Expressions of Interest Respondents' Conference Call
August 11, 2009

Michael Salazar: First of all, I want to thank everybody for taking time out of your schedules to join the call. I also want to thank everybody for submitting your expressions of interest by the original deadline. The responses were fantastic, to be quite honest, and we'll get through here some of the questions as to why we've opened up the expression of interest in line.

But as part of this particular call, I want to make sure that we are able to answer, or have answered the majority of your questions. You've submitted a total of roughly 42 questions. Some of them sort of overlap so we've combined those. You are going to hear a few different voices on the phone. I will ask those individuals to introduce themselves, but if you look at the agenda on Page 2, of course, the introduction, the roll call, we will go through questions that have been grouped into application processing, into evaluation panels, pricing and applicant data management.

So in terms of introduction, as I said, this is Michael Salazar. I'm the new gTLD Program Director. I've actually been at ICANN for about a month, so I've sort of been learning, effectively through a fire hose, but it's been fantastic. So there's a lot for us to cover and do over the next several months and I am looking forward to working with some of you, and obviously, with the ICANN staff.

Kurt, are you on the line?

Kurt Pritz: Yes, I'm Kurt Pritz. I'm Vice President of Service Systems and a Project Sponsor for the new gTLD Program, so I'll be answering some of the questions.

Michael Salazar: Great. Thank you, Kurt. Karen?

Karen Lentz: Yes, this is Karen Lentz. I am Research and Contact Manager at ICANN. I'm responsible for drafting the drafts that we've posted so far of the Applicant Guidebook.

Michael Salazar: Great. Thank you, Karen. Dan?

Daniel Halloran: Good morning. This is Daniel Halloran. I'm ICANN's Deputy General Counsel.

Michael Salazar. Thank you. Hayley…

Hayley Laframboise: Hi, I'm Hayley Laframboise. I'm the Communications Coordinator and I shall be facilitating this session.

Michael Salazar: Great. Thank you, Hayley. And thanks for getting all this sorted out, Hayley.

Hayley Laframboise: Don't thank me yet.

Michael Salazar: So, in terms of housekeeping, you guys have already clearly stated your names. We are recording this session. The purpose of recording it is we want to transcribe it and post those notes on our website for everybody to have access to. We will send a follow up email notifying you when that's been posted.

Time permitting, at the end of this, getting through the questions, we will take questions, but we request that those questions really be focused on clarifying any of the answers that we have provided during the session. In order to raise a question, on your screen, on the bottom left, there is a little icon, and if you drag your mouse over it, you'll get a little pop up that will indicate to raise your hand. That is how we will give you the mic. Because we are on a conference call, it's very easy for us to speak over each other. So we would like to just limit who's speaking during the questions with the raise of the hand. And that's it and so I think with that, we will actually get started here.

In terms of general application processing time, this first set of questions, I think, will be answered by Kurt.

Hayley Laframboise: Mike, can you hold on a second. Operator, can you please start the recording?

Operator: Thank you. The recording has been started.

Hayley Laframboise: Go ahead Mike.

Michael Salazar: Sorry about that. Kurt, can you see the screen?

Kurt Pritz: Yes. So with regard to the first one, obviously, those who are going to apply, and many of those people attend ICANN meetings, have asked ICANN for a timeframe to process these applications and then delegate the TLDs in the root zone. So our internal calculations indicate - the short answer is we're sort of relying on you as experts to devise a process that will be able to evaluate a large number of applications. And when I say large, you've read the request for information, but about 500 with a possibility of more. What's the best way of processing those applications in a way that will get a consistent answer out to the applicant? If you have hundreds of applications,

we are managing expectations in our community that that would take some months to get through all the applications.

But part of this process is a learning process where you bring your expertise to the table and say, if we process the applications this way we can get through them all, and so we can get through 300 in two months or 300 in four months, like that. So we're kind of relying on you, but the bottom line answer's going to be a number of months, much less than half a year, much more possibly than a couple of months.

Michael Salazar: So I think the second question is very similar to the first question.

Kurt Pritz: That's right. And so I'll say, just to provide a little more detail because I was going to keep talking back. What we've told the community is that applications would go through the initial evaluation, if you're familiar wit that and I'm sure you are, in a 4 ½-month timeframe. And what that allows is from the time that the application period closes until the TLD is actually delegated in the root zone is 7 ½ or 8 months, depending on all the other processes that need to go on, and that's a pretty long time. And so that's why we are looking at each step of the process, trying to jimmy that down. In the time, as you've seen in our writings, that processing time includes a lot of steps for the initial evaluation, doing the evaluation, but then doing the evaluation and then having a communication of some type with the applicant, if that's necessary, and having different evaluators score different evaluations.

