ADDENDA - Final Report Joint SO/AC New gTLD Applicant Support Working Group

1. Working Group Members, Affiliations, Statements of Interest (SOI) and Attendance
2. Transcript - Brussels Meeting Workshop Session
3. Public Comment *Summary and Analysis,* including African Statement

1. Working Group Members, Affiliations, Statements of Interest (SOIs) and Attendance

1.1 JAS Working Group members and respective affiliations:

Name	Affiliation
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	ISCPC
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

1.2 Statements of Interest (SOIs)

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

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

Individuals & Afiliations	SOIs
Carlos Dionisio Aguirre **ALAC**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** a. LAWYER - Specialist in Business Rights; b. PROFESSOR of ECONOMY & PROFESSOR of LAW, ECONOMY & BUSINESS in the INFORMATION SOCIETY (UNC - National University of Cordoba - Argentina) **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** a. Owner of his law firm; b. Academical specially. **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** none **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** I have no commercial interests in ICANN activities. **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** I'm current re-elected ALAC member . **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** LAC region **7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization** Non Commercial End Users - ALAC
Sébastien Bachollet **ALAC**	See: http://www.icann.org/en/committees/alac/bachollet.html
Tijani Ben Jemaa **At Large**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** Executive Director of the Mediterranean Federation of Internet Associations (FMAI) **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** Executive Director **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**

	None **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** None. No **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** None **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** Africa **7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization** AFRALO / At-Large
Fabien Betremieux **Individual - AFNIC**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** Employer: AFNIC, non-profit in charge of .fr, .re and several other ccTLDs with a "co-development" developing country outreach program (http://www.afnic.fr/afnic/international/college_en). Position : Registry Services Development and International Cooperation **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** Provision of registry services to new gTLD applicants Provision of expertise & tools to ccTLD managers of developping countries through a capacity building approach (the "International College") **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** None **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** AFNIC has a commercial interest in the provision of registry services to new gTLD applicants. **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** None **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** 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
Olga Cavalli Nominating Committee Appointee	See: http://gnso.icann.org/council/soi/cavalli-soi-09april09.html
Rafik Dammak **Non Commercial**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** Research Student, University of Tokyo **2. Type of work performed in 1 above**

Stakeholder group	Research/Academic **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** none **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** none **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** none **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** Africa **7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization** NCSG
Avri Doria **Non Commercial Stakeholder group** **JAS co-chair** *Updated: 27 April 2010*	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** I am a portfolio worker in the field of technical and policy system architectures and currently have the following mix of employment: a. I have a part time position as Adjunct Professor at Luleå University of Technology; b. I work under a recurring part time contract for the IGF Secretariat; c. I am a listed affiliate of Interisle; d. I act as an independent consultant to clients considering application in the forthcoming gTLD process. **2. Type of Work** With regard to each of the employers in question 1 above: 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. b. UN/IGF: Assist in preparing papers of various sorts, provide technical consultation on issues in Internet governance. c. Interisle: no contracts at the moment. 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." **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. 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 newgtldapsup 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: newgtldapsup 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

	justice done in any business I may be involved in. 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. **6. Location** I maintain residences in Providence USA and Luleå Sweden and split my time between these locations, a hotel in Geneva Switzerland and various airports. **7. Stakeholder Group** I am a member of the NCSG and currently serve as Chair of its Executive Committee.
William Drake **Non Commercial Stakeholder group**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** Senior Associate Centre for International Governance Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva, Switzerland **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** Academic & some policy consulting, none involving ICANN **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** None **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** None **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** None
Alex Gakuru **Noncommercial Stakeholder Group**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** 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. **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** 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.

