timeline here for Community Priority Evaluation. We've been working with the evaluation panel for Community Priority Evaluation in recent weeks, and we expect to be publishing by the 5<sup>th</sup> of August the procedures for Community

---

Priority Evaluation. We're expecting to receive and looking forward to feedback from the community on those procedures, and we expect to finalize those procedures by the end of August. From there, we will give applicants – well, actually, we extended the opportunity for community applicants to elect and identify that they intended to elect Community Priority Evaluation back in June. But once we post these procedures and as all of the applications, initial evaluation is expected to be completed by the end of August. All community applicants will have 15 days to elect Community Priority Evaluation, so that would be election is scheduled for the 20<sup>th</sup> of August and we would expect to have the first Community Priority Evaluation batch beginning by the end of September. The 23<sup>rd</sup> of September here would be our first CPE batch.

We are working with the providers to finalize the cost estimates. I believe the Guidebook specifies \$10,000 it estimates. Community Priority Evaluation is estimated for \$10,000. Right now it's looking to be higher than that, but I don't have a finalized dollar amount. As soon as we finalize those costs with the provider, I will certainly publish that and let you know.

One of the questions I've been asked about Community Priority Evaluation and we've received through our customer service portal – is about application comments for community applications. And application comments, anyone is still able to post comments for applications. We will be sharing those comments with the CPE, the evaluation panels, for their consideration during the Community Priority Evaluation.

---

Auctions, so we are working with a provider. The same provider that we had engaged with to write the procedures for auctions that resulted in much of the language of the Guidebook, and we are working with that provider towards operational readiness. My team is also putting together our own procedures for operational readiness. We expect to publish user documentation, sort of a user guide with some more details than are specified in the Guidebook for auctions, by September 3. By the end of September, we're looking ahead to be able to begin training. There will be a test environment available, and the provider will be able to offer mock auctions. And we anticipate by mid-October we could be conducting the first set of auctions, depending on whether we have applicants who wish to participate in those auctions. Again, we recognize that the ICANN auction is the mechanism of last resort for string contention resolution, and we encourage applicants to resolve contentions amongst themselves.

So we talked about the Board approving the RAA and the Registry Agreement, and we now have our first new contracted parties to both of those agreements. And as we look ahead, we would anticipate that the first new gTLD could be delegated by fall of this year.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This fall?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Oh, sorry, fall. So when? We can talk about specific dates. I'm moving on to a timeline here which I think might be helpful. So this is a timeline that I've shared a version of this. I've shared in my webinars previously.

---

It's the earliest path to the first new gTLD. It's certainly hypothetical. It's very dependent on the actions of each of the contracted parties.

So let's just walk through this quickly. It started with the Registry Agreement being approved on July 2. Starting July 3, I mentioned previously that we initiated the Contracting Information Requests, and through the 15<sup>th</sup> we have now contracted four, we've signed agreements with four new gTLD applicants. We expect to be inviting those applicants later this week to participate in Pre-Delegation Testing, so those applicants must successfully go through Pre-Delegation Testing.

There's a transition to IANA. There's work that under the program we need to document that each applicant has proceeded through each aspect of the new gTLD program processes effectively and successfully, so we would transition to IANA in late August. IANA has a process for delegation we're estimating at about two weeks. So theoretically, hypothetically here we could see the first new TLD delegated by the 5<sup>th</sup> of September.

Once a new gTLD is delegated and they go through their own testing process – assuming that they have successfully tested with the Trademark Clearinghouse – they would be able to provide notice and issue notice of a Sunrise period. So applicants must provide 30 days' notice of a Sunrise period, and then there must be a 30-day Sunrise period. So that's the dates that are depicted here. So we could see a new gTLD delegated early September with a Sunrise period happening from early October to early November. So those are the dates here.

---

This is another overall picture of the timeline, so you can see how things are wrapping up. Initial evaluation is coming to a close. We're beginning an extended evaluation. Shortly on the heels of beginning extended evaluation in the September or October timeframe, we're going to be moving forward with our string contention resolution procedures. The green bars, I note that the Board and or NGPC has addressed a significant portion of the GAC Advice from the Beijing Communique, but there are still outstanding items that the Board will continue to address. Components of that advice, potentially more advice coming out of this meeting. We've initiated the contracting process, and we're moving towards the production version of our Pre-Delegation Testing. Our Rights Protection Mechanisms have been operational. The verification service of the Trademark Clearinghouse has been operational since February, and we've reviewed the dates and timelines. When I publish to the microsite next week – well, the whole slides will be updated – but I'm going to try to depict some of the other milestone dates that we discussed here today, the URS dates as well as under operational support the SLA monitoring and EBRO dates so that we have one comprehensive timeline that depicts this.

So that's the end of my slides. I want to highlight for you some of the upcoming sessions. This afternoon, we have two sessions I wanted to follow this afternoon, one on contracting, the second on Pre-Delegation Testing. The Trademark Clearinghouse session is on Wednesday morning starting at 11 and going until 13:00, not 13:09. And then in the afternoon, the URS demo as well.

So with that, we're going to open things up for questions. I believe we have a microphone there, and where is Wendy? Oh, we have a remote



---

participation. So let's start with some remote participation questions while folks get queued up. If you will, Wendy, I've got a microphone somewhere. There you go.

WENDY PROFIT:

The first question: how does string contention and prioritization draw affect the contract offer process? Is contract offered before to all parties in contention and contingent on winning or only after resolution of string contention?

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

Thanks, Wendy. Yes. So the Contracting Information Request is not provided to applicants who have outstanding objections or who are a participant in a string contention set. So, no, if you have an objection or you are in contention, you will not be receiving a Contracting Information Request. Once that objection clears or once that contention set is resolved, you would then be invited to participate in and receive the Contracting Information Request in the next cycle.