So then, there's a normalization step that needs to take place so that we get consistency across all evaluations. So, in that few-month timeframe, there's got to be the chance to ask questions of the applicant, give them time to answer the questions back, and then have a normalization before we publish the results of that.

So, as far as the number of resources we expected you to devote, we've done some internal, for ourselves, as you can imagine, so the balancing we're doing is between if you get 100 applications, then you hand them out to 100 panels and you're done in a few days, but you might have 100 inconsistent results, and balance that against giving them all to one person and have the evaluations take a year.

So what's the balance? We want to provide enough resources so you can get through the process as quickly as possible, but then maintaining some sort of consistency of result, so that consistency can be gained through having very few evaluators or having some sort of normalization step after

the scoring is done by several evaluators. So that's the balancing we're trying to do.

Our goal is consistent, fair results, but as fast as possible, so that's the balancing in the number of resources I think you should devote.

Male: Just to add to that Kurt, I think one of the questions in the EOIs are to give us your sense of being able to process applications, either from 100 up to a 1,000. Obviously, if you have a 4 ½-month timeframe to get through initial evaluation, you're going to have to throw more bodies at it. So we'd like to know how you're going to scale. What are your plans for scaling and how you will be able to sort of meet, if you will, a 4 ½-month timeframe to get through just the initial evaluation phase?

Kurt Pritz: And if the answer is you can't, that you really need to batch the applications because you don't want 100 evaluators trying to normalize 100 different results, and your recommendation is that for consistency (10:10 unintelligible), you really need to batch the applications in some form and therefore take more time. That isn't a disqualifier. That shows us good judgment and so on.

So I don't know what the right answer is and I'm not (10:27 unintelligible) there's a wrong answer. So what we're looking for is good judgment, because what has to happen here is that this process has to succeed and when I said, succeed, I mean timely results but also consistent, fair results that when we run them up the flagpole, the internet community generally nods because yes, they got it right.

Michael Salazar: Great. Thank you, Kurt. I think that covers the five questions on this page. On to the next page. Three questions or a few questions were focused on what's the interaction with the ICANN staff. Well, it looks like I skipped a page here. Hold on a second. All right. There we go. Conflicts of interest. Dan, I think this was your area.

Daniel Halloran: Great. Thanks Mike. We recognize this is a general issue and it's good that it came up here. I think it's more complicated than we can deal with fully on this call, so partly we'll just take this on notice. But we want to let you know that we are working on a comprehensive conflict of interest policy of procedures for evaluators through our **Co** Program. And we think this is such a big component, we're actually going to do something detailed, a couple of pages setting out definitions, guidelines, time periods, and we're going to post that for public comment. We definitely invite everyone on this call's comments on that because, you're in the best position to know where the issues and the corner cases might rise, or what kind of standards we

should be using, or bring your experiences to bear. And so we will be posting that. I'm not sure if that's in the next days or weeks, but we're getting a draft of that ready. And I think that will cover all of these in questions about conflicts.

Male: Ken, I think the goal is to actually have that out with Version 3 of the Guidebook. Is that correct?

Karen Lentz: I think that's correct. There will be a set of documents released for public comment sometime before the ICANN meeting in October. So that could potentially be a part of that.

Male: Great. Thank you.

Michael Salazar: So now on to my questions here. So, again, the questions here are, what kind of interaction are we going to have or are the panelists going to have with the ICANN staff. What's this project going to look like kicking off?

So clearly, the way I look at this is, is we are in the process of designing the flows, the software, the processes that are going to handle all the applications. The way I look at it is we're going to have probably 80% to 90% of those processes complete, and then bring the panelists on board. You're going to have some processes or thoughts on processes, and we want to leverage that information and work with you to make sure that we have an integrated process. And that will be part of, if you look at the financial template in the EOIs, I've listed a line item there called "Startup Costs." I would cover that in sort of your one-time startup costs and how you are going to integrate with us. But we will have a kickoff meeting. We will, as I said, go through integrating our processes with your processes.

We will have some training, including some trial runs, just to see, to get a better sense of how long it's going to take to get through the applications and what issues or concerns we have as we get through the process so that we can account for those. And then, we will have some program management or project management, including status reporting. We haven't sorted that out yet. It's not finalized, I should say, but we will have that finalized as we engage with the panelists.

In terms of providing a walk-through of the detailed applications, we're detailing how the applications will be received and processed. There is a flow chart, high-level flow chart, on the very last page of Module 1 of the Applicant Guidebook. As I said, the detail processes are still in development, and that we will be working with each of the firms to refine those.