	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. **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** 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. **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** I do not have any commercial interest in ICANN policy outcomes and I represent no other parties. **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** None. **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** Africa (Kenya) **7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization** 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 SOI.
Dr. Govind **GAC - India**	
Alan Greenberg **ALAC**	See: http://gnso.icann.org/issues/vertical-integration/soi-vi-pdp-wg-01apr10-en#greenberg
Anthony Harris **Internet Service and Connectivity Providers Constituency**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** Executive Director of Argentina Internet Association – CABASE; Executive Director of Latin America and Caribbean Federation of Internet and Electronic Commerce - eCOM-LAC **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** Non-profit Association tasks - Internet services development and regulatory work, representation in global Internet fora. **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** None whatsoever **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** Interest in new gTLDs, as a potential applicant. No other parties represented.

	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 Am a member of the ISPCP constituency. **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** Latin America/Caribbean **7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization** CSG
Dave Kissoondoyal **At Large**	See: **http://gnso.icann.org/issues/post-expiration-recovery/soi-pednr-20july09.html#kissoondoyal**
Evan Leibovitch **ALAC** **JAS co-chair**	See: http://gnso.icann.org/issues/registration-abuse/soi-rap-22july09.html#
Andrew Mack **CBUC**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** I am Principal of AMGlobal Consulting, a boutique consulting firm based in the US (DC area) working with emerging markets and technology issues. **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** 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. **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** None. **4.Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** 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. **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** None **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** North America/USA **7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization**

	I'm a new member of the BC.
Michele Neylon **Registrar Stakeholder Group**	**See:** http://www.mneylon.com/blog/statement-of-interest.html
Cheryl Langdon-Orr **ALAC**	See: http://gnso.icann.org/issues/vertical-integration/soi-vi-pdp-wg-01apr10-en#langdon-orr
Elaine Pruis **Individual**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** Vice President, Client Relations at Minds + Machines **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** 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. 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. **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** I am a senior manager for a registry services provider and new TLD consulting company. **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** 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. b. No. **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** None. **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** North America. **7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization** 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.
Vanda Scartezini **Individual**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** a) Partner POLO Consultores Associados and IT TREND Consulting b) ALTIS Software & Services (www.altis.org.br) and FITEC (www.fitec.org.br) (telecommunications & IT

	research and development) c) Nexti (ALS under LACRALO – association of ITC executive women) **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** a) Consulting senior partner; b) Chair of the board; c) Vice chair **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.** None **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes.** Advisor of a potential new gTLD without compensation. *4.1 Are you representing other parties?* NO **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** None **6. Geographic Region associated with the nationality of volunteer (Africa, North America, Latin America/Caribbean, Asia/Australia/Pacific and Europe)** LATIN AMERICAN & CARIBBEAN **7. Stakeholder Group(s) in which volunteer currently participates within the ICANN organization** **I am acting as liaison to the board of ICANN representing ALAC** I am also member of an ALS under LACRALO.
Baudouin Schombe **AFRALO - At large**	**1. Current vocation, employer and position** 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). **2. Type of work performed in 1 above** Implementing ICT community access (telecentre). Supporting ccTLD redelegation for DR Congo. Organizing training for different community in grass-root level. **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** none **4. Identify any type of commercial interest in ICANN policy development outcomes. Are you representing other parties?** No commercial interest. My representation role is under AFRALO, Regional At-Large Organisation for Africa **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** AFRALO MEMBERS: no any arrangement or agreement but I am sure to have their support

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

19

20

1.3 Attendance Sheet for WG Conference Calls

Name	29 Apr	5 May	10 May	17 May	24 May	1 Jun	8 Jun	15 Jun	6 Jul	13 Jul	20 Jul	27 Jul	03 Aug	10 Aug	17 Aug	24 Aug	31 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												–					