WENDY PROFIT:

Second question from Maxim. Question: will there be any active new registries before SLA monitoring works?

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

We anticipate that both the SLA monitoring tool, the EBRO systems, will be in place before the first new gTLD is delegated.

---

WENDY PROFIT: I have about four more questions. Should we take turns?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Amadeo.

[AMADEO ABRIL]: That's me? It works?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Yes.

[AMADEO ABRIL]: Okay, thanks. I have three brief questions. One of them is regarding PDT, so you may decide whether it goes to this session or the other.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Okay.

[AMADEO ABRIL]: The first one is regarding the contractual rate in which you were sending that because historically we thought that we were going 20 by week each step – contracting, PDT, etc. – but you said that you have sent out to 31. So what's the rate? I'm neutral to that. Simply to know how do people have to be prepared and when they will be receiving the contracts in the next weeks or months. So 50 a week and 20 a week, it's simple to double, right? So some clarification on that.

---

The second one is regarding the CPE, and you said that the guidelines for the procedure would be provided. And the question is whether these guidelines will be some sort of procedure so that this is just an evaluation of the applications or the applicants will be able to respond to the concrete 14 points? Because the problem is that the story of the community TLDs is just spread in questions regarding the applications. So for instance, when you are addressing enforcement, you have things in Q20 or Q29 that are spread over the application. So that is the question is whether we will need to for the Community Priority redo and answer the 14 questions, or this is directly done by the evaluators. My preference is, indeed, that the applicants have a chance to point where they have addressed each of the questions for the evaluation in the questions.

And the last one is regarding PDT. I repeat, it's very simple. In the beta PDT, we got questions from the PDT evaluator saying, for instance, your DNS practices statement lacks a date. Please provide a valid DNS practices statement. So they were right, but the question was completely marginal. The problem here is, can we change our DNS practices statement for the PDT evaluators? Because our understanding is that we cannot change the application at this stage, and not through this procedure. So I think we should talk, then, in the next session about what things they can ask us to change and what happens in these things. We got this which is a stupid one but real. The other one was also a real one said, well, there was something that was a mistake in one of our questions so they asked us for a clarification. But they said, provide us the correct version of the answer to question whatever, and for me the correct version is the one in the application. So we don't

---

know exactly what instructions they got, and we were a little bit confused about how to react to that. Thanks.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

Thank you, Amadeo. So I think I can try a couple of these. First in terms of contracting rate, I mentioned yesterday that after this Durban meeting, next week expect to issue Contracting Information Requests through priority number 108. So all eligible applications that are not in contention, etc., all of the IDN applications would receive a Contracting Information Request the week of the 22<sup>nd</sup> of July. Going forward, I also mentioned yesterday at the GNSO that we are anticipating issuing Contracting Information Requests at a rate of 40 priority numbers per week. That may go up or down. We want to prime the pump, if you will. We have a pipeline that we want to fill, and everyone isn't responding to their Contracting Information Requests so it may take some time for people to respond to those. So we want to get enough applications in the queue that we are working them, and then we may exceed our capacity. In which case, once we've built a sufficient backlog, we might ramp that rate down and we would certainly notify the community if we're going to change that pace. So that's about the contracting rate.

The second about the CPE questions, I don't believe we're currently anticipating that the applicant will answer those 14 questions specifically. The evaluator does have the opportunity as the Guidebook states to ask questions of the applicant, ask for any additional information that might be needed. So that's certainly something we can work through, and we'd love to get some feedback on that if you feel

---

that would be valuable to answer those questions specifically. It wasn't something we were considering.

In terms of the third question, I think part of it is related to a specific application and I'm not prepared to discuss it. The other aspect of it I think we could discuss later today in the Pre-Delegation Testing session if you might be attending that. Okay. Let's try and get that addressed at that session, okay?

[AMADEO ABRIL]: As my follow up for the rate of the contracts, but I guess that if you take one more week to sign that somebody else it doesn't mean that you miss your spot in the priority, right?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Correct.

[AMADEO ABRIL]: Okay.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So we are initiating the Contracting Information Requests based on priority number. We are processing responses in the order they come in. We aren't going to wait for priority number three because priority number one and two haven't responded. That clearly hasn't happened. So we're going to proceed based on responses, but then once you do respond, you are in the queue. And once you are contracted, then you would move forward and you would, once we have a backlog and a

---

queue for contracting, the intention is to work the contracting requests in priority order.

Do we have another one, Wendy? Okay, so we'll alternate. Okay, go ahead, Wendy.

WENDY PROFIT:

During yesterday's meeting between the NGPC and the GAC, it was made clear by the GAC that the list of strings in their Category 1 and 2 advice were meant to be representative and not definitive. When will ICANN post a definitive list of strings effected or on hold due to Category 1 and 2 GAC Advice?

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

So the NGPC is still considering the Category 1 Advice. We have no direction yet from them as to whether they will be creating or recommending that a definitive list be created, so all of our considerations are based on the lists of strings specified in the GAC Advice that are explicitly called out in the Beijing Communique.

JIM PRENDERGAST:

Hi, Christine. Jim Prendergast, the Galway Strategy Group. Two questions, back to extended evaluation, if you could bring that slide back up maybe. I noticed that the timeline was approximately 12 weeks to complete the extended evaluation, but what we're seeing is some extended evaluations because of an issue with the COI or with Question 45, financials. Is that really going to take 12 weeks to clear up?

