**Status WG - Review of Public Comments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Respondents | JAS WG discussions finalized? | Summary of Discussions  Available? | Final Disposition  Available? | Comments/Next steps/ Responsible party |
| **Danny Younger** – NGO domain proposal | maybe | yes | no |  |
| **Danny Younger** - Ongoing costs in the event of registry failure—assistance measures |  |  |  |  |
| **Danny Younger** - Cultural and Linguistic TLDs—Proposal for Support and New Fast-Track Program |  |  |  |  |
| **Danny Younger** - Registrar Transaction Fee--Support for Disadvantaged gTLD Applicants. | Yes | Yes | Draft ready for WG review |  |
| **Danny Younger** - Bundling of Applications—Reduced Fee Proposal | Yes – same as Stefano Cimatoribus proposal | Yes – same as Stefano Cimatoribus proposal | Draft ready for WG review |  |
| **Danny Younger** - Exception to Registry-Registrar Separation for certain groups |  |  |  |  |
| **Stefano Cimatoribus** | Yes – same as Danny Young bundling of applications proposal | Yes - same as Danny Young bundling of applications proposal | Draft ready for WG review |  |
| **George Kirikos** - Leap of Faith Financial Services Inc. | No – comment not specific to the report nor issues discussed |  |  |  |
| **Jeff Neuman** – Neustar |  |  |  |  |
| **Dr. Ibaa Oueichek** - Arab Team for domain names and Internet issues |  |  |  |  |
| **Michele Neylon** - Blacknight |  |  |  |  |
| **Debra Y. Hughes** - American Red Cross | started | started |  |  |
| **AfriICANN/AFRALO Statement** | Maybe | started | To be agreed by the group | Definition of ethnical and linguistic community raised following a long discussion. More clarity needed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Comments Received to date related to WT1**  *This is a summary of points raised for discussion and reference only; not part of Final Proposal* |
| **WT1-1.** It is not unreasonable to ask the broader registrant community to participate in supporting the expansion of the namespace; increase in registrar fees. Subsidize by an increase and registrants fee passed trough by registrar.    **Discussion:**  Increasing on a per string of one cents to fund such support.  problem is that it comes from the pocket of the user  goes against the intent of being self financing.  is this the time to fight that political battle  this is a rough mechanism used by ICANN to get registrars to accept new comments and this would be difficult to convince them.  This Could be sufficiently assured funds that we could ''borrow'' from next year's revenue... |
| **WT1-2**. The Working Group should propose that each additional script proposed by a gTLD applicant will be priced commensurate with the cost calculations for the fast-track IDN ccTLDs namely, $26,700 per script.  **Discussion:**  - Interesting Idea  - Supports getting scripts that won't be built out built out  - Andrew's suggestion regarding Tier1 and Tier2  - fits into notion of bundling lower prices for additional scripts  - does not fit into the model of all TLDs costing the same. did the cost model factor in multiple applications for variants.  - refer to DAGv4 on this issue.  - difficult to do |
| **WT1-3**. supportive of the staggered fee approach recommended by the WG, and the use of some portion of any auction proceeds to provide a partial refund of application fees to qualified applicants. Since the minimum annual fee of $25,000 would likely be very challenging for some disadvantaged Applicants, Neustar also supports the elimination or reduction of fees for disadvantaged applicants, but only in circumstances where registration volumes do not support payment of the annual minimum.  **Discussion:**  - support for addition |
| **WT1-4**. There are two important points that need to be taken into account prior to the issuance of any final report. First (WT2 issue). Second, while fully supportive of the need to ensure the protection of registrants in the event of a registry failure, the primarily reliance by ICANN on a financial instrument is misguided. There are other mechanisms, beside mere financial instruments, that exist to safeguard registrant interests in the case of a registry failure.  While ICANN’s application fee may represent a barrier to enter for some potential applicants, the potential posting of a financial instrument prior to the launch of the gTLD represents a much more substantial barrier to entry. This Working Group should address what other support mechanisms exist in the potential case of a registry failure and how they could be made available to applicants.  **Discussion:**  - should this apply to just new gTLD - support the idea. |
| WT1-5. The working group's current document offers ICANN several possible solutions to allow new TLDs to be available to organisations and/or communities without imposing artificial economic barriers. Since "status quo" is so often mentioned within the ICANN realm, if you examine the current ICANN budget it is clear that economic barriers were removed to allow .museum to operate. The working group's document recognises that strict criteria for economic exceptions need to laid down and that only a limited number of applicants would meet the criteria. Several companies, including ourselves, have stated that they would be willing to offer services to qualified applicants.  **Discussion:** |
| WT1-6. Concerns raise that various fee structures in the program (evaluation, auction, etc) are cost prohibitive for non-for-profit organizations and take away funds otherwise used to serve the public. Lower the cost for non-for-profit organizations – waive the cost of program development; staggered fees; partial refund from auction proceeds; lower registry fixed fees; reconsider risk/contingency cost per applicant; consider reduction of fixed/variable cost.  **Discussion:** |
| WT1-7. Comprehensive statement from African/Afralo about the extent of the support (financial, technical, linguistic, legal…); support is of utmost importance for geographic, cultural linguistic, and more generally community based applications; Since Africa is disadvantaged and lagging behind due to the digital divide, we strongly suggest that ICANN provides supplementary support and additional cost reduction for gTLDs applications from African countries  **Discussion:** |
| **WT1-8** Bundling  **Discussion:**  - Is this more of an applicant guide book consideration  - Andrew to send in a suggestion |