2. Transcript – Brussels Meeting Workshop Session

Intro

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

ICANN Brussels/Reducing Barriers to New gTLD Creation in Developing Regions Wednesday, 23 June 2010 questions and comments from the audience.
>>KARLA VALENTE: So the first question comes from Danny Younger. Director Touray, I am aware of a registry operator that handles a limited amount of registrations that does not charge any fee for registrations and that uses no registrar services. Their organization's contract is up for rebid next year, and we all know that the prospect of competition often inspires new innovative solutions. This registry operator, Diana, can provide such registry services for IGOs by the way for INT. Is there any particular reason why it couldn't be cajoled into providing equivalent registry services for NGOs in the developing world, perhaps a similar dot NGO TLD?
>>KATIM TOURAY: Good afternoon, everyone. And thanks very much, Evan, for that, your very kind, and I daresay overblown presentation. I don't think it's quite accurate to say that I was responsible for the resolution that resulted, in effect, in this Joint Working Group. I'd like to see it as everything that ICANN does as a joint effort that really saw the involvement of each and every one 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 to come and join you here, even if briefly. We have an ongoing board workshop right now, but I had to pull myself out of that, because it's important, I think, to come and be with you and express my gratitude to you for the wonderful job, especially the Joint Working Group has been doing. The work that you're doing is very important. As I was telling the African group yesterday, it must also be seen in the context of the fact that it's work that you are doing not only for your own benefit and the benefit of developing world, but also for the benefit of ICANN itself.
You will recall that the board resolution that we passed, board resolution number 20 in Nairobi, specifically mentioned that to do this would be very much in service of ICANN's objectives of being an inclusive organization. So to the extent that you are helping move the objectives of the resolution forward, you are also helping ICANN achieve its objectives. I really want to thank you again very -- thank you again for the wonderful work that you're doing, that you have been doing, and also encourage you to get as much information as is possible, as many perspectives as is possible. Because as I always keep saying, none of us is as smart or smarter than all of us. And so that's why it's particularly important that we move this multistakeholder approach, the grass roots-driven approach by ensuring that we have as much input into these deliberations as is possible. We certainly are looking forward to the recommendations that are going to emanate from the wonderful work that you are doing, and hopefully we'll come away with something that's going to be to the mutual satisfaction of all of us.
Again, thank you very much. I'm sorry I came in late, and I'm especially sorry that I have to leave to go and join the board back again in our workshop. Again, thanks very much and all the best wishes

of success in your deliberations. Thanks.
>> Okay. Thank you. I hope it's the right place to pose a question. (inaudible) what will happen long term IDN language-wise competition. One has the domain name burnout.com. Now will come maybe a domain name in Swahili, burnout.africa. Both are TLDs. They will be translated by search engines. So in three years' time, what name will win the page ranking competition internationally? And I already experienced that my Farsi name for caviar is being translated in --
>>EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I'm sorry. I hate -- I hate to cut you off, but I really don't think that's relevant to what -- we're talking here about cost reduction.
>>EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Good question. Wrong place. Sorry.
>>STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve Delbianco for Net Choice Coalition. Carlos, you said your focus on who was all about people. I feel as if talking about just applicants as people, you missed the fact that 56% of the people on the planet don't use the Latin script as their primary language. And until this year, they've had zero capability to do a URL, domain name, or e-mail address. So I have a question, if the who is the people, we aren't really serving them today with anything but a couple of IDN ccTLDs. And what I'm hearing this week, it would be one or two years before the gTLD IDNs can serve these people. So I saw a little bit of a clash, if the who we're serving are the people, it may be necessary to give incentives to companies to launch their gTLDs in versions of other languages that are IDNs or they're just not going to do it. They're not going to spend 2- to $400,000 to serve those people. So how does that clash between the first group that said we wouldn't serve, say, a commercial applicant, even though we know they're serving the people that need it most?
>>KARLA VALENTE: The question comes from Mary and's a segue from what Elaine just said. Just to be clear, the basis or assumption is that support is only for community-based TLD applicants, and the question was based on the slide that says first round only for ethnic and linguistic communities. We clarified on the chat room that the support is not limited to communities only. That was just the way that the slide was written. So the other question from Mary is, to the extent that the first-round recommendations are more likely to and more clearly be candidates from community-based applicants, I wonder if the group considered the requirements and dispute resolution sections of the Draft Applicant Guidebook Version 4 as within its mandate. For example, fair, attainable by likely candidates.
>>CHUCK GOMES: My name is Chuck Gomes. I have a question with regard to the bundling idea with regard to underserved language communities.
New gTLD applicants as well as even existing registries who want to offer IDN gTLDs are not in need of special support with regard to financial support or like that, but they would be very unlikely to be able to justify, from a business point of view, offering their versions of their IDN TLDs and pay 185,000 fee, et cetera, to underserved language community. Is it the intent or even consideration, I know they are not definite recommendations yet, of the working group to include that kind of bundling opportunity in your recommendation?
>>ROBERT HUTCHINSON: I am Bob Hutchinson from Dynamic Ventures. We specialize in helping entrepreneurs start new businesses. And I was wondering if you considered the lively idea of bundling. I think it makes a lot of sense. I wonder if you looked at micro-capital kinds of ways of funding the beginnings of these bundled businesses and so on and so forth. I'm curious if you did that.
>>KARLA VALENTE: Hi, this is Karla on behalf of our remote participants. So you know we have around 28 remote participants throughout this session. This question comes from John McCormick. Will local ccTLD's impact be part of the evaluation process for community linguistic gTLD proposals? Basically the commercial impact of a community language gTLD on a local ccTLD where most of the