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So that's our estimate for the outset. We want to get all scenarios covered in 12 weeks. If an issue is resolved quickly and financials can be provided in a week and the panel considers it, we are not going to hold anything up. We won't delay based on priority number. We will be releasing extended evaluation results as soon as that's possible.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay. And then I saw on the agenda there was a security and stability bullet point, but we didn't cover anything.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: I had my pre-delegation in a separate section under security and stability, and I didn't delete that from my header. My fault.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay. Well, I understand that ICANN has gotten the two stability and security studies back that were supposed to be released before Durban. Is there any reason that they haven't been released yet?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So I'm aware of what the two are. There's one on the high-risk string collisions.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Name certificates and then .list.

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: The name, yes, and the other one on the .list domains. I'm not aware that we have final versions on either of those, so as soon as we do we would certainly publish those and look for comment. I think we have a session later this week.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Wednesday. The SSR on Wednesday.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay, so will those studies be discussed then?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We'll discuss what we can, but they haven't been finalized and ready for publication. We'll disclose and discuss what has been essentially taken in to date.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay, thanks.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thanks, Jim. Wendy, do you have somebody online?

WENDY PROFIT: Question, what is the process to demonstrate compliance to GAC's additional safeguards?



---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: I am looking to my esteemed colleagues. I think that the safeguards – let me try this, and someone can correct me if you want to enhance it – we have safeguards identified in the Spec 11. The Specification 11 of the Registry Agreement has been expanded to cover the portions of the GAC Advice which have been addressed, and it would be a PICDRP process that would be used to address compliance or noncompliance with Specification 11. Anything to add, anyone? Excellent.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Hi, Antony Van Covering of Minds + Machines. Hi. You took us through a timeline that looked at when you're going to get the first one out. And then you mentioned that the IANA process would take about two weeks. The slide had a much longer amount of time there. So once this thing is going, can you take us through how long it will take?

So we're going to be invited to fill out some contracting materials, and it's going to go to contracting, and then it's going to go to pre-delegation, and then you get delegated and give notice of the Sunrise. So assuming things are moving along, how long is it going to take from the time that you sign your contract to the time that you're delegated? Are we still looking at 20 per week for contracting, 20 per week for pre-delegation testing, and then is IANA going to move faster if they're going to do it in two weeks? I mean, are we still looking at the same rates? I'm just trying to sort of understand.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Yes, Antony, I'm not trying to depict any different rates than we've discussed previously. So the goal is still to be able to sign 20 contracts

---

per week. We'll be inviting more participants in to contracting them out. The provider has guaranteed us 20 pre-delegation testing slots per week, so we anticipate that. In the pre-delegation meetings, we've had various discussions on the timeline. You get invited in one week. You provide your documentation in a second week. There are two weeks of testing, possibly a third if you need it. Then the report, etc. So the IANA process as it has been specified to me is anticipated to be possibly a one- to two-week process, but Elise is right here so I'll let her add.

ELISE GERICH:

As is Kim, but I'm Elise Gerich. And I think the question might be, do we have capacity, say, to do more than 20 a week? Yes. The IANA has more capacity than 20 a week, so if somehow there was a bottleneck and we ended up getting 40 in one week instead of 20, we would process them. And it's just an estimate that it would take approximately two weeks. Two weeks? Is that what I said?

ANTONY VAN COUVERING:

Yes, you did.

ELISE GERICH:

Okay.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING:

Is the IANA process, does that include the participation of VeriSign and the Department of Congress?

---

ELISE GERICH: Yes. That's from start to finish.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Okay. So if I'm understanding this then, the Pre-Delegation Testing itself could take from four to six weeks, and the IANA process could take approximately two weeks. So from the time you sign the contract to the time that you're delegated would be about two months. Is that fair?

ELISE GERICH: I think that's a reasonable estimate.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: So when you said that your goal was 20 a week, does that mean that you have what you think is going to happen, or is there a larger goal and you think that's what the average is?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: We can't speak to, one, how many applicants are going to choose to negotiate contracts or not, so that would significantly affect the number of contracts we're able to sign in a given week. It's very difficult to predict how quickly everyone will pass if they're going to be successful in conducting their Pre-Delegation Testing. Also, applicants don't have to immediately go into Pre-Delegation Testing. They don't have to go into the next week's Pre-Delegation Testing slot. We have applicants who may choose to wait a week, a month, two months down the line for their Pre-Delegation Testing. So there are various timelines, and we will accommodate all of those scenarios.

---

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: One more little set of follow-up questions because I'm sure a lot of people are thinking about this. In the legal department when you're looking at this, is it just one group that's going to handle everything or do you have a group that's going to handle those where they're not negotiated and then there's a negotiating team? So would this proceed perhaps on two tracks? And secondly, doesn't the pre-delegation beta testing give you some idea of how well people are going to do or how quickly they are going to pass?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So in terms of contracting, I do believe we've got multiple queues, if you will, with different resources working those standard as well as versus the negotiated agreements. So, yes, we've got two separate threads and pools of resources. And, yes, we're seeing more and more positive results out of pre-delegation testing, but I think we've only had a handful of completely clean, successful pre-delegation tests so far. So we certainly hope that rate improves, and by the time we get to probably priority 500 or 600, everyone will have smoothed things out and gone through it and it will be much quicker.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: It would be helpful, I think, if indeed there are two tracks on the contracting side that supposing somebody wants to negotiate, they would not actually hold up the others. And if that's the case, you would be able actually to estimate how many of the non-negotiated contracts you would be able to do. And that would help people, I think, quite a bit in making their planning.

