

1 **ADDENDA - Final Milestone Report Joint SO/AC New gTLD**  
2 **Applicant Support Working Group**  
3

- 4 1. Working Group Members, Affiliations, Statements of Interest (SOI) and  
5 Attendance  
6 2. Call for Input – Support for New gTLD Applicants  
7 3. Transcript - Brussels Meeting Workshop Session  
8 4. Public Comment *Summary and Analysis*, including African Statement

**Comment [U1]:** Needs to be aligned with Final Milestone Report.

9

## 10 **1. Working Group Members, Affiliations, Statements of** 11 **Interest (SOIs) and Attendance**

### 12 **1.1 JAS Working Group members and respective affiliations:**

13

| <b>Name</b>             | <b>Affiliation</b> |
|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Carlos Dionisio Aguirre | ALAC               |
| Sébastien Bachollet     | ALAC               |
| Tijani Ben Jemaa        | At Large           |
| Fabien Betremieux       | Individual; AFNIC  |
| Olga Cavalli            | NomCom Appointee   |
| Rafik Dammak            | NCSG               |
| Avri Doria              | NCS; co-chair      |
| William Drake           | NCSG               |
| Alex Gakuru             | NCSG               |
| Dr. Govind              | GAC                |
| Alan Greenberg          | ALAC               |
| Anthony Harris          | ISPCPC             |
| Dave Kissoondoyal       | At Large           |
| Evan Leibovitch         | ALAC; co-chair     |
| Andrew Mack             | CBUC               |
| Michele Neylon          | RrSG               |
| Cheryl Langdon Orr      | ALAC               |
| Elaine Pruis            | Individual         |
| Vanda Scartezini        | Individual         |
| Baudouin Schombe        | AFRALO; At Large   |
| Alioune Traore          | Individual         |
| Richard Tindal          | Individual         |

14

15 **1.2 Statements of Interest (SOIs)**

16 The statements of Interest below, published on May 27 2010, can be found at:

17 <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/jas/soi-jas-wg-27may10-en.htm>.

18

| Individuals & Affiliations                     | SOIs  |
|--|---|
| <p><b>Carlos Dionisio Aguirre</b><br/>ALAC</p> | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b><br/>a. LAWYER - Specialist in Business Rights; b. PROFESSOR of ECONOMY &amp; PROFESSOR of LAW, ECONOMY &amp; BUSINESS in the INFORMATION SOCIETY (UNC - National University of Cordoba - Argentina)</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b><br/>a. Owner of his law firm; b. Academical specially.</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b><br/>none</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b><br/>I have no commercial interests in ICANN activities.</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b><br/>I'm current re-elected ALAC member.</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b><br/>LAC region</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b><br/>Non Commercial End Users - ALAC</p> |
| <p><b>Sébastien Bachollet</b><br/>ALAC</p>     | <p>See: <a href="http://www.icann.org/en/committees/alac/bachollet.html">http://www.icann.org/en/committees/alac/bachollet.html</a></p>   |
| <p><b>Tijani Ben Jemaa</b><br/>At Large</p>    | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b><br/>Executive Director of the Mediterranean Federation of Internet Associations (FMAI)</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b><br/>Executive Director</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b></p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>None</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b></p> <p>None. No</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b></p> <p>Africa</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b></p> <p>AFRALO / At-Large</p>   |
| <p><b>Fabien Betremieux</b><br/><b>Individual - AFNIC</b></p> | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b></p> <p>Employer: AFNIC, non-profit in charge of .fr, .re and several other ccTLDs with a "co-development" developing country outreach program (<a href="http://www.afnic.fr/afnic/international/college_en">http://www.afnic.fr/afnic/international/college_en</a>).</p> <p>Position : Registry Services Development and International Cooperation</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b></p> <p>Provision of registry services to new gTLD applicants Provision of expertise &amp; tools to ccTLD managers of developing countries through a capacity building approach (the "International College")</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b></p> <p>AFNIC has a commercial interest in the provision of registry services to new gTLD applicants.</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b></p> <p>Europe; Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization Supporting the City of Paris' representative in his role as an observer to the GNSO/RySG</p> |
| <p><b>Olga Cavalli Nominating Committee Appointee</b></p>     | <p>See: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/council/soi/cavalli-soi-09april09.html">http://gnso.icann.org/council/soi/cavalli-soi-09april09.html</a></p>  |
| <p><b>Rafik Dammak</b><br/><b>Non Commercial</b></p>          | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b></p> <p>Research Student, University of Tokyo</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b></p>   |

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>Stakeholder group</b></p>   | <p>Research/Academic</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b></p> <p>none</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b></p> <p>none</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b></p> <p>none</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b></p> <p>Africa</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b></p> <p>NCSG</p>  |
| <p><b>Avri Doria</b></p> <p><b>Non Commercial Stakeholder group</b></p> <p><b>JAS co-chair</b></p> <p><i>Updated: 27 April 2010</i></p> | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b></p> <p>I am a portfolio worker in the field of technical and policy system architectures and currently have the following mix of employment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. I have a part time position as Adjunct Professor at Luleå University of Technology;</li> <li>b. I work under a recurring part time contract for the IGF Secretariat;</li> <li>c. I am a listed affiliate of Interisle;</li> <li>d. I act as an independent consultant to clients considering application in the forthcoming gTLD process.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Type of Work</b></p> <p>With regard to each of the employers in question 1 above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. LTU: I am a research professor working on Delay Tolerant Networking Technology under a European Commission research grant. Supervise the research of several students. Do a research of my own on routing in a DTN and on methods of network management in a DTN.</li> <li>b. UN/IGF: Assist in preparing papers of various sorts, provide technical consultation on issues in Internet governance.</li> <li>c. Interisle: no contracts at the moment.</li> <li>d. Consulting: I provide advice for possible applicants for community based gTLDs. For the most part, I provide this as an incidental service in exchange for coffee and pastry, while for others I set up a longer term consultant agreement that includes payment. My consultant agreement includes the following: "Nothing in this agreement commits Avri Doria to take any particular positions within ICANN, any ICANN internal organizations or working groups. With regard to Internet technical or policy work, Avri Doria remains a free agent except as constrained by any non disclosure agreements agreed to by both parties."</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN</b></p> |

**has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement.**  
None

**4. Identify any type of commercial or non-commercial interest in ICANN GNSO policy development processes and outcomes. Are you representing other parties? Describe any arrangements/agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination/selection as a work team member.**

I am a member and currently serve as the Chair of the NCSG Executive Committee and do represent them in other groups such as the OSC. In this role, while I do need to explain my reasoning to the NCSG membership I am not bound in the positions I take. Of course if my positions were to start to run counter to the interests of the NCSG as perceived by its membership, they may remove me from my seat on the Executive Committee. I would probably remove myself before that happened.

I do not represent the views of any client I may have and always insist that I remain a free agent in any agreement. I will leave any employment that attempts to restrict this free agency and understand that any employer unhappy with my expressed views may discontinue their agreement with me.

Specific statement regarding the various groups that I may be engaged in:  
I represent the the NCSG in the OSC  
In the PDP and WG work teams and in the COTS work team, as well as the VI WG and the newgtdapsup WG I participate in my own capacity but do have a special concern for the interests of international non commercial users of the Internet and for their adequate representation and opportunities in ICANN processes.