In terms of the support that we will provide to the consulting firms, ICANN is, of course, ultimately responsible for coordinating all aspects of the evaluation process. We will answer questions about that process. We'll provide for the normalization process to help ensure the consistency across all the applications. We'll coordinate and handle the communicating with the public as well as posting the results. You may be involved in some of these steps, but we will certainly work through those tasks with you.

Primarily, the evaluation panelists are responsible for reviewing each application and any associated public commentary, and then asking, of course, clarifying questions, as Kurt pointed out, clarifying questions of the applicant if some of the data doesn't get you to, or help you come up with a score. And then, of course, determining the score on the particular question.

On to the next page here. What is the expected number of applications? So Kurt has already said that, I guess the official answer is 500 plus or minus 400. There are obviously various estimates out there, but we're sort of going on the assumption and building on the assumption of between 300 and 500 applications in order to build our processes. But clearly, we are asking you, as the responding firms, to give us an indication of how you're going to scale, as I said earlier, from 100 applications up to 1,000 applications, so that we understand that.

We'll review applications as they come in several batches during the application period or in one batch after the period closes. That's going to depend on a number of factors. Obviously, the number of applications received. Your ability to process those applications and then, of course, if there are any potential conflicts of interest. The goal is to get through the registration period. We will not, at least we do not foresee, sending out any of the applications until the registration period is closed. At that point, we have to complete our administrative check and completeness check to make sure that all the information is actually in hand. And then at that point, we will start sending them out to the panelists for review.

Will there be a need for any onsite work at client locations? No. We do not anticipate that the panelists will be onsite doing any of the work. The work, we believe, can be done remotely either in your office or some place else, perhaps. I think we will have a little bit of office space, although not much in the new location, but I wouldn't count on that, to be honest. I think that the most of the work, as I said, can be done remotely. There shouldn't be any travel to client locations. There will be travel on occasion to meet with ICANN staff, perhaps for program updates and, of course, for training and on boarding. But in terms of the costs for those, you should provide an

indication of what you think those costs are in your proposal and how you would expect to account for those and pass those on.

Kurt Pritz: This is Kurt. Can you hear me?

Michael Salazar: Yes.

Kurt Pritz: I think also that necessarily with certain types of evaluation that we would almost expect that evaluators would be geographically dispersed or there be evaluators in different regions, or if not physically in different regions, from different regions in order to (18:15 unintelligible) the cultural aspects and meet the multilingual requirements that will be needed.

Michael Salazar: Great. Karen has the next questions.

Karen Lentz: For the first question in this set, is asking whether we have a sample application with the assessment criteria. I'll answer that a couple of different ways depending on what was actually meant by the question. In terms of the application form that applicants would fill out, and then the criterion, scoring methodologies that the evaluators would be expected to use in the financial and technical portion.

So there have been a few iterations of that application form along with the criteria. The latest one is an excerpt of the Guidebook that was posted in May. I believe it was May 30th. So I can point – staff can point anybody to that who hasn't seen it already. That's the latest version that we have.

If the question was going more towards, do we have a sample application form that was filled out by somebody, meaning an example of what a completed application might look like. We haven't developed a sort of mock up of an application to this point, but that could be something that we would do as part of on boarding the panelists.

But if the question is trying to get a sense of what an application might actually look like that the evaluator would be reviewing, there are applications available on our website from previous gTLD application processes that can give some frame of reference for what that might look like. The questions and the criteria that were used in previous processes are not exactly the same as what will be used in the program going forward, but the old applications are useful as a point of reference for looking at that.

So, the next question is about whether ICANN is going to be providing feedback to applicants during initial evaluation or at the end. And to answer that, I guess it depends on what you mean by feedback. During the initial

evaluation period, the evaluation teams have an opportunity to send back to each applicant one set of questions to clarify information that's contained in the application, and then the applicant has an opportunity to respond to that. So there's one exchange between the evaluators and the applicant that occurs during initial evaluation.

Now, in terms of getting the results, currently, it's expected that that will all happen at the end of initial evaluations. So when all applicants have completed that step, that's when the results will be published and given to applicants.

There's a second part of the question which asks about extended evaluation and whether that's handled inline or separately. So the answer to that is that extended evaluation is a later period, so it doesn't start until the initial evaluation has closed and all applicants have gone through that stage.

Then, there will be a point where a definitive evaluation period can start for those applicants that are eligible for it and that have selected (23:04 unintelligible).