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: I think the point would be it would be helpful to have some visibility. Jeff Neuman made the point yesterday that this predictability of the initial evaluation results knowing 100 a week has been helpful and valuable. I think it probably behooves us to figure out what we can do to provide some clarity and status on where you stand in a given queue – whether it’s the contracting queue or pre-delegation testing queue. So thanks for your questions. Sincerely, I appreciate the questions because when you’re presenting so much content it’s hard to gauge exactly what people want to know. So thank you, Antony.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: One thing from the remote participants is that they’re having a hard time hearing the questions from the mic in the room, so if you could please get a little bit closer and speak a little bit louder that might be helpful to the people. Adobe Connect, and I do have a bunch more questions, so could I ask one more?

MIKE PALAGE: Mike Palage. I’ve never been known as a soft talker. Carry a big stick too. Good afternoon, Christine. Just a point of order, September 2013 in southern hemisphere will actually be spring, so it’s hemispherically challenged so you just may want to just use Q1.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you.

---

MIKE PALAGE:

And Peter Dengate Thrush, he drilled that into me years on the Board. I've never become hemispherically challenged again. First question with regard to CPE. You said that on August 5 you're going to be posting procedures. You say that it is going to begin on the 23<sup>rd</sup>. Do you have any idea on the length. And with regard to the length, this is with regard to what the applicant needs to do as well as what third parties may want to do because there is the ability for organizations of non-negligible size to comment. So is this something that they need to start getting in place now or on the 5<sup>th</sup>. Will they have to have it in place by the 23<sup>rd</sup>? What do they need to do third parties and the timing? This is not very clear, and if you can give us some insight instead of making us wait until August 5, that would be helpful.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

Let me share with you what we know now. Things are still very much a work in progress there. We had not contemplated offering the community applicants the ability to answer each question individually. The intention was for the panel to review the application in total – all of the letters of support as well as the application comments, etc. – and then determine if additional information would be required. So it's not a clarifying question, but additional information could be requested by the panel. So that would be at the beginning of the Community Priority Evaluation process. So from that perspective we were not anticipating the applicant would have to do much of anything, that the work would be done by the CPE panel. And I'm looking at my notes to see if we have a timeline. We are right now the panel is estimating that given a current capacity the evaluations are estimated to take five to six weeks.

---

MIKE PALAGE: So third parties would then want to have...when will third parties know when someone has elected for a CPE? Because then they need to know when they need to get their comments on record. Since we're dealing with a five-week window here, I would just ask for you to take that into account, particularly in light of the ombudsmen with the timeliness of filings and fairness. It would really be awkward.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Yes. I would encourage anyone who has a comment to make, to make their comments early. Almost all of the objections were filed on the very last day in the last hour. So that didn't seem to work so well. So I would encourage anyone who has a comment to make, to make it early and make your voice heard.

MIKE PALAGE: Christine, you've now been on the job for about nine months. You've looked at the public forums. It's a tradition. It's the last minute. It's the ICANN way. Dangerous way, but it is the ICANN way.

The second point that I wanted to ask, and I think I had raised this question in – where were we last? Beijing. With regard to amendments that some parties may seek during the negotiation phase, has ICANN thought about how they will be communicating those changes to other applicants so they might be able to see what has already been negotiated. Is there going to be some type of portal where legal will be keeping a docket of approved contractual changes so that other lawyers will not have to reinvent the wheel, but you could perhaps go and pick

---

the options that have already been preapproved? I raised this in Beijing. Any work or progress on that?

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

I recall the question – the negotiation portal. So I think my answer is still the same, that the intention is not to share terms of negotiation until contracts are finalized. But once contracts are finalized, as with all Registry Agreements, they will be published. So could we do something to summarize negotiated terms? We'll certainly take that under consideration as to how we can do that.

MIKE PALAGE:

And again, just as a point of reference, trying to track on the website when the changes occur between white line versions not very easy. So if you could somehow provide the red line, it would help.

Just one final question. In the Board resolutions that were posted yesterday regarding the payment of fees to the ICC, it stated that the amount of fees were in excess of a half a million dollars. And since a lot of people in this audience paid a lot of money, could you perhaps give us the exact dollar amount that was paid to the ICC in total?

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

I would look to my legal colleagues. I don't know if that's a number that would be appropriate to share.

MIKE PALAGE:

So it's our money that's being paid. Okay.



---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Yes.

MIKE PALAGE: Open and transparent.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you. We're going to take something from the online portal, and then we'll try to be a little quicker.

AMY STATHOS: Just to clarify, the question was, how much have we paid to the ICC to advance fees for the objections that we're funding?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Yes.

AMY STATHOS: We don't have that number yet.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Okay.

AMY STATHOS: But that's certainly a number that we will be able to provide when that number is available.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thanks, Amy. Go ahead, Wendy.

---

WENDY PROFIT: Question from the queue, what do you know about applicants in contention sets asking the U.S. Department of Justice whether they can pool and create participations by percentage in each other's applications and agree to withdraw in some sets because they have participation in other sets?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: I know nothing about that.

WENDY PROFIT: Next question, when should we expect contractual negotiation process started and the process described and published? I think it's missing a word, but when should we expect the contractual negotiation process be started and the process described and published? They want to know when it will be described and published.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So we have another session on contracting in a few hours. We could certainly discuss that there. I don't know that there is much to be documented in a negotiation process, but we can certainly talk about that there. We'll be sure to put that on the agenda. Thank you. We'll go to the gentleman in line. I'm sorry.