**5. Describe any tangible or intangible benefit that you receive from participation in such processes. For example, if you are an academic or NGO and use your position to advance your ability to participate, this should be a part of the statement of interest, just as should employment by a contracted party, or a business relationship with a non- contracted party who has an interest in policy outcomes.**

As far as my university position goes, they could not care less about ICANN and generally consider it an interference in my work. In terms of my work in the IGF, I am sure the knowledge I have about how things work in ICANN and what goes on is an advantage. It is possible that consulting opportunities may be made possible by my range of volunteer activities in ICANN and the opinions I express and postions I take in those activities. Other then that, I think I am an 'ICANN Addict', someone who cares about the organization in many respects and wants to participate to make sure it comes out right. Specific statement regarding the various groups that I may be engaged in:  
Re VIWG: As far as VI is concerned, it is critical the GNSO come up with a policy rather quickly and come up with a good policy that has consensus. This will be both interesting and challenging. I enjoy participating in things that are interesting and challenging and I suppose that is also something I will get out of this process.  
Re: newgtdapsup WG, I have been concerned since the time when I was a member of the GNSO with pricing policies that would make new gTLDs prohibitively expensive for those who have a good social or cultural use/need but who do not have deep pockets. Doing this satisfy a personal need to see social

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>justice done in any business I may be involved in.</p> <p>Re OSC membership as well as participation in PPSC PDP and WG Work Teams and the OSC Council Operations Team: this for me is work that was left incomplete from my service as council chair. Working as a member of these groups is part of my self definition as one who see tasks through to the end. I find living within my own self definition to be critical to my mental well being.</p> <p><b>6. Location</b></p> <p>I maintain residences in Providence USA and Luleå Sweden and split my time between these locations, a hotel in Geneva Switzerland and various airports.</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group</b></p> <p>I am a member of the NCSG and currently serve as Chair of its Executive Committee.</p>  |
| <p><b>William Drake</b><br/><b>Non Commercial Stakeholder group</b></p> | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b></p> <p>Senior Associate Centre for International Governance Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva, Switzerland</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b></p> <p>Academic &amp; some policy consulting, none involving ICANN</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b></p> <p>None</p>  |
| <p><b>Alex Gakuru</b><br/><b>Noncommercial Stakeholder Group</b></p>    | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b></p> <p>Primarily an ICT systems consultant trading as Way Forward Technologies. Self-employed and holds Lead Consultant title. Also serves as (unpaid) Chairman, ICT Consumers Association of Kenya. Recently appointed as Councilor, Broadcast Content Advisory Council – Communications Commission of Kenya – the converged national ICT sector regulator.</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b></p> <p>Way Forward Technologies develops and deploys integrated information and communications technologies content solutions thus consults mainly in the following areas databases, software development, open source software, ICT Migration, digital animation, project management, telecommunications consultancy, training, and ICT research services. As chair ICT Consumers Association of Kenya, and closely working with civil society, human rights and social justice organisations, my work involves promoting consumer rights and interests through constructive engagements with all ICT stakeholders (government, regulator and private sector players). Through the media brings consumer rights to the fore in regard to policy, legislation, regulation and at the market place.</p> |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>As member Broadcast Content Advisory Council, my advisory duties are to advise the regulator on the content that is broadcast on Kenyan public communications space and its adherence to the National ICT Policy, Kenya Information and Communications Act, and all relevant regulations.</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b></p> <p>No financial, ownership, or senior management interest in any registry, registrar, ccTLD, Internet technologies or equipment firms, or other firms that are interested in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement.</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b></p> <p>I do not have any commercial interest in ICANN policy outcomes and I represent no other parties.</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b></p> <p>None.</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b></p> <p>Africa (Kenya)</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b></p> <p>A member of the Noncommercial Stakeholder Group(NCSG) where I am leading the Consumer Interest Group. I was elected (in 2009) as Africa Representative, Non Commercial Users Constituency (NCUC). I participate on PDP-WT and now JAS WG - for which I write this SOL.</p> |
| <p><b>Dr. Govind<br/>GAC - India</b></p>  |  |
| <p><b>Alan Greenberg<br/>ALAC</b></p>   | <p>See: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/vertical-integration/soi-vi-pdp-wg-01apr10-en#greenberg">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/vertical-integration/soi-vi-pdp-wg-01apr10-en#greenberg</a></p>  |
| <p><b>Anthony Harris<br/>Internet Service and<br/>Connectivity Providers<br/>Constituency</b></p> | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b></p> <p>Executive Director of Argentina Internet Association – CABASE; Executive Director of Latin America and Caribbean Federation of Internet and Electronic Commerce - eCOM-LAC</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b></p> <p>Non-profit Association tasks - Internet services development and regulatory work, representation in global Internet fora.</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b></p> <p>None whatsoever</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b></p> <p>Interest in new gTLDs, as a potential applicant. No other parties represented.</p>   |



|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b><br/>Am a member of the ISPCP constituency.</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b><br/>Latin America/Caribbean</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b><br/>CSG</p>   |
| <p><b>Dave Kissoondoyal</b><br/>At Large</p>            | <p>See: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/post-expiration-recovery/soi-pednr-20july09.html#kissoondoyal">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/post-expiration-recovery/soi-pednr-20july09.html#kissoondoyal</a></p>  |
| <p><b>Evan Leibovitch</b><br/>ALAC<br/>JAS co-chair</p> | <p>See: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/registration-abuse/soi-rap-22july09.html#">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/registration-abuse/soi-rap-22july09.html#</a></p>  |
| <p><b>Andrew Mack</b><br/>CBUC</p>                      | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b><br/>I am Principal of AMGlobal Consulting, a boutique consulting firm based in the US (DC area) working with emerging markets and technology issues.</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b><br/>We work with companies and donor agencies interested in doing more work in emerging markets, looking at how new technology and tech policy is developing in these markets, and how technology will affect the development of these markets.</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b><br/>None.</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b><br/>Our firm has done consulting at different points for a range of clients (companies, donors, trade associations and regional business coalitions) interested in how internet governance issues might affect future business and the business environment. We specialize in work with Africa and Latin America. I would be participating in my personal capacity and not representing the views of anyone else.</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b><br/>None</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b><br/>North America/USA</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b></p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | I'm a new member of the BC.  |
| <b>Michele Neylon</b><br>Registrar Stakeholder Group | See: <a href="http://www.mneylon.com/blog/statement-of-interest.html">http://www.mneylon.com/blog/statement-of-interest.html</a>   |
| <b>Cheryl Langdon-Orr</b><br>ALAC                    | See: <a href="http://gns0.icann.org/issues/vertical-integration/soi-vi-pdp-wg-01apr10-en#langdon-orr">http://gns0.icann.org/issues/vertical-integration/soi-vi-pdp-wg-01apr10-en#langdon-orr</a>   |
| <b>Elaine Pruis</b><br>Individual                    | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b><br/>Vice President, Client Relations at Minds + Machines</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b><br/>M+M is a Registry Services provider and Consulting firm for new TLD applicants. My role is to participate in ICANN policy creation, instruct clients on new TLD application requirements, and liaise with the technical staff on developing the registry software to meet the established requirements.<br/>As the previous Liaison for CoCCA (Council of Country Code Administrators, a group of ccTLD operators that share resources and registry tools) I have nearly a decade of experience working with third world and post conflict ccTLD operators such as Afghanistan. I'm deeply interested in ensuring that the new TLD process is inclusive and all interested parties have the opportunity to apply and launch viable TLDs.</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b><br/>I am a senior manager for a registry services provider and new TLD consulting company.</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b><br/>a. ICANN policy directly influences the way we will operate our business. Requirements on registries such as Escrow, PDDRP etc do matter. However, creating support for disadvantaged applicants does not have a commercial affect on M+M, therefore my participation in this particular working group is the most neutral it could possibly be in this phase of ICANN's policy development.<br/>b. No.</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b><br/>None.</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b><br/>North America.</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b><br/>As a new company without any TLDs in the root, M+M is not a formal member of the Registry SO but I suppose that is where we would fit if we were allowed.</p> |
| <b>Vanda Scartezini</b><br>Individual                | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b><br/>a) Partner POLO Consultores Associados and IT TREND Consulting<br/>b) ALTIS Software &amp; Services (<a href="http://www.altis.org.br">www.altis.org.br</a>) and FITEC (<a href="http://www.fitec.org.br">www.fitec.org.br</a>) (telecommunications &amp; IT</p>  |