community language group is based.
>> Hi, my name is Xing Hsao (phonetic). I work for DotAsia registry, but speaking on my own behalf. Two questions. First is I would like to know how confidence is the group right now, for example, in the next six months to incorporate the ideas into the real implementation plan of the new gTLD program. Speaking of which is that, for example, I'm understanding the mission of cost cutdown for the applicant fee, but there's still fees involved in additional cost. For example, like registry evaluation or even in the question of that 50 questions, there will be requirement of a three-year -- I mean, their financial deposit for the operation. So that's one. And actually the second is noticing that there's some exemptions of the brands from the developing country may not be eligible for that. I would like to take from a different perspective is that perhaps the groups can also think about to help the brand owners in the developing countries, like China, India, or Brazil, to make sure that they are aware of the program, so their brands in the new gTLD rounds can be more involved and be aware of what's happening in the trademark clearinghouse area and so on and so forth.
>>NII QUAYNOR: Yes, my name is Nii Quaynor. I come from Ghana.com. I am a registrar but I am speaking for myself. I want to be clear that we are doing this for a better Internet, and I want to ask publicly whether you do have a particular operate in mind as you define the applicant support system. And specifically to Alex, you mentioned a dot Africa operator. Does it exist? Thank you.
>>NARESH AJWANI: My name is Naresh Ajwani. I am a president of Cyber Caf Association of India. We are an ecosystem of 180,000 cyber cafss, 70 ISPs, 49 government application, and 70 million Internet users. I have a question. I am sure the cost for the entry fee is very a thought throughout approach of ICANN. So when we are talking about the cost reduction, from where this cost would be recovered is my question, is my query?
>>NARESH AJWANI: Shortly, it does. But yes, I have a comment to make. It is a cross-subsidy. There are no free lunches. I think if a business model can be considered based on revenue share, this particular challenge can be addressed. Entry fees in all these developing countries are now getting replaced by revenue share model. For example, if a hundred dollars come into an organization, then a percent from the gross revenue is taken by the licenser, government, or anybody like ICANN. So I'm sure that particular piece might have been considered by you to not bring a cross-subsidy or a feeling of cutting the cost. Revenue share is only suggestion I think I can make at this juncture. Thank you.
>>NARESH NAJWARI: Suggestion would be kindly consider different provision also that will really make not somebody to feel that he is being benefited in different business model.
You have referred about India. I must tell you, a few years back, the biggest company in shampoo, P&G, was going back thinking shampoo can't be sold in India. So they changed the business model and they brought sachets, small pouches. Today every house, nook and corner of India has got shampoo from P&G. It's all about changing business models instead of doing any cross-subsidy, reducing the cost. If that particular aspect can be considered, I am very confident it will be accepted much faster. Thank you.