SHEEL MOHNOT: Yes. Hey, my name is Sheel, and I'm with the Applicant Auction, the group resolving gTLD contention through private auctions. So my question is naturally around the last resort auction. And you mentioned that the first sets you expect will go mid-October. So I wanted to get a

---

sense from you as to what you think in terms of how you'll decide who is participating and sort of what the process is going forward.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

So as we define the procedures in the user documentation, we would describe a process whereby applicants in a contention set could request to participate in an auction. So just like we've done with everything else, in this user documentation we'd specify how do you elect to participate in an auction, how do request that, how do you submit your fees, where does that go. So we have a lot of details to pull together, and once that's done and in the user documentation, I think we'll have more clarity. I wish I had more to share with you there today.

SHEEL MOHNOT:

Thank you.

WENDY PROFIT:

Has there been any documentation – test plans, technical specifications – released detailing the testing that new gTLD registries have to go through with Trademark Clearinghouse to move forward with Sunrise?

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

That's a good question. Could I ask Karen Lentz to chime in? Have we published anything on testing documentation?

---

KAREN LENTZ: Thank, Christine. This is Karen Lentz. The short answer is we have not yet published that. It's in development, and we expect to cover more of that in the Trademark Clearinghouse session on Wednesday.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thanks.

LILLIAN FOSTERIS: Thank you. Lillian Fosteris from FairWinds Partners, and this is a follow-up to one of the remote questions relating to GAC Advice and the CIR. So with CIRs, if a string is listed in the Beijing Communique, it will not receive a CIR. Is that correct?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So if the string is listed in Category 1 GAC Advice, they would not receive the CIR.

LILLIAN FOSTERIS: So following up on the meetings yesterday in that the GAC explicitly stated that there were some mistakes and that they may work on a more definitive list and they said that it's not exhaustive, what would occur if a string is not listed, the applicant contracts with ICANN, and then in that process the GAC lists that it's a string to be included in Category 1?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: We would have to consider that situation carefully. It would depend on where the application, where the TLD stands in the delegation process.

---

LILLIAN FOSTERIS: So hypothetically a string, a gTLD, you could be a contracted party with ICANN but then it would be pulled?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: I don't know. I can't really anticipate what GAC Advice could be or what the outcomes of the NGPC dialogue with the GAC might be. So that dialogue may have other requirements. I don't know that it could be pulled. I think Category 1 is about a set of safeguards that are being desired. So there could be additional requirements put on those strings. And we have considered that in the agreements that we've signed to date.

LILLIAN FOSTERIS: And one follow-up question relating to GAC Advice for closed generics, will there potentially be an opportunity for applicants to change their application to agree to a new PIC specification so that it's more open if it's a generic term?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Two things, one, if any applicant wishes to change their application, they can certainly submit a change request at any time. Secondly, as you begin the contracting process, the Spec 11 has some criteria around the exclusive and restricted access, so that would be reflected in the Specification 11 document portion of the contract.

LILLIAN FOSTERIS: I'm sorry. I don't understand that. So at this time you would change the registration policies in order to comply with Spec 11?

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Well, your contract would state what your...let me turn it over to my legal team or to Cyrus. Is there somebody who wants to comment on this?

DAN HALLORAN: Yes, thanks. This is Dan Halloran on the legal team. So what the Board said is they passed the new agreement with Spec 11 as it's stated, and that's available to any registry that's ready to go forward. If you have an application and you're ready to sign that, but your application is not consistent, then it sounds like maybe you would do an Application Change Request. We have received some Application Change Requests saying, "We had initially applied as what's being called closed generic; now we want to change." And we've received and processed those requests.

LILLIAN FOSTERIS: Alright. That's simple. Thank you.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you. Okay, let's take one more.

CAROLIN SILBERNAGL: Carolin Silbernagl for dotHIV. I have a question relating to the overview slide of the whole program timeline. Can you switch to that, please? Okay, it's relating to the GAC Advice also. So there is a bar for the resolution of the still open elements of the GAC Advice, and it goes on until the end of November. So I wanted to ask if you can specify a little bit on that scenario and if it does mean that you really fixedly plan on

---

leaving it open until after the Buenos Aires meeting for providing a solution.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So we currently do not have a timeline for the NGCP work with the GAC Advice. So this is reflecting from where we are now through the Buenos Aires meeting. This is personally our best estimate, but the NGCP has not provided a formal timeline in their work with the GAC as of yet.

CAROLIN SILBERNAGL: So you would say this is the best estimate? So the first resolution we can hope for would be after Buenos Aires?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: No. Could they resolve something sooner? Certainly possible. I don't have a timeline. Perhaps this should have been all the way out to the end. I don't have any end date at this point.

CAROLIN SILBERNAGL: It looks better that way with an end.

JACOB MALTHOUSE: Hi. Jacob Malthouse with Big Room .ECO. I wanted to say first, thank you for the update on the duration of the CPE. Five to six weeks, I think, is shorter than what you said before, which was six to 12. So thanks for being dedicated to efficiency on that side, and I hope that will also continue through to negotiating the fees with the providers so we're

---

not having unexpectedly expensive fees along with other things. But that's great. Thank you.

Our question is simply related actually to the GAC Advice and the relationship potentially to Community Priority Evaluation and whether if your string falls into that Category 1 if it might prevent you from starting the CPE or not or give you the option to delay. There might be some discussion around that. Just wondering if you could speak to that a little bit.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

That's a good question. Let me take that back to the team. I would think that a CPE could proceed, but I need to consider that. I think the GAC Advice would more likely affect the ability to move towards contracting rather than affect the ability for applicants to move through Community Priority Evaluation, just like we're continuing initial evaluation or extended evaluation. To me Community Priority Evaluation would be similar, but I'll definitely think about that.

JACOB MALTHOUSE:

That would be great. Thanks.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

Thank you. Hi, Kristina.