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | <p>research and development)</p> <p>c) Nexti ( ALS under LACRALO – association of ITC executive women)</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b></p> <p>a) Consulting senior partner; b) Chair of the board; c) Vice chair</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement.</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes.</b></p> <p>Advisor of a potential new gTLD without compensation.</p> <p>4.1 Are you representing other parties? NO</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b></p> <p>None</p> <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b></p> <p>LATIN AMERICAN &amp; CARIBBEAN</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b></p> <p>I am acting as liaison to the board of ICANN representing ALAC</p> <p>I am also member of an ALS under LACRALO.</p>                              |
| <p><b>Baudouin Schombe</b><br/><b>AFRALO - At large</b></p> | <p><b>1. Current vocation, employer and position</b></p> <p>ICT Academy agency manager, I am involved in Icann towards CAFEC NGO like African ALS. I am now GNSO/NCUC member. National Coordinator Of NGO network called "Réseau National des ONG pour la Promotion des NTIC" (RERONTIC) and Gaid member for African Civil Society for Information Society ( ACSIS).</p> <p><b>2. Type of work performed in 1 above</b></p> <p>Implementing ICT community access (telecentre). Supporting ccTLD redelegation for DR Congo. Organizing training for different community in grass-root level.</p> <p><b>3. Identify any financial ownership or senior management/leadership interest in registries, registrars or other firms that are interested parties in ICANN policy or any entity with which ICANN has a transaction, contract, or other arrangement</b></p> <p>none</p> <p><b>4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?</b></p> <p>No commercial interest. My representation role is under AFRALO, Regional At-Large Organisation for Africa</p> <p><b>5. Describe any arrangements or agreements between you and any other group, constituency or person(s) regarding your nomination or selection as an advisory group team member</b></p> <p>AFRALO MEMBERS: no any arrangement or agreement but I am sure to have their support</p> |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><b>6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)</b><br/>AFRICA</p> <p><b>7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization</b><br/>I am involved in various Icann community: NCUC/GNSO, Vertical Integration, IRTP B and BCEC</p> |
| <p><b>Alioune Traore</b><br/>Individual</p> |   |
| <p><b>Richard Tindal Individual</b></p>     | <p>See: <a href="http://gnso.icann.org/issues/vertical-integration/soi-vi-pdp-wg-01apr10-en#tindal">http://gnso.icann.org/issues/vertical-integration/soi-vi-pdp-wg-01apr10-en#tindal</a></p>   |

19

20

21

22 **1.3 Attendance Sheet for WG Conference Calls**

23

| Name                    | 29<br>Apr | 5<br>May | 10<br>May | 17<br>May | 24<br>May | 1<br>Jun | 8<br>Jun | 15<br>Jun | 6<br>Jul | 13<br>Jul | 20<br>Jul | 27<br>Jul | 03<br>Aug | 10<br>Aug | 17<br>Aug | 24<br>Aug | 31<br>Aug |
|-------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Carlos Dionisio Aguirre |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Sébastien Bachollet     |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Tijani Ben Jemaa        |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Fabien Betremieux       |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Olga Cavalli            |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Rafik Dammak            |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Avri Doria              |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| William Drake           |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Alex Gakuru             |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Dr. Govind              |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Alan Greenberg          |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Anthony Harris          |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Dave Kissoondoyal       |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Evan Leibovitch         |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Andrew Mack             |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Michele Neylon          |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Cheryl Langdon Orr      |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Elaine Pruis            |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Vanda Scartezini        |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Baudouin Schombe        |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Alioune Traore          |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |
| Richard Tindal          |           |          |           |           |           |          |          |           |          |           |           | -         |           |           |           |           |           |

24

## 25 **2. Call for Input – Support for New gTLD Applicants**

26 The JAS WG posted a blog on ICANN's site entitled: "Call for Input – Support for New gTLD  
27 Applicants. The blog was posted on June 14, 2010 and received 5 comments that can be  
28 viewed here: [http://blog.icann.org/2010/06/call-for-input-support-for-new-gtld-  
29 applicants/#comments](http://blog.icann.org/2010/06/call-for-input-support-for-new-gtld-applicants/#comments). See below the letter:

30

31 *Dear Registry Services Provider,*

32

33 *The ICANN board recently passed a resolution requesting that a Working Group develop a  
34 sustainable approach to providing support to applicants requiring assistance in applying for and  
35 operating new gTLDs. (<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-12mar10-en.htm#20>)*

36 *The Working Group has outlined five objectives, two of which are:*

- 37 • *Objective 3: To identify what kinds of support (e.g. technical assistance, organizational*  
38 *assistance, financial assistance, fee reduction) and support timelines (e.g. support for the*  
39 *application period only, continuous support) are appropriate for new gTLD applicants fulfilling*  
40 *identified criteria.*
- 41 • *Objective 4: To identify potential providers of the identified kinds of support as well as*  
42 *appropriate mechanisms to enable support provisioning.*

43 *We are seeking input from the community on these two objectives, and will create a "pool" of*  
44 *providers of these services for these applicants. In order to progress with our work, we are asking for*  
45 *a "show of hands" from interested providers.*

46 *The following types of support have been identified:*

- 47 • *Extended outreach to potential applicants-to make them aware of the opportunity and to allow*  
48 *them extra time to prepare*
- 49 • *Application writing assistance*
- 50 • *Registry services-outsourced or assistance with local operations*
- 51 • *DNS services*
- 52 • *Infrastructure-IPV6 compatible hardware/networks*
- 53 • *Education-DNSSEC implementation*
- 54 • *Legal & documentation – providing support to cover legal costs or process docs*
- 55 • *Translation – The Applicant Guidebook is only published in English- a disadvantage to many in*  
56 *the non-English speaking world*
- 57 • *Training – in areas like building a sustainability plan, marketing, and operations*
- 58 • *Assistance through the application process*

59

60 *Are there other types of support you could identify that a disadvantaged applicant might need to*  
61 *succeed in the gTLD application process?*

62 *Would your organization consider providing any of the support functions for disadvantaged*  
63 *applicants for free, or on a cost recovery basis, or for reduced rates?*

64 *Are you aware of any other providers (including yourself) that would support disadvantaged*  
65 *applicants?*

66 *Please post your responses to soac-newgtldapsup-wg@icann.org, the working group mailing list.*

67 *A session and public discussions on the topic are scheduled for the Brussels meeting. There will be a*  
68 *public comment period and follow up with potential providers as the work progresses.*

69

70 *Thank you for your consideration.*

71 *Joint SO/AC Working Group on New gTLD Applicant Support*

72

### 73 **3. Transcript – Brussels Meeting Workshop Session**

#### 74 **Intro**

75 The Working Group organized a workshop on June 23, during the ICANN Brussels meeting  
76 entitled “Reducing Barriers to New gTLD Creation in Developing Regions”. The details of the  
77 session can be found here: <http://brussels38.icann.org/node/12503>. Below is the excerpt of  
78 transcript from the audience at Brussels Workshop.

79

---

80 ICANN Brussels/Reducing Barriers to New gTLD Creation in Developing Regions Wednesday, 23 June  
81 2010 questions and comments from the audience.

82 >>KARLA VALENTE: So the first question comes from Danny Younger. Director Touray, I am aware of  
83 a registry operator that handles a limited amount of registrations that does not charge any fee for  
84 registrations and that uses no registrar services. Their organization's contract is up for rebid next  
85 year, and we all know that the prospect of competition often inspires new innovative solutions.  
86 This registry operator, Diana, can provide such registry services for IGOs by the way for INT. Is there  
87 any particular reason why it couldn't be cajoled into providing equivalent registry services for NGOs  
88 in the developing world, perhaps a similar dot NGO TLD?