3. Public Comment Summary and Analysis

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

3.1 Source:

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

3.2 Overview

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

3.3 Summary of comments and WG discussion

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

3.3.1 From: ICANN African Community (22 June 2010)

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

- Welcome the Board resolution 20 related to the support for Applicants requesting assistance in applying for and operating new gTLDs.
- Express our gratitude to the Board members for their consideration of the community concerns about the cost of applying for new gTLDs that might hinder applicants, especially those from developing countries.

- Strongly believe that entrepreneur applicants from African countries, where the market is not wide enough for a reasonable profit making industry, are eligible for support.
- Deem that Civil society, NGOs and non for profit organizations in Africa are the most in need of such support, because they have a deep impact in society since they work at the grass-root level.
- Believe that support is of utmost importance for geographic, cultural linguistic, and more generally community based applications.
- Urge that support to new gTLD applicants in Africa be prioritised since this support will be an incitement for new aspirants to come forward and apply for new gTLDs.
- Believe that the support to be provided to applicants of new gTLDs in Africa should include, but is not limited to the following:
    - Financial, by reducing the application and the on-going fees
    - Linguistic, by translating all the application documents, especially the Applicant Guidebook, in the six UN languages
    - Legal, by assisting the applicants in preparing their applications properly.
    - Technical, by
        - helping the applicants to define the infrastructure options,
        - addressing the issue of infrastructure problems in some African countries; such as IPV6, internet connectivity etc.
- Strongly support that cost reduction is the key element in fulfilling the goals of ICANN Board's Resolution 20 within the principles of the recovery of the application and on-going costs.
- Propose that the following be entertained to achieve cost reduction:
    - Waiving the cost of Program Development ($26k).
    - Waiving the Risk/Contingency cost ($60k).
    - Lowering the application cost ($100k)
    - Waiving the Registry fixed fees ($25k per calendar year), and charge the Registry-Level Transaction Fee only ($0.25 per domain name registration or renewal).
- Propose that the reduced cost be paid incrementally, which will give the African applicants more time to raise money, and investors will be more encouraged to fund an application that passes the initial evaluation.
- Believe that African communities apply for new gTLDs according to an appropriate business model taking into consideration the realities of the African region. ICANN's commitment towards supporting gTLD applicants in Africa will be a milestone to the development of the overall Internet community in Africa
- 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

WG discussion summary:

"Strongly believe that entrepreneur applicants from African countries, where the market is not wide enough for a reasonable profit making industry, are eligible for support."

The Working Group (WG) believes the report could indeed be further clarified. The group understands the terminology used could be confusing; nevertheless, it is NOT the intent to restrict the support to non-for-profits. The proposal is to have the ethnic and linguist groups as a starting point. WG believes these groups present a natural and less controversial approach to begin the support program during the first round. The WG also acknowledges that the definition of NGOs may differ deepening on the jurisdiction and also because organizations change over the course of time. Also, just being and NGO does not make an entity necessarily in need of support. There are NGOs with very good economical status. Concerns raised during the discussion:

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

WG will clarify the language in the report in 2 points:

- There is no restriction to limiting the support to non-for-profits only; for profits are considered
- The recommendation to support ethnic and linguistic groups is valid for the first round, but this is to be revisited in future rounds. The WG sees the first round as a learning experience and agrees that a limited, identifiable and generally non-controversial set of applicants to receive support is the best approach, particularly considering the timing and pace of the New gTLD program.
- WG recognizes there might be applicants from Africa that are disadvantaged for a whole host of reasons, political, economic, linguistic, logistical, etc. However, there is no intent to automatically qualify/prioritize an applicant for support based on a specific continent of origin/establishment. One must take into account countries, entities within a continent and country have diversity in financial status and needs.

3.3.2 From: G. Kirikos (20 July 2010)

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

WG discussion summary:

Karla:

Note the same comment was sent to DAG, v4 public forum and ICANN staff will respond.