KRISTINA ROSETTE COVINGTON:

Hi. I'm Kristina Rosette Covington. A question and a request. ICANN has established a process under which approved Application Change



---

Requests are put out for public comment. There are at least one or two of those requests that have received a number of public comments. What process is ICANN using to evaluate those public comments, and how is the community notified when that preliminary approval transforms into a permanent approval?

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

That's a very good question. Right now on the website there's no indicator to differentiate between the two, and frankly very honestly I've received feedback and I think it's difficult to find what portions of the application have changed. We are working to improve the microsite and the page with the application posting information. I think there are still more enhancements we can make, so let me take that as an action to see what we can do to indicate that a final acceptance of the change has been made.

KRISTINA ROSETTE COVINGTON:

Okay, and I guess in that case I'll make a second request, and that being if ICANN would, please, publish either there or somewhere else on the microsite the process that's being used to evaluate the public comments that are being received and response to those preliminarily approved Application Change Requests. So thank you very much.

CHRISTINE WILLETT:

Thank you.

---

KRISTINA ROSETTE COVINGTON: The second is to request, although we've provided consent in writing, that ICANN publish on the correspondence page the letter that was sent on behalf of Patagonia to ICANN regarding the independent objectors conflict of interest. We'd like to see that posted.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you.

KRISTINA ROSETTE COVINGTON: Thanks.

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Hi. Vladimir Shadrnov with Asiamix Digital. Could you, please, help me figure out how the prioritization will work for those applicants who end up in ICANN auction, namely a first question. You said that the auction order will be determined depending on the priority numbers. So are you taking the lowest priority number in the contention set or highest or whatever?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Applicants retain their priority number regardless of however the contention is resolved, whether it's resolved...

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Let's say the first contention set is made of applicants with priority numbers 1, 500, and 1,000. The second contention set is with, let's say, 200, 700, and 1,300. Are you taking the lowest priority number to determine which auction goes first?

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So, first of all, we anticipate auctions being based on request as well as priority number, so it's not exclusively one or the other. We anticipate being able to hold more than one auction in a single day or week period. So we're not limited to a single auction in a set auction period. So I think we've started looking into some of the details around auctions, and there are some scheduling complexity issues there. So we would be looking at times and dates that are amenable to all participants in the contention set. So, yes, we will certainly take priority into consideration, but it's a complex scheduling issue as well.

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Okay, second, do you have any indication of the rate in which the auctions will go? How many per week, per month?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So the provider has the ability to do many at a time, dozens at a time, frankly. I have some concerns there. I think that there's some balance as to how many auctions it would be prudent to conduct in a single day or week period. So we will certainly be publishing information about that and looking for input as well.

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Okay, and the last question, once the winner in every auction is determined, in which order do they enter the subsequent pipeline? Is it the order of the auctions or the initial priority number?

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So after auction, so that resolves contentions that there are no other objections, that applicant retains their own priority number and they would be invited into the next possible contracting phase, would receive the Contracting Information Request at the next possible batch, if you will, and that priority number would be honored in the contracting process. So when you get into the queue, you will still be in the contracting queue with your priority number.

VLADIMIR SHADRUNOV: Okay, thank you.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you. We're going to take a couple of questions from the online. Since we started about 10 minutes late and we don't have anybody else in this room, we're going to go some more time – at least 10 minutes – as long as we have additional questions. Go ahead, Wendy.

WENDY PROFIT: Thank you. A remote participant wants to know if the community can still file objections to any new gTLD. Community objection.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So the objection window has been closed. That closed on March 13. So, no, objections are no longer possible to be submitted.

---

WENDY PROFIT: Peter Green wants to know, is a newly issued COI applicable to the execution of the RA rather than going through a 30-day public comment period? Newly issued COI applicable to the execution of RA.

KRISTA PAPAC: This is Krista Papac. No, the COIs that the updates or whatever they're doing with COIs to meet the requirements of the Registry Agreement don't have to go through a 30-day change request process.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you.

WENDY PROFIT: Next question, as to process on how to address additional safeguards, how can one submit Spec 11 to the Registry Agreement to ICANN if one's application is put on hold by ICANN because this question has not been solved?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So once the applicant is invited into the contracting process, they would be able to submit and would be asked to provide their Specification 11 document. As long as they are a string that are subject to Category 1 GAC Advice and it's not resolved, they will not be receiving those Contracting Information Requests.

KRISTA PAPAC: Yes, it's Krista again. I don't think I fully understand the question, but let me try to provide an answer where I think they're going. So we have

---

existing voluntary PICs, we have a Specification 11 that has mandatory Public Interest Commitments in Section 3 of it. To Christine's point, Category 1 Advice, until those are resolved, they can't proceed through contracting those applicants. For those who did submit PICs, that information is being put into Specification 11 in addition to the mandatory Public Interest Commitments that are in the third section already. I don't know if the question is if they want to submit additional PICs, what's the process. I'm not sure if that's where they're going with this, but that's the way the process exists right now while we wait to hear what's going to happen with Category 1.

CHRIS WRIGHT:

Hi, it's Chris from ARI Registry Services. Your presentation detailed a number of different things that need to be resolved, like your PICDRP process and so forth, and most of those things had very iffy timelines like fall or end of the year and so forth. So I'm wondering, for all the things that are outstanding, which ones are prerequisites that must be solved or completed before anyone can be delegated? So which ones can get in the way of delegation? And which ones can get in the way of Sunrise? So for example, the Trademark Clearinghouse is clearly a prerequisite for Sunrise. We can't launch a Sunrise without the Trademark Clearinghouse. But does the PICDRP provider have to have been selected prior to anyone allowing to go into Sunrise, for example? So for all of these things that are outstanding, which ones are prerequisites and which ones aren't?