89 >>KATIM TOURAY: Good afternoon, everyone. And thanks very much, Evan, for that, your very  
90 kind, and I daresay overblown presentation. I don't think it's quite accurate to say that I was  
91 responsible for the resolution that resulted, in effect, in this Joint Working Group. I'd like to see it as  
92 everything that ICANN does as a joint effort that really saw the involvement of each and every one

93 of us. And it's for this reason that I promised Avri and also Olof that I was going to try to do my best  
94 to come and join you here, even if briefly. We have an ongoing board workshop right now, but I had  
95 to pull myself out of that, because it's important, I think, to come and be with you and express my  
96 gratitude to you for the wonderful job, especially the Joint Working Group has been doing. The work  
97 that you're doing is very important. As I was telling the African group yesterday, it must also be  
98 seen in the context of the fact that it's work that you are doing not only for your own benefit and  
99 the benefit of developing world, but also for the benefit of ICANN itself.

100 You will recall that the board resolution that we passed, board resolution number 20 in Nairobi,  
101 specifically mentioned that to do this would be very much in service of ICANN's objectives of being  
102 an inclusive organization. So to the extent that you are helping move the objectives of the  
103 resolution forward, you are also helping ICANN achieve its objectives. I really want to thank you  
104 again very -- thank you again for the wonderful work that you're doing, that you have been doing,  
105 and also encourage you to get as much information as is possible, as many perspectives as is  
106 possible. Because as I always keep saying, none of us is as smart or smarter than all of us. And so  
107 that's why it's particularly important that we move this multistakeholder approach, the grass roots-  
108 driven approach by ensuring that we have as much input into these deliberations as is possible.  
109 We certainly are looking forward to the recommendations that are going to emanate from the  
110 wonderful work that you are doing, and hopefully we'll come away with something that's going to  
111 be to the mutual satisfaction of all of us.

112 Again, thank you very much. I'm sorry I came in late, and I'm especially sorry that I have to leave to  
113 go and join the board back again in our workshop. Again, thanks very much and all the best wishes  
114 of success in your deliberations. Thanks.

115 >> Okay. Thank you. I hope it's the right place to pose a question. (inaudible) what will happen long  
116 term IDN language-wise competition. One has the domain name burnout.com. Now will come  
117 maybe a domain name in Swahili, burnout.africa. Both are TLDs. They will be translated by search  
118 engines. So in three years' time, what name will win the page ranking competition internationally?  
119 And I already experienced that my Farsi name for caviar is being translated in --

120 >>EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm sorry. I hate -- I hate to cut you off, but I really don't think that's relevant  
121 to what -- we're talking here about cost reduction.

122 >>EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Good question. Wrong place. Sorry.

123 >>STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve Delbianco for Net Choice Coalition. Carlos, you said your focus on who  
124 was all about people. I feel as if talking about just applicants as people, you missed the fact that  
125 56% of the people on the planet don't use the Latin script as their primary language. And until this  
126 year, they've had zero capability to do a URL, domain name, or e-mail address. So I have a question,  
127 if the who is the people, we aren't really serving them today with anything but a couple of IDN  
128 ccTLDs. And what I'm hearing this week, it would be one or two years before the gTLD IDNs can  
129 serve these people. So I saw a little bit of a clash, if the who we're serving are the people, it may be  
130 necessary to give incentives to companies to launch their gTLDs in versions of other languages that  
131 are IDNs or they're just not going to do it. They're not going to spend 2- to \$400,000 to serve those  
132 people. So how does that clash between the first group that said we wouldn't serve, say, a  
133 commercial applicant, even though we know they're serving the people that need it most?

134 >>KARLA VALENTE: The question comes from Mary and's a segue from what Elaine just said.  
135 Just to be clear, the basis or assumption is that support is only for community-based TLD applicants,  
136 and the question was based on the slide that says first round only for ethnic and linguistic  
137 communities. We clarified on the chat room that the support is not limited to communities only.  
138 That was just the way that the slide was written. So the other question from Mary is, to the extent



139 that the first-round recommendations are more likely to and more clearly be candidates from  
140 community-based applicants, I wonder if the group considered the requirements and dispute  
141 resolution sections of the Draft Applicant Guidebook Version 4 as within its mandate. For example,  
142 fair, attainable by likely candidates.

143 >>CHUCK GOMES: My name is Chuck Gomes. I have a question with regard to the bundling idea  
144 with regard to underserved language communities.  
145 New gTLD applicants as well as even existing registries who want to offer IDN gTLDs are not in need  
146 of special support with regard to financial support or like that, but they would be very unlikely to be  
147 able to justify, from a business point of view, offering their versions of their IDN TLDs and pay  
148 185,000 fee, et cetera, to underserved language community. Is it the intent or even consideration, I  
149 know they are not definite recommendations yet, of the working group to include that kind of  
150 bundling opportunity in your recommendation?

151 >>ROBERT HUTCHINSON: I am Bob Hutchinson from Dynamic Ventures. We specialize in helping  
152 entrepreneurs start new businesses. And I was wondering if you considered the lively idea of  
153 bundling. I think it makes a lot of sense. I wonder if you looked at micro-capital kinds of ways of  
154 funding the beginnings of these bundled businesses and so on and so forth. I'm curious if you did  
155 that.

156 >>KARLA VALENTE: Hi, this is Karla on behalf of our remote participants. So you know we have  
157 around 28 remote participants throughout this session. This question comes from John McCormick.  
158 Will local ccTLD's impact be part of the evaluation process for community linguistic gTLD proposals?  
159 Basically the commercial impact of a community language gTLD on a local ccTLD where most of the  
160 community language group is based.

161 >>Hi, my name is Xing Hsao (phonetic). I work for DotAsia registry, but speaking on my own behalf.  
162 Two questions. First is I would like to know how confidence is the group right now, for example, in  
163 the next six months to incorporate the ideas into the real implementation plan of the new gTLD  
164 program. Speaking of which is that, for example, I'm understanding the mission of cost cutdown for  
165 the applicant fee, but there's still fees involved in additional cost. For example, like registry  
166 evaluation or even in the question of that 50 questions, there will be requirement of a three-year -- I  
167 mean, their financial deposit for the operation. So that's one. And actually the second is noticing  
168 that there's some exemptions of the brands from the developing country may not be eligible for  
169 that. I would like to take from a different perspective is that perhaps the groups can also think about  
170 to help the brand owners in the developing countries, like China, India, or Brazil, to make sure that  
171 they are aware of the program, so their brands in the new gTLD rounds can be more involved and be  
172 aware of what's happening in the trademark clearinghouse area and so on and so forth.

173 >>NII QUAYNOR: Yes, my name is Nii Quaynor. I come from Ghana.com. I am a registrar but I am  
174 speaking for myself. I want to be clear that we are doing this for a better Internet, and I want to ask  
175 publicly whether you do have a particular operate in mind as you define the applicant support  
176 system. And specifically to Alex, you mentioned a dot Africa operator. Does it exist? Thank you.

177 >>NARESH AJWANI: My name is Naresh Ajwani. I am a president of Cyber Caf Association of India.  
178 We are an ecosystem of 180,000 cyber cafss, 70 ISPs, 49 government application, and 70 million  
179 Internet users. I have a question. I am sure the cost for the entry fee is very a thought throughout  
180 approach of ICANN. So when we are talking about the cost reduction, from where this cost would  
181 be recovered is my question, is my query?