Other proposed reply for consideration:

The JAS WG has believes that community participation and input is very important for the development of proposal in related to new gtld applicant support. Regarding the WG membership,

the process adopted was open and flexible accommodating members from around the world, including late additions. In addition to an open participation in the WG calls and work, the WG gave the community several opportunities for input, more specifically:

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

All comments received were considered for the development of this final report from the WG.

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

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

- 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.

(Blacknight Solutions) ICANN seems to think that TLDs in the "new regime" need to be slotted into a "one size fits all" scenario. This is neither realistic not does it truly fit with ICANN's own goals which are often summed up by Rod Beckstrom as "One World. One Internet. Everyone Connected." To make this a reality, economic barriers need to be removed where appropriate. The Working Group documents recognize that strict criteria for economic exceptions need to be laid down and that only a limited number of applicants

would meet the criteria. Several companies, including Blacknight Solutions, have stated that they would be willing to offer services to qualified applicants.

WG discussion summary:

WG acknowledges that applicants can benefit from a broad range of assistance, including logistical, outreach, technical, administrative (application), etc. The WG proposal is not at a stage o address the details of how the proposal will be implemented and how the various parties interested in helping in this initiative would be involved.

3.3.4 From: American Red Cross (22 July 2010)

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

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

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

- Initial/pilot phase—also support not-for-profit organizations: Red Cross agrees with targeting support to ethnic and linguistic communities and also proposes that support be given to not-for-profit organizations during the initial/pilot phase.
- Red Cross disagrees with the recommendation that support for other groups, especially NGOs and civil society organizations, should be addressed at a later point. We strongly urge the Working Group and ICANN to consider support for not-for-profit organizations as soon as possible. Red Cross recommends immediate support during the initial/pilot phase for not-for-profit organizations that would use a new gTLD to communicate with the public about their mission and services, to engage in

activities to increase social inclusion of non-governmental organizations with technology, to distribute educational, informational or lifesaving information to members of their communities, or to collect donations to support their operations. These potential applicants, whose mission, objectives and status can be verified and approved by the Working Group/ICANN criteria, are the type of potential applicants for which support is non-controversial.

- Red Cross agrees that the geographic location of the applicant is one of many factors that could be considered when deciding to provide support to applicants.
- Red Cross believes that the recommendations regarding groups not to be supported at this time lack sufficient specificity to provide meaningful comments.
- Significant outreach and education efforts are needed and should begin immediately and then increase once the final Applicant Guidebook is released, allowing for the ability to timely ask questions and seek guidance. ICANN should make information readily available about the new gTLD processes and procedures to potential applicants in underserved markets and to certain groups such as not-for-profit organizations that may not be as engaged in ICANN activities. ICANN should improve its education and outreach services especially to not-for-profit organizations such as Red Cross to ensure that its user community is able to navigate the process and is not excluded or negatively impacted.
- In the outreach the provided information should address the application process as well as information of interest to those not applying for new gTLDs (e.g. objection procedures, rights protection mechanisms). Also, advice about the technical requirements for operating a new TLD (e.g. details of Modules 2 and 5) should be provided in this outreach to these targeted populations, regions and organizations, especially since those details are likely to be daunting to groups that have not previously operated a registry.
- Outreach should occur in all five ICANN regions and ICANN should provide live, in-person seminars open to the public, rather than only posting educational information on the ICANN website or hosting webinars.
- Fee reduction/subsidization and/or phased in payment of fees for deserving applicants. Red Cross supports the intent of this recommendation. The current proposed payment schedule and fees will be prohibitive and could impact the ability of not-for-profit organizations to fund and fulfill their mission-related activities and objectives.
- Technical support (infrastructure, education/consulting regarding DNSSEC, possible technical waivers or “step ups”, lower cost or shared back end registry services). Red Cross supports the intent of the recommendation especially since many applicants will be new to registry operations. Red Cross generally supports discounted pricing for or assistance with new gTLD back end registry services.