|  |
| --- |
| ***Comments Received to date related to WT 2***  *This is a summary of points raised for discussion and reference only; not part of Final Proposal* |
| **WT2-1.** The targeting of ethnic and linguistic communities in the initial/pilot phase while providing preference to applicants geographically located in Emerging Markets/Developing countries and in languages whose presence on the web is limited.  The document also presents appropriate criteria for determining who would not qualify for special support.  Some additional thought should be given, however, to the evaluation process for those Applicants who wish to participate, including the timing and resources required.  The transparency of the process, including information about the Applicants, the details of the program applications, as well as financial or other support received is particularly important to foster confidence in the program.  **Discussion:**  - related to WT2-4  - giving up privacy in terms of transparency?  We acknowledge we need to offer further guidance on how it should be done, but not at this time. |
| **WT2-2.** Reference to the Government Advisory Committee (GAC) communiqué in connection with this issue is also relevant, specifically that ICANN is urged, “ to set technical and other requirements, including cost considerations, at a reasonable and proportionate level in order not to exclude developing country stakeholders from participating in the new gTLD-process. Key documents should be available in all UN languages. The GAC urges that the communications and outreach strategy for the new gTLD round be developed with this issue of inclusiveness as a key priority.”  **Discussion:**  It would be better if all program was multilingual, but it it difficult to implement in this round. It would require a major revamping of ICANN processes and operations to have a multilingual program. This will not happen in a short time and in the first round. ICANN needs to ensure informational materials are available in multiple languages. As part of support, we might help people with the English applications and English contracts. |
| **WT2-3.** There are two important points that need to be taken into account prior to the issuance of any final report. First the proposal to prohibit “any” support from applications in connection with governments is overly broad and inappropriate. Second, (WT1 Issue)  **Discussion:**  It is not the intent of the WG to propose that governments do not qualify or cannot participate to receive support. The main point is that the support should not be used to subsidize a government initiative, a largely and purely government initiative.  The WG said that if the proposal is majority government funding or a majority government sponsor, it does not qualify.  This is a complex issue, particularly for the first round.  Are governments part of the needy group? How to define a government lead initiative? Complex issue.  We might need to further define projects in terms of persons; percentages….which could lead to a slippery slope.  Group consensus: the working we have on the document regarding this issue is ok. Maybe we can add a clarification bullet saying that having government funding does not disqualify an applicant, however this is not intended for applications that are primarily government finances and supported. |
| **WT2-4.** Support to pilot phase, targeting ethnic/linguistic communities, but WT2 should consider also non-for-profit organizations under specific circumstances  **Discussion:**  - the fact of being a non-profit does not mean they can't cover the fees.  - the Red Cross notion of non-profit refers to charitable and service organization who attempt to keep the overhead as low as possible so that most of their funding can go to the victims they are meant to help.  - can include charitable/service organizations  The most important criteria is the need, than the intention of the string. The form/structure of the applicant should not be as important. The intent of starting with ethnic/linguistic communities was to narrow the scope and gather political and other support for the initial round. It is reasonable to have prioritization criteria among the qualifying applicants. |
| **WT2-5.** Issue about information being globally available, especially to those that are not aware of ICANN; more education and comprehensive communication; live in-person seminars.  **Discussion:** |
| **WT2-6.** Comprehensive statement from African/Afralo about the extent of the support (financial, technical, linguistic, legal…); support is of utmost importance for geographic, cultural linguistic, and more generally community based applications; Since Africa is disadvantaged and lagging behind due to the digital divide, we strongly suggest that ICANN provides supplementary support and additional cost reduction for gTLDs applications from African countries  **Discussion:** |

|  |
| --- |
| ***General Comment Received (non WT1 and non WT2)***  ***This is a summary of points raised for discussion and reference only; not part of Final Proposal*** |
| **Other - 1.** Criticism to the complexity of the New gTLD process as compared to early times – Postel, IANA...  **Discussion:**  *This comment is not directly related to this WG proposal. The current New gTLD Program is based on a Policy developed by the GNSO, approved by the Board in June 2008. This program is different than the previous rounds. Also, the IANA criteria process for assigning ccTLD delegation (during Postel time and beyond) is completely different.* |
| **Other - 2.** Criticism to ICANN’s public comment process  **Discussion:**  *This comment is not directly related to this WG proposal.* |
| **Other - 3.** AGB, v4 not aligned with Failover Plan  **Discussion:** |
| **Other - 4.**  Not every new TLD needs to be regarded as a gTLD.  Cultural and Linguistic TLDs could well deserve their own unique class designation as clTLDs.  A new class… a new approach… a new fast-track.  **Discussion:** |
| **Other - 5.** It would behoove the Applicant Support WG to interact with the Vertical Integration WG on the above to better define the exceptions category so that a combined recommendation might be offered to the ICANN Board.  The WG will also need to evaluate whether an exception for the registry operator is to be preferred over a subsidization effort to support a new local registrar.  **Discussion:** |