182 >>NARESH AJWANI: Shortly, it does. But yes, I have a comment to make. It is a cross-subsidy.  
183 There are no free lunches. I think if a business model can be considered based on revenue share,  
184 this particular challenge can be addressed. Entry fees in all these developing countries are now

185 getting replaced by revenue share model. For example, if a hundred dollars come into an  
186 organization, then a percent from the gross revenue is taken by the licensor, government, or  
187 anybody like ICANN. So I'm sure that particular piece might have been considered by you to  
188 not bring a cross-subsidy or a feeling of cutting the cost. Revenue share is only suggestion I think I  
189 can make at this juncture. Thank you.  
190 >>NARESH NAJWARI: Suggestion would be kindly consider different provision also that will really  
191 make not somebody to feel that he is being benefited in different business model.  
192 You have referred about India. I must tell you, a few years back, the biggest company in shampoo,  
193 P&G, was going back thinking shampoo can't be sold in India. So they changed the business model  
194 and they brought sachets, small pouches. Today every house, nook and corner of India has got  
195 shampoo from P&G. It's all about changing business models instead of doing any cross-subsidy,  
196 reducing the cost. If that particular aspect can be considered, I am very confident it will be  
197 accepted much faster. Thank you.  
198

199

## 200 4. Public Comment Summary and Analysis

### 201 JOINT SO/AC WORKING GROUP ON NEW gTLD APPLICANT SUPPORT SNAPSHOT

202

#### 203 3.1 Source:

204 The full text of the comments may be found at [http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#wg-](http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#wg-snapshot)  
205 [snapshot](http://www.icann.org/en/public-comment/#wg-snapshot).

206

#### 207 3.2 Overview

- 208 • The English language public comment period ran from 16 June 2010 to 21 July 2010.
- 209 • An extended public comment period to accommodate French, Spanish, Arabic, Russian, Chinese  
210 ran from 23 July 2010 to 23 August 2010.
- 211 • There were thirteen (13) submissions from eight (8) different parties:
  - 212 ○ AfriCANN/AFRALO Statement
  - 213 ○ Danny Younger
  - 214 ○ Stefano Cimatoribus
  - 215 ○ George Kirikos - Leap of Faith Financial Services Inc.
  - 216 ○ Jeff Neuman – Neustar
  - 217 ○ Dr. Ibaa Oueichek - Arab Team for domain names and Internet issues
  - 218 ○ Michele Neylon :: Blacknight
  - 219 ○ Debra Y. Hughes - American Red Cross
- 220 • *Note:* The AfriCANN/Afralo Statement was presented at the ICANN Brussels meeting and also  
221 submitted to the public forum.

222

#### 223 3.3 Summary of comments and WG discussion

224 The comments captured below are excerpts of the actual comments and have been  
225 organized by topic followed by a short summary of the WG discussions.

226

##### 227 3.3.1 From: ICANN African Community (22 June 2010)

228 The Members of the African Community, consisting of the AFRALO and the AfriCANN,  
229 attending the 38th ICANN meeting in Brussels, jointly discussed the possible support to be  
230 given to new gTLD applicants in Africa, who need assistance in applying for, and operating  
231 the gTLDs. As members of the community, we:

- 232 ■ Welcome the Board resolution 20 related to the support for Applicants requesting  
233 assistance in applying for and operating new gTLDs.

- 234   ▪ Express our gratitude to the Board members for their consideration of the community  
235   concerns about the cost of applying for new gTLDs that might hinder applicants,  
236   especially those from developing countries.
- 237   ▪ Strongly believe that entrepreneur applicants from African countries, where the market  
238   is not wide enough for a reasonable profit making industry, are eligible for support.
- 239   ▪ Deem that Civil society, NGOs and non for profit organizations in Africa are the most in  
240   need of such support, because they have a deep impact in society since they work at the  
241   grass-root level.
- 242   ▪ Believe that support is of utmost importance for geographic, cultural linguistic, and  
243   more generally community based applications.
- 244   ▪ Urge that support to new gTLD applicants in Africa be prioritised since this support will  
245   be an incitement for new aspirants to come forward and apply for new gTLDs.
- 246   ▪ Believe that the support to be provided to applicants of new gTLDs in Africa should  
247   include, but is not limited to the following:
- 248    ○ Financial, by reducing the application and the on-going fees
- 249    ○ Linguistic, by translating all the application documents, especially the Applicant  
250    Guidebook, in the six UN languages
- 251    ○ Legal, by assisting the applicants in preparing their applications properly.
- 252    ○ Technical, by
- 253      ▪ helping the applicants to define the infrastructure options,
- 254      ▪ addressing the issue of infrastructure problems in some African  
255      countries; such as IPV6, internet connectivity etc.
- 256   ▪ Strongly support that cost reduction is the key element in fulfilling the goals of ICANN  
257   Board's Resolution 20 within the principles of the recovery of the application and on-  
258   going costs.
- 259   ▪ Propose that the following be entertained to achieve cost reduction:
- 260    ○ Waiving the cost of Program Development (\$26k).
- 261    ○ Waiving the Risk/Contingency cost (\$60k).
- 262    ○ Lowering the application cost (\$100k)
- 263    ○ Waiving the Registry fixed fees (\$25k per calendar year), and charge the Registry-  
264    Level Transaction Fee only (\$0.25 per domain name registration or renewal).
- 265   ▪ Propose that the reduced cost be paid incrementally, which will give the African  
266   applicants more time to raise money, and investors will be more encouraged to fund an  
267   application that passes the initial evaluation.
- 268   ▪ Believe that African communities apply for new gTLDs according to an appropriate  
269   business model taking into consideration the realities of the African region. ICANN's  
270   commitment towards supporting gTLD applicants in Africa will be a milestone to the  
271   development of the overall Internet community in Africa
- 272   ▪ Since Africa is disadvantaged and lagging behind due to the digital divide, we strongly  
273   suggest that ICANN provides supplementary support and additional cost reduction for  
274   gTLDs applications from African countries

275 **WG discussion summary:**

276 The Final report has been further clarified in relation to who can apply, particularly the fact  
277 that the recommendations are not restricted to non-for-profits. For all applicants,  
278 regardless of the entity type, the main criterion for eligibility is need and support would not  
279 be given through this program unless the need criterion is met. The Working Group (WG)  
280 nevertheless believes that by narrowing the initial focus/round to a relatively limited  
281 identifiable set of potential applicants, the proposed applicant support program would  
282 potentially present political resistance and be controversy. This is why the cultural, linguistic  
283 and ethnic groups are proposed as a starting point and this could be revisited for future  
284 rounds.

285 It has also been a consensus among the WG members that the funds should not be further  
286 limited or prioritize applicants from a certain geographic location. The WG recognizes there  
287 might be applicants from Africa that are disadvantaged for a whole host of reasons, for  
288 instance political, economic, linguistic, logistical, etc. However, the proposal presented at  
289 this time does not envision automatically qualifying nor prioritizing an applicant for support  
290 simply based on a specific continent of origin/establishment. One must take into account  
291 that countries and entities within a specific continent and country have diversity in financial  
292 status and needs. Detailed discussions about the practical aspects of such criterion for  
293 prioritization presented to be challenging and unnecessarily open doors to various forms of  
294 gaming, which would be difficult to address, at least at this stage of the New gTLD Program  
295 getting close to launch.

296

297 The WG further acknowledges that the definition of Non-Governmental Organizations  
298 (NGOs) may differ deepening on the jurisdiction and the organizations legal status could  
299 also change over the course of time. Another important point is the fact that just because  
300 an entity is an NGO, it does not make it necessarily in need of support since there are many  
301 examples of NGOs around the world have a healthy economical status.

302 There were some concerns raised by the WG during this discussion, for example:

- 303       • Should we speak of future rounds not knowing if they will happen and if they do  
304       when?  
305       • Are we at risk to limit innovation if targeting the support during the first round to  
306       the linguistic and ethnic group only?  
307

308

---

### 309 **3.3.2 From: G. Kirikos (20 July 2010)**

310 ICANN does not value public input. We will passively resist by not participating in a process  
311 that only leads to predetermined outcomes. We request that ICANN notify the community  
312 when it is ready and willing to demonstrate that it properly values public comments.