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So I'd have to go look at each specific slide. We have a number of individual project timelines, and we are considering all of the dependencies. In terms of prerequisites to delegation, I'm not thinking of any key milestones that are critical to delegation. We have the security and stability, the string studies that are going on that we'll be discussing later this week. Certainly, that needs to be understood as we move towards delegation, but in terms of other timeline, if you haven't tested with the Trademark Clearinghouse, then you couldn't have a Sunrise for sure, but it wouldn't necessarily stop you from delegating.

CHRIS WRIGHT: Okay.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: But it's a good request, and I can look at another timeline, another way of presenting milestones to look at what's on either a delegation-critical path, but I think it's more an operational-critical path.

CHRIS WRIGHT: A launch critical path.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Yes. So thank you, Chris.

SOPHIA BEKELE: Hello. My name is Sophia Bekele. I represent DotConnect Africa. We're a .africa gTLD applicant. Two questions. One is on the GAC Advice. We have received a GAC consensus advice on our application. It's more of

---

an accountability question. During the Beijing meeting, there was the opposition to our application for lack of government support. However, the Kenyan representative which has endorsed our application, our application is endorsed by the Kenyan government because we're based out of there. And the Kenyan government representative has sent in an e-mail according to the GAC Principles, which says if nobody is present, if they cannot be present, they are allowed to actually send a written statement. So based on that, the current Kenya representative has submitted that, but that was not considered as part of an opposition to GAC Advice against DCA. So it has affected the way our application has been processed now to a status of non-approval. So who do we go to to seek this accountability in terms of actually verifying that this e-mail has been sent to the GAC Chair, the CEO, as well as the GAC Secretariat and some other representatives on the GAC?

So we need to know that, and second, on the evaluation status, you have posted obviously we passed all the evaluation criteria and the whole process is now stopped for the geographic name panel to progress. But if they don't see we have government support and it's stopped by the NGCP resolution, then one cannot really see if we have government support or not. So it's like having the horse before the cart. So we're looking for a way to resolve this. And also, why isn't our evaluation, the passes, posted just like anybody else with all the supports? Even if it's not progressing and we passed, and if it says "incomplete," actually it's the completed version of the evaluation should be posted with all the scores. So we are requesting that should be done for the sake of transparency.



---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So thank you, Ms. Bekele. In terms of the initial evaluation results report, I'll start with the last question. So initial evaluation is not a single panel. It's multiple panels' work, so an initial evaluation report is representing the work of multiple panels. So until all of those panels' results have been provided, we cannot provide and present a complete initial evaluation report. Without going into specifics about a single application which, as I've stated multiple times, is one of the principles of the program. We don't discuss specific applications, so I can't go in any further to the evaluation of a specific application. In terms of who can you seek to confirm that correspondence was received, I would look to my team here.

AMY STATHOS: This is Amy Stathos. I think the best thing if you could put your request in writing, and we will make sure that we look at it and then we will be able to respond once you put that in writing. And, Christine, I think send that to the Customer Service Center.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: That would be fine.

SOPHIA BEKELE: Would we do it through the Customer Service?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: That would be fine, and we would have a record of that. We'd have a systematic record, and we would make sure it gets routed to the right individuals.

---

SOPHIA BEKELE: Okay, thank you very much.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you for your question.

FRED KRUEGER: Hello. Fred Krueger, Minds + Machines. A question on the auctions, you mentioned a date of October 15 as a possible date for an auction where the parties have actually agreed to that date. What I'd like to understand is what would be the first date where the parties, in fact, were sort of dragged into the auction. They may not have agreed to do it earlier, but you say time's up. It is the last resort. When are we actually going to auction? So that's really what I would call the auction date, and we're trying to figure that out, and from your presentation I can't get that date.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Note, that is not a date I have published. Let me think about that.

FRED KRUEGER: Q4?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Well, it depends on the results of Community Priority Evaluation because auctions can often depend on that.

---

FRED KRUEGER: Well, let's assume that people are not in community priority. I mean, they're all evaluated by August 30. I guess, just for planning perspective and we're dealing with private auctions, joint ventures, and the like, and we'd really like to get some guidance as to when is the date of last resort? Or when is the first date of last resort? So if you could get back to us, that would be great.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Absolutely. So let me take that offline and think about it. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That was exactly my question.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Excellent. Good. Okay.

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE VIGNES: Hello, Jean-Christophe Vignes. I have a question regarding the objections. You mentioned some lack of information from one of the providers – the ICC – but the process is still ongoing with this lack of information. Which bears the question, if I'm not mistaken, the AGB doesn't provide for any appeal mechanism with regards to the decision that will be rendered by the dispute resolution provider. Given the issues that you've mentioned before, will there be any type of recourse against that judgment, so to speak? Would that be the ombudsmen? Would that be a specific panel?

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So as with other aspects of the program, there are three dimensions of further recourse. One would be the ombudsmen, the second would be a reconsideration request, and the third is independent review panel. Thank you – IRP – thank you for the acronym translation. It would be those three mechanisms.

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE VIGNES: We'd have to go through IRP with the decision and if it's reversed or something like that? is that what you are referring to?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So those would be the three mechanisms if you were dissatisfied with the outcome of the dispute resolution.

JEAN-CHRISTOPHE VIGNES: Okay, thank you.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you.

WENDY PROFIT: Another question from the queue from a remote participant – it's kind of worded in a weird way, so hopefully it makes sense. What was the reason to add extra security measures to PIC spec on applicant significant expense without negotiation with applicants? As it was stated in the Applicant Guidebook, it is a material hardship to applicant.

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So the modifications to the PIC specification were made based on the GAC Advice and our efforts to address and incorporate, give registry applicants a mechanism to address the GAC Advice.