- Support for build out in underserved languages, IDNs for new gTLDs, price discounts to incentivize build out in scripts with limited web presence, bundled pricing to promote build out in multiple scripts at once, tests to prevent gaming and ensure support reaches its targets. Generally Red Cross supports discounted pricing for new gTLDs.

WG discussion summary:

The WG has discussed the issue and agrees that the simple fact that en entity holds a non-profit status, it does not mean this entity is financially unable to cover the fees and meets the "need" criterion.
The WG further acknowledges that 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.
The most important criterion is the need, than the intention of the string. The form/structure of the applicant is not as relevant at this point. The intent is, for the initial round, to focus and narrow the support to ethnic/linguistic communities since this is a less controversial group and will likely generate political support for this initiative. Also, these potential applicants have the benefits of being relatively well defined as groups, and pass the test of being generally non-controversial. Such communities already have a history of recognition at ICANN and facilitating community on the web is one of ICANN's core values. The WG believes it is reasonable to have prioritization criteria among qualifying individuals.

3.3.5 From: Arab Team (21 July 2010)

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

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

(2) While we are supportive of the need to ensure the protection of registrants in the event of a registry failure, the primary reliance by ICANN on a financial instrument is misguided. Other mechanisms exist to safeguard registrants in case of a registry failure. The potential posting of a financial instrument prior to launch of the gTLD represents a much more substantial barrier to entry than the application fee. The Working Group should address what other support mechanisms exist in the potential case of registry failure and how they could be made available to applicants.

WG discussion summary:

The Working Group (WG) believes the report could indeed be further clarified. The group understands the terminology used could be confusing; nevertheless, it is NOT the intent of the WG to propose that governments do not qualify or cannot participate to receive support. Nevertheless, it is a consensus of the WG that the support should not be used to subsidize a largely and purely government initiative. That said, if the proposal requesting assistance is majority government funding or a majority government sponsor, it does not qualify.

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

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

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

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

3.3.6 From: D. Younger (24 June 2010)

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

- 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).

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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.

WG discussion summary:

The Working Group (WG) believes the report could indeed be further clarified. The group understands the terminology used could be confusing; nevertheless, it is NOT the intent to restrict the support to non-for-profits. The proposal is to have the ethnic and linguist groups as a starting point. WG believes these groups present a natural and less controversial approach to begin the support program during the first round. The WG also acknowledges that the definition of NGOs may differ deepening on the jurisdiction and also because organizations change over the course of time. Also, just being and NGO does not make an entity necessarily in need of support. There are NGOs with very good economical status. Concerns raised during the discussion:

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

3.3.7 From: D. Younger (17 July 2010)

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

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

WG discussion summary:

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

---

3.3.8 From: D. Younger (17 July 2010)

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

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

WG discussion summary:

??

3.3.9 From: D. Younger (17 July 2010)

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

WG discussion summary:

The problem is that increasing the registrar transaction fees comes from the pocket of the user.
It goes against the intent of the program being self financing. Changes to registrar contracts are not an easy process. Is this the time to fight that political battle? It would be hard and take a long time to reach an agreement with the registrars.
This could be sufficiently assured funds that we could ''borrow'' from next year's revenue...

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

Bundling of Applications—Reduced Fee Proposal.

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

D. Younger - A bundled gTLD application is the equivalent of an ASCII gTLD application combined with an additional IDN gTLD application. 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. Equivalency of treatment is the bigger issue—i.e., if a cost calculation has already been made for the processing of IDN applications, it would certainly be discriminatory (contrary to Section 3 of the ICANN By-laws) if an equivalent application were charged at a higher rate.

WG discussion summary:

This is overall an interesting idea. The WG believe this supports getting scripts that would not be built out. The WG discussed a potential suggestion of having Tier 1 and Tier 2 approach.
It fits into notion of bundling lower prices for additional scripts.
It 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.
It is difficult to implement

3.3.11 From: D. Younger (19 July 2010)

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

WG discussion summary:

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