#### 313 **WG discussion summary:**

314 This comment is not directly related to the WG proposal or work.

315 This WG however believes that global Internet community's participation and input is very  
316 important for the development of proposal in related to new gTLD applicant support. The Final  
317 report will be posted again for public comment and the WG invites the community to participate  
318 and help to raise the awareness of this important issue and this work. To date, this WG gave the  
319 following participation opportunities:

- 320       • On June 16, 2010 - posted its preliminary findings for public comments;  
321       • On June 23, 2010 held a public workshop with remote participation during the ICANN  
322 Brussels meeting.

323 All comments received were carefully discussed and considered for the development of this final  
324 report.

325 Regarding the WG membership, the process adopted has been open and flexible to accommodate  
326 members from around the world and different backgrounds. The WG also welcomed late  
327 membership additions. The participation in the WG calls and work is open, transcripts and  
328 recordings publically available.

329

---

### 330 **3.3.3 From: Neustar; Blacknight Solutions (21 July 2010)**

331 (Neustar) Agreement that support should be provided for certain gTLD applicants in some  
332 limited cases.

- 333
- 334
- 335
- 336
- 337
- 338
- 339
- 340
- 341
- 342
- 343
- 344
- 345
- 346
- 347
- 348
- 349
- 350
- 351
- Neustar agrees that in some limited circumstances special consideration should be given to applicants proposing certain types of gTLDs, who otherwise would not have the financial means or access to resources or expertise required to participate.
  - Neustar supports the staggered fee approach recommended by the Working Group and the use of some portion of any auction proceeds to provide a partial refund of application fees to qualified applicants.
  - Given the challenge posed by a minimum annual fee of \$25,000 for some disadvantaged applicants, Neustar supports elimination or reduction of fees for disadvantaged applicants, but only in circumstances where registration volumes do not support payment of the annual minimum.
  - The Working Group’s proposed initial qualifications and criteria are appropriate (targeting certain communities, geographies and languages), but some additional thought should be given to the evaluation process for applicants wishing to participate, including the timing and resources required. Transparency—including information about the applicants, program applications, and financial or other support—is important to foster confidence in the program.
  - Neustar intends to participate in the program by providing support of some kind to qualified Applicants.

352 *(Blacknight Solutions)* ICANN seems to think that TLDs in the “new regime” need to be  
353 slotted into a “one size fits all” scenario. This is neither realistic nor does it truly fit with  
354 ICANN’s own goals which are often summed up by Rod Beckstrom as “One World. One  
355 Internet. Everyone Connected.” To make this a reality, economic barriers need to be  
356 removed where appropriate. The Working Group documents recognize that strict criteria  
357 for economic exceptions need to be laid down and that only a limited number of applicants  
358 would meet the criteria. Several companies, including Blacknight Solutions, have stated that  
359 they would be willing to offer services to qualified applicants.

360 **WG discussion summary:**

361 The WG welcomes the involvement and intent to support several entities have expressed in  
362 the past months and expects a larger number of companies and individuals come forward  
363 to join and strengthen this program.

364 The final report acknowledges that applicants can benefit from a broad range of assistance  
365 beyond financial, including logistical, outreach, technical, administrative (application), etc.

366 This broad range of assistance adds flexibility and diversity to a support program that  
367 hopefully can increase participation in the New gTLD process from around the world.

368 Although the Final Proposal presents a broad range of recommendations and there has  
369 been an effort to make it comprehensive, at this phase of the work, the recommendations

370 detailed. The WG believe this is a beginning and further work will be carried not only by  
371 staff and policy, but also by various parties interested in helping in this evolving initiative.  
372 With this approach, the WG also believes there is more flexibility added to the  
373 implementation process and expects to see some or most aspects of the final report  
374 implemented in the first round.

375

---

### 376 3.3.4 From: American Red Cross (22 July 2010)

377 Not-for-profit organizations—request that ICANN set lower costs. Not-for-profit groups are  
378 concerned about the costs of the new gTLD program, both application-related and  
379 enforcement-related. The Red Cross strongly urges ICANN to consider that not-for-profit  
380 organizations may use a proposed new gTLD for internal business purposes under a model  
381 that is different from a commercial, profit-driven new gTLD. Red Cross is concerned that  
382 the various costs place the acquisition of a new gTLD out of reach of most not-for-profit  
383 organizations. The fees represent resources that must be allocated from funds that Red  
384 Cross and other groups would otherwise spend on directly serving the public. Red Cross  
385 requests that ICANN set a lower cost for not-for-profit organizations such as Red Cross in  
386 light of the significant and important role new gTLDs owned by these groups would serve  
387 for the ICANN community.

388

389 Support for Working Team 1 recommendations. Red Cross agrees with the intent of the  
390 following Working Team 1 recommendations: waiving the cost of Program Development for  
391 selected entities; staggered fees; auction proceeds—partial refund; lower registry fixed fees  
392 due to ICANN; reconsideration of the risk/contingency cost per applicant; and consideration  
393 of reduction of the fixed/variable cost of US \$100K for applicants that meet the Working  
394 Group criteria.

395 Working Team 2 Recommendations: Red Cross offers the following comments:

- 396 • Initial/pilot phase—also support not-for-profit organizations: Red Cross agrees with  
397 targeting support to ethnic and linguistic communities and also proposes that  
398 support be given to not-for-profit organizations during the initial/pilot phase.
- 399 • Red Cross disagrees with the recommendation that support for other groups,  
400 especially NGOs and civil society organizations, should be addressed at a later point.  
401 We strongly urge the Working Group and ICANN to consider support for not-for-  
402 profit organizations as soon as possible. Red Cross recommends immediate support  
403 during the initial/pilot phase for not-for-profit organizations that would use a new  
404 gTLD to communicate with the public about their mission and services, to engage in  
405 activities to increase social inclusion of non-governmental organizations with  
406 technology, to distribute educational, informational or lifesaving information to  
407 members of their communities, or to collect donations to support their operations.



- 408 These potential applicants, whose mission, objectives and status can be verified and  
409 approved by the Working Group/ICANN criteria, are the type of potential applicants  
410 for which support is non-controversial.
- 411 • Red Cross agrees that the geographic location of the applicant is one of many factors  
412 that could be considered when deciding to provide support to applicants.
  - 413 • Red Cross believes that the recommendations regarding groups not to be supported  
414 at this time lack sufficient specificity to provide meaningful comments.
  - 415 • Significant outreach and education efforts are needed and should begin immediately  
416 and then increase once the final Applicant Guidebook is released, allowing for the  
417 ability to timely ask questions and seek guidance. ICANN should make information  
418 readily available about the new gTLD processes and procedures to potential  
419 applicants in underserved markets and to certain groups such as not-for-profit  
420 organizations that may not be as engaged in ICANN activities. ICANN should improve  
421 its education and outreach services especially to not-for-profit organizations such as  
422 Red Cross to ensure that its user community is able to navigate the process and is  
423 not excluded or negatively impacted.
  - 424 • In the outreach the provided information should address the application process as  
425 well as information of interest to those not applying for new gTLDs (e.g. objection  
426 procedures, rights protection mechanisms). Also, advice about the technical  
427 requirements for operating a new TLD (e.g. details of Modules 2 and 5) should be  
428 provided in this outreach to these targeted populations, regions and organizations,  
429 especially since those details are likely to be daunting to groups that have not  
430 previously operated a registry.
  - 431 • Outreach should occur in all five ICANN regions and ICANN should provide live, in-  
432 person seminars open to the public, rather than only posting educational  
433 information on the ICANN website or hosting webinars.
  - 434 • Fee reduction/subsidization and/or phased in payment of fees for deserving  
435 applicants. Red Cross supports the intent of this recommendation. The current  
436 proposed payment schedule and fees will be prohibitive and could impact the ability  
437 of not-for-profit organizations to fund and fulfill their mission-related activities and  
438 objectives.
  - 439 • Technical support (infrastructure, education/consulting regarding DNSSEC, possible  
440 technical waivers or “step ups”, lower cost or shared back end registry services).  
441 Red Cross supports the intent of the recommendation especially since many  
442 applicants will be new to registry operations. Red Cross generally supports  
443 discounted pricing for or assistance with new gTLD back end registry services.
  - 444 • Support for build out in underserved languages, IDNs for new gTLDs, price discounts  
445 to incentivize build out in scripts with limited web presence, bundled pricing to

446 promote build out in multiple scripts at once, tests to prevent gaming and ensure  
447 support reaches its targets. Generally Red Cross supports discounted pricing for  
448 new gTLDs.