Finally, the last question that we have in this set, it refers to a scenario I the draft Applicant Guidebook where there's an applicant who fails both initial and extended evaluation. And so the question goes to whether we've contemplate an appeals process beyond that. The answer to that is ICANN has appeal mechanisms, or accountability mechanisms available that are generally available to members of the community, so there are things like ombudsman or the reconsideration process, which goes to the Board. Or there's a capacity for an independent review of a decision.

So there's nothing that would prevent an applicant from going through one of those processes if they felt that they had been treated unfairly in some way. But I would point out that those processes are designed to address specific types of unfairness or specific types of complaints. It's not intended as an opportunity for an applicant who hasn't passed the extended evaluation to get another opportunity to have more evaluation. Thanks.

Michael Salazar: Thank you, Karen. So the next set of questions relate to why the expression of interest deadline has been extended. I think this kind of the million-dollar question for a lot of you on the phone. Our goal has and continues to be to select the most qualified firms to provide evaluation services. As I said earlier, this is not a reflection of the responses received. Obviously, we value the fact that you provided responses on time and we think the responses are very well detailed in your approach.

What we have to do, and as we posted in our extension notice on the 31st of July, is that we have to manage for potential conflicts of interest, and we also need to make sure that we will have the capacity to process all evaluations within our agreed-on timeframes. Again, that 4 ½-month period for the initial evaluation is one of those timeframes.

So the EOI has been opened up to address those two concerns. As mentioned, the EOI, we are moving forward with selecting a primary, a secondary, and a contingent third party, a firm for each panel. And then in terms of providing just some additional guidance here, we are having this conference call with the early respondents. We do not anticipate having any additional conference calls with any of the new respondents, so we wanted to give you the opportunity to ask your questions and to refine your responses based on this conference call.

The last question here is whether or not, are all responses from each organization going to be held in confidence. So the answer is, yes. It's the short answer. We don't intend to make any of these documents available or public, but if for some reason we are asked, we will notify the firm prior to releasing the document.

What will happen after the September 15th deadline? So we are tentatively scheduled to identify the firms around early November, or I should say mid-November. We will have a short list. We will conduct oral presentations. We're still finalizing the details on that. We're not committed to listing how many firms are going to be short-listed for each of the panels, and I would expect that all presentations will happen sometime in early November, and then with the result of that, that we will notify who the primary, the secondary and contingent third party firms are.

I think that answers both of those questions. Let me just make sure. Yes.

Onto the next set of questions. So, in terms of the number of panelists, as I just said, we are introducing the concept of a primary and secondary. The goal really is that the primary will handle a majority of the applications. The reality is as I see it that the only time that they're really not going to be processing is if there's a clear conflict of interest, or there's a capacity concern. Or, if once we've agreed on the amount of applications or the timeline, if we see that the primary is not processing the applications within the agreed-on timeframes, and we feel that we are going to run past the 4 ½-month goal, then we will work with the primary to start moving some of those, or more of those applications to a secondary, and potentially do a contingent third.

But I do want to reiterate that we expect the primary to handle a majority of the applications. Twenty-Four is how many consultant firms will be selected, again, primary, secondary, contingent third. Is ICANN is hoping that bidders will come together and revise joint responses? No, not necessarily. That is entirely up to you. If you feel that will provide a better response, but no, we are not looking at that at all and we are not looking for a single contractor for all the work.

Geographic names. Kurt, I believe this is you.

Kurt Pritz: Yes. So, I am in between versions of the Applicant Guidebook. ICANN sharpened the definition of what is a country and territory name so that it's essentially defined by a list now rather than a vague definition. But there's a serious complexity in that we can consult the list and see if a name is on the list, but then it's the translation of those names too. And the way the Guidebook is written today, it's translation into any language.

So, if you're thinking about possibilities, you're thinking, "Oh my gosh, 7,000 languages, 251 countries and territories." I don't think we can cover the field. I think realistically we'll get 200 to 300, maybe a few more applications, and just some of those will be in non-Latin scripts, and languages are grouped by scripts, so I don't think the inquiry, really at the end of the day, is tremendously broad or impossible but it could present some challenges.

You know, things in ICANN aren't done until, well, I don't think things at ICANN are ever done, but the version of the Guidebook that's posted is for public comment. There may be some iteration of that definition. So, for example, one of the comments made publicly suggested that it should be every translation of a country name that, if a generic word was applied for and there was some absurd result that that was somehow the translation of a country name, and in a language that was never used, that the panel would have some discretion to disqualify it.

But, having said all that, I think you can rely largely on what the definition is that's in the Guidebook, so I would rely on that in formulating your responses.

With regard to your second question, there's not really a list of government contacts, but there's two partial answers. One is for those