WENDY PROFIT: Do registries with more than one new gTLD have to go through pre-delegation testing for each one or just the first one?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Yes, registry service providers with more than one new gTLD application will need to go through pre-delegation testing multiple times. I understand the sensitivity there. The amount of effort is non-trivial and the timeline is certainly non-trivial. However, we can talk about this further during our session later today, there are definite differences between many applications and things that are unique. So we wouldn't be able to make a blanket statement that a single registry provider could execute a test only once.

So we're going to take maybe one last question online, and we've got Antony, and then we'll wrap up here.

WENDY PROFIT: A quick question, if we add something which was not included in our application, say an EPP extension, do we need to change the application and will the application change results in an extended evaluation?

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So if you make a change, if you're adding an EPP extension, you're likely intending to offer a new registry service, which you could make a change request before contracting or you could proceed through contracting and initiate an RSEP process post-contracting, which would probably be the recommended course of action if it were me.

So our last question.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Thank you very much. As you may recall, some of us voluntarily submitted PICs at the request of the GAC, and now we have mandatory PICs. And as Chris explained, these are both going to go into a section. What if they contradict one another? What if they are duplicative of one another? Why, indeed, should these so-called voluntary PICs in fact remain except where they are actually outside the bounds of the new mandatory PICs?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thanks. So I know that our legal team as part of the contracting process is looking at the previously submitted portions of the PIC and the new portions of Spec 11 and looking at portions that are duplicative or contradictory, and those would be discussed during the contracting process with each applicant and addressed on a case-by-case basis.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: So if I get this right, because we voluntarily submitted PICs, our contracting process will take longer and we will therefore be at a

---

disadvantage as compared to people who did not voluntarily submit PICs.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Krista?

KRISTA PAPAC: So, no, Antony. Your PICs do not put you into the negotiation process. They still put you in the...if you elect to not...I don't know why...

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Didn't you just say I was going to go into a negotiation process.

KRISTA PAPAC: No. She said that we're going to take your PIC language, we're going to put it in the Specification 11, and we're going to make sure that it's not contradictory. We're going to let you look at that, make sure you're okay with it, but that's not meant to open up a greater negotiation. So we're not going to penalize you because you submitted a PIC is what I'm trying to tell you.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Let me understand. So the mandatory PICs are set. They're going to be there for everyone, right?

KRISTA PAPAC: Correct.

---

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: And if I submitted PICs that are different in some way – they may not even be contradictory, they may just not be consonant entirely with one another – do I then have the opportunity to change those or do they coexist? And if they coexist, which one should I follow?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So the previous Public Interest Commitments are intended to be referenced or placed into Section 2 of the new Specification 11, so they will coexist. We understand that there's a possibility that there could be conflicts between various sections, so we understand that there's a need to work through each of those situations individually.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: But that's not a negotiation and that won't take any time?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Well, the intention is that there's two queues. One is the non-negotiation queue and the other is the negotiation queue. This will not put you into the negotiating queue. That's what I can say. As long as it takes to work through the Specification 11, you will still be in the standard contracting process.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: However, correct me if I'm wrong, but I think I was not wrong to say that those people who submitted voluntary PICs, their contracting process – whatever queue they are in – will take longer than those who decided they just wouldn't.



---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Some will, and some will not. So some certainly could.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: It's a basic point of fairness that it's disturbing that ICANN won't address head-on. I'm someone who submitted voluntary PICs because I thought it was the right thing to do and because there was some pressure to do so, and those people who stood on the sidelines are going to go through quicker than I am. It doesn't seem fair.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: I do appreciate the perspective. The initial Public Interest Commitments were offered to applicants as a mechanism for addressing GAC Early Warnings or avoiding GAC Advice, so that was the intention behind Public Interest Commitments. So the intention is not to penalize anyone. We are committed to working with every applicant on a timely basis and moving everyone through all aspects of the process as efficiently as possible.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Can I ask one additional question? And I think I asked it a little bit before, but I'll ask it again in a different way. If, for instance, there are two sets of PICs – the mandatory and the voluntary – and one, for instance, is a higher standard than the other. Say the voluntary PIC is a higher standard than the GAC mandatory pic, will the voluntary one be able to be changed, or is that not a possibility? And if it is not a possibility, which should I adhere to?

---

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So in a moment, I will turn to my legal colleagues to comment on the legal perspective on this. My perspective from the program is that the Public Interest Commitments which were submitted back in March were put out there and published and ostensibly could have influenced whether the GAC provided advice or not on certain applications and could have influenced whether objections were filed against applications. So I think that there's reason to believe that there's an important reason that those previous commitments should stand. But I think that the legal team will need to weigh in on that.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Just to make clear, I'm not unhappy that I made the commitments. I'm fine with them. I just want to understand how they're supposed to be conformed.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Understood. Krista or Kevin? Anyone want to chime in?

KRISTA PAPAC: We'll take that question offline and get back to you.

ANTONY VAN COUVERING: Thank you.

CHRISTINE WILLETT: Thank you. One last question online.

---

WENDY PROFIT: Last question from the queue is, when will the new gTLD current application status system on the website be updated to show what applications have signed contracts?

CHRISTINE WILLETT: So we are endeavoring to get those statuses updated by the end of the week. We typically publish initial evaluation results on Fridays and status changes go out then, so I would expect that by this Friday those statuses would also be changed. Thank you.

Thank you all for participating. Thank you for standing in the long lines. Appreciate it. Have a great day, and we'll see some of you for our Contracting and Pre-Delegation Testing Sessions later today. Thank you.

[ END OF AUDIO ]