449 **WG discussion summary:**

450 The WG thanks the Red Cross and all other entities that explicitly took the time to support this  
451 important work. Some of the points raised were clarified in previous comment analysis, for example  
452 the simple fact that an entity holds a non-profit status, it does not mean this entity is financially  
453 unable to cover the fees and meets the “need” criterion.

454 The WG further acknowledges that the Red Cross notion of non-profit refers specifically to  
455 charitable and service organizations that attempt to keep the overhead as low as possible so that  
456 most of their funding can go to the victims/causes they are meant to help.

457 It is important to stress that the most important criterion is the need. At this stage, the need  
458 criterion is more important than the intention of the string or the structure or form of the applicant.

459 The intent is, for the initial round, to focus and narrow the support to ethnic/linguistic communities  
460 since this is a less controversial group and will likely generate political support for this initiative.

461 Also, these potential applicants have the benefits of being relatively well defined as groups, and pass  
462 the test of being generally non-controversial. Such communities already have a history of  
463 recognition at ICANN and facilitating community on the web is one of ICANN’s core values. The WG  
464 believes it is reasonable to have prioritization criteria among qualifying individuals.

465

---

466 **3.3.5 From: Arab Team (21 July 2010)**

467 The Government support prohibition is overbroad, and the financial instrument  
468 requirement in case of registry failure is major barrier to entry. The Arab Team appreciates  
469 ICANN’s and the Working Group’s recognition of the important issue of applicant support.  
470 The ICANN GAC communiqué in connection with the issue of inclusiveness as a priority and  
471 not through program requirements excluding developing country stakeholders from  
472 participating in the new gTLD process is also important. Two important points need to be  
473 taken into account before issuance of a final report:

474 (1) The proposal to prohibit “any” support from applications in connection with  
475 governments is overly broad and inappropriate;

476 (2) While we are supportive of the need to ensure the protection of registrants in the event  
477 of a registry failure, the primary reliance by ICANN on a financial instrument is misguided.  
478 Other mechanisms exist to safeguard registrants in case of a registry failure. The potential  
479 posting of a financial instrument prior to launch of the gTLD represents a much more

480 substantial barrier to entry than the application fee. The Working Group should address  
481 what other support mechanisms exist in the potential case of registry failure and how they  
482 could be made available to applicants.

483 **WG discussion summary:**

484 The Final report has further clarified the issue raised. It is not the intent of the WG to  
485 propose that governments do not qualify or cannot participate to receive support through  
486 this program. Nevertheless, after careful consideration, it has been consensus of the WG  
487 that the support should not be used to subsidize a largely and purely government initiative.  
488 That said, if the proposal requesting assistance is majority government funding or a majority  
489 government sponsor, it should not qualify.

490 The WG acknowledges that this is a complex issue, particularly for the first round and raises  
491 important questions, such as: (a) Are governments part of a needy group? (b) How should a  
492 government led initiative be defined?

493 The proposal implementation details might require further details that address definition of  
494 projects in terms of persons, percentages, which would lead to a difficult and potentially  
495 controversial implementation process.

496 The group reached a consensus that the current proposal should stay as it is, with additional  
497 clarification that an applicant with a government funding might qualify for support,  
498 however, the support is not intended for applications that are primarily government  
499 financed and supported.

500 The WG also agrees that it would be better if the program was multilingual, but it is difficult  
501 to implement in this round since it would require a major revamping of ICANN's processes  
502 and operations. ICANN needs to continue ensuring that informational materials are  
503 available in multiple languages. The WG further acknowledges that part of the support that  
504 can be offered to applicants is assistance with English applications and contracts (ICANN  
505 Registry Agreement)

---

507 **3.3.6 From: D. Younger (24 June 2010)**

508 NGO Domain Proposal. The time is ripe for a new general organizational category TLD  
509 managed by IANA on a non-fee basis to serve the needs of the developing world in a  
510 sustainable manner and obviate the prospect of a multitude of new TLD applications each  
511 requiring some degree of support provisioning. The creation of a new TLD offering a form of  
512 relief to the disadvantaged among us should not have to be complex but should be a fairly  
513 straightforward proposition that reflects the community's will and commitment.

- 514
- An NGO domain comports well with fulfilling ICANN's charitable mission.
  - An NGO domain would meet the principles set forth by the ICANN Business Constituency that new TLDs must meet (i.e., differentiation, certainty, honesty, competition, diversity and meaning).
- 515  
516  
517

- 518
- 519
- 520
- By aggregating a class under a single TLD, differentiation is possible at the second level. Organizations will find a place where they want to be and these NGOs will readily be found by their respective user communities at the second level.
- 521
- ICANN's current contingency fund is more than ample to fund the IANA's new duties on a first year basis; thereafter such charitable expenditures would become their own line in a line-item budget that would highlight IANA's charitable operations. In all likelihood IANA will not seek to invoke cost recovery measures, so the recovery cost of the NGO domain proposal will not be passed on to the disadvantaged that seek to use such registry services.
- 522
- 523
- 524
- 525
- 526
- The NGO domain approach is fiscally prudent; through it we can see if a substantial portion of the needs of those that work at the grass-roots level who lack the financial resources to support a registry operation (and whose needs perhaps might not be fully met by .ORG or through other current TLDs) can be met by the NGO domain. After that it can be determined if further initiatives are still warranted in order to better promote geographic, cultural and linguistic considerations.
- 527
- 528
- 529
- 530
- 531
- 532
- IANA is provisioned to implement the offering of the NGO domain at the root level in characters other than ASCII if that is necessary, and given IANA's origins and role there is a comfort level with designation of IANA as the trustee of the TLD for the global Internet community.
- 533
- 534
- 535
- 536
- Eligibility criteria for the NGO domain would need to be defined carefully by the Working Group and some documentation would be required—i.e., a charter or founding papers should likely be sufficient for the record.
- 537
- 538
- 539

540 **WG discussion summary:**

541 The Final report has been further clarified in relation to who can apply, particularly the fact

542 that the recommendations are not restricted to non-for-profits. For all applicants,

543 regardless of the entity type, the main criterion for eligibility is need and support would not

544 be given through this program unless the need criterion is met. The Working Group (WG)

545 nevertheless believes that by narrowing the initial focus/round to a relatively limited

546 identifiable set of potential applicants, the proposed applicant support program would

547 potentially present political resistance and be controversy. This is why the cultural, linguistic

548 and ethnic groups are proposed as a starting point and this could be revisited for future

549 rounds.

550 Regarding the proposed examples and approach to simplify the program, although it has

551 merit, it is important to remember that the complexity of the New gTLD program is relative

552 to the complexity of the New gTLD Policy developed by the GNSO. This policy was a long  
553 process of consensus building that took into account the experiences from previous rounds  
554 and needs of the market place.

555  
556 **3.3.7 From: D. Younger (17 July 2010)**

557 Ongoing costs in the event of registry failure—assistance measures. While registrant  
558 protection is critical and critical registry functions must be sustained for an extended period  
559 of time in the event of registry failure, the 3-5 year timeframe established by ICANN in the  
560 DAG does not comport with the recommendations in the ICANN gTLD Registry Failover Plan  
561 presented on 15 June 2008.

- 562 • The Failover Plan calls for a timeframe of highly limited duration (30 to 90 days or  
563 more).
- 564 • The Failover Plan is completely at odds with the DAG’s requirement for a financial  
565 surety instrument to guarantee continuity for critical registry functions for 3-5 years  
566 subsequent to a registry failure.
- 567 • The first step in reducing the financial instrument requirement has already been  
568 taken (see statement from ICANN staff regarding Benchmarking of Registry  
569 Operations that it is possible that continuity and registrant protection can still be  
570 met with a slightly reduced reserve requirement—i.e. 2 years of funding instead of 3  
571 years). The Working Group should now press home the point that timeframes (and  
572 consequent costs) may logically be reduced further based on earlier communitywide  
573 Failover conclusions.
- 574 • Taking a conservative approach, a first step could be to stipulate to a financial  
575 instrument that supports critical registry functions for 180 days subsequent to the  
576 declaration of a registry “event”. This is realistic and exceeds the Failover Plan  
577 recommendations.
- 578 • It should be considered whether a way can be formulated by which a potential  
579 successor operator can be pre-designated so that the extended financial surety  
580 obligation may be completely waived. Reducing or eliminating the  
581 DAG’s required financial surety instrument would go a long ways toward providing  
582 real support to new gTLD applicants. The Working Group can draw from ICANN’s  
583 prior experience with a pre-designation process (in .net and .org) in establishing a  
584 new procedure to prepare for a possible successor operator as part of each support-  
585 requiring-registry’s Continuity Plan.

586 **WG discussion summary:**

587 The WG believes this comment is not directly related to the proposal

588

---

**589 3.3.8 From: D. Younger (17 July 2010)**

590 Cultural and Linguistic TLDs—Proposal for Support and New Fast-Track Program. Cultural  
591 and linguistic TLDs should be treated in a fashion akin to new IDN TLD applicants (rather  
592 than as new gTLDs); they could well deserve their own unique class designation as cITLDs.

- 593 • The Working Group should make the case that it would be “good policy” that  
594 comports with ICANN’s charitable and educational mission to establish a new fast-  
595 track program for cultural and linguistic TLDs with clearly defined requirements.
- 596 • It may be advisable to agree to a minimal applicant fee for cultural and linguistic  
597 TLDs, similar to what has been calculated for IDN TLD applicants, and to agree to  
598 preparation of a pre-arranged and recommended annual registry contribution  
599 document.
- 600 • Considerations include: how large of an applicant pool is expected; and what portion  
601 of that applicant pool has a legitimate need for financial assistance? It is unclear if  
602 cultural communities are adequately served by .org or by their respective ccTLDs, so  
603 the process should begin with a campaign to solicit expressions of interest to better  
604 outline the scope and range of the potential applicant pool.

**605 WG discussion summary:**

606 **To be completed**

607

---

**608 3.3.9 From: D. Younger (17 July 2010)**

609 Registrar Transaction Fee--Support for Disadvantaged gTLD Applicants. An increase in the  
610 registrar transaction fee (at a current low of eighteen cents) should be used to support  
611 disadvantaged gTLD applicants. It is not unreasonable to ask the broader registrant  
612 community to participate in supporting the expansion of the namespace, as such expansion  
613 will better serve the long-term broad registrant interest. Establishing a Foundation to  
614 properly manage such funding and to serve as a point of contact for charitable giving is a  
615 proper way forward.

**616 WG discussion summary:**

617 **The Final report presents ICANN and the community with diverse and specific ways to**  
618 **address the funding needs for this program. The WG believes there are several funding**  
619 **ways that should be explored before considering increasing the registrar transaction fees,**  
620 **since this would come from the pocket of the registrant (user).**  
621 **From an implementation stand point, changes to registrar contracts are not an easy**  
622 **process and, overall, would add complexity and likely raise political issues.**  
623 **Also, it is important to remember that the policy clearly states that the New gTLD Program**  
624 **should be self financing.**

625 There is **Consensus** in the JAS WG for a proposal recommending that registrars put in place  
626 the means for existing registrants to make voluntary contributions to the development  
627 program through registrar-to-registry contribution pass-through, and to find ways of  
628 enabling non-registrant small donors to contribute to the development program.  
629 Concurrent with the execution of the development message to the donor communities, that  
630 the development message should also be delivered to the registrant, and non-registrant  
631 user communities through internal and external media.  
632 There is also a **Minority** concern about the degree to which Registrars would be open to this  
633 suggestion and the manner of its implementation.

634

635

---

### 636 3.3.10 From: S. Cimatoribus (20 July 2010); D. Younger (18 June 2010)

#### 637 Bundling of Applications—Reduced Fee Proposal.

638

639 *S. Cimatoribus* - There should be a discounted fee for bundled applications with extra  
640 languages. ICANN should adjust the budget for application processing so that bundled IDN  
641 applications have lower costs and lower application fees. ICANN should encourage  
642 applicants to propose IDN versions of their preferred TLD string (e.g., .flowers in Cyrillic);  
643 this would allow people to use domain names and emails in their mother language. There  
644 may not be very many IDN applications unless ICANN offers incentives or discounted fees  
645 on bundled applications that include non-Latin IDNs.

646

647 *D. Younger* - A bundled gTLD application is the equivalent of an ASCII gTLD application  
648 combined with an additional IDN gTLD application. The Working Group should propose that  
649 each additional script proposed by a gTLD applicant will be priced commensurate with the  
650 cost calculations for the fast-track IDN ccTLDs—namely \$26,700 per script. Equivalency of  
651 treatment is the bigger issue—i.e., if a cost calculation has already been made for the  
652 processing of IDN applications, it would certainly be discriminatory (contrary to Section 3 of  
653 the ICANN By-laws) if an equivalent application were charged at a higher rate.

654

#### 655 **WG discussion summary:**

656 Subject to the requirements for receiving support from the program, the WG believed that  
657 price reductions should be implemented to encourage the build out of IDNs in small or  
658 underserved languages, with the exact amount and timing of the support to be determined.

659 There was a **Minority View** that applicants who may not meet the need requirement for  
660 support but who have explicit endorsement from within the language community to be  
661 served should also be able to receive some form of support, for example bundling  
662 discounts, in order to offer these services to the underserved language/script community.  
663 This community endorsement must come from organizations, NGOs and/or local companies  
664 from within the language/script community

---

665  
666 **3.3.11 From: D. Younger (19 July 2010)**

667 Exception to Registry-Registrar Separation for certain groups. The Applicant Support  
668 Working Group should interact with the Vertical Integration Working Group to better define  
669 the public-interest-based exceptions category regarding registry-registrar separation so that  
670 a combined recommendation could be offered to the ICANN Board. Possible areas of  
671 exception include certain language groups, developing countries, certain communities due  
672 to size or economic conditions, etc. The Applicant Support Working Group will need to  
673 evaluate whether an exception for the registry operator is to be preferred over a  
674 subsidization effort to support a new local registrar.

675 **WG discussion summary:**

676 There is **Consensus** within the JAS WG members that in cases where market power is not an  
677 issue, applicants who met the requirements for support would be granted a special  
678 exemption from the requirement for registry-registrar separation. This special exemption  
679 would expire after 5 years at which time the Registry would be required to meet the  
680 existing conditions within ICANN relating to registry-registrar separation. During year 4, the  
681 Registry would be required to document a transition plan. During the period of the  
682 exemption, the ICANN compliance group would, at its discretion, schedule reviews to insure  
683 that the exemption was not being abused.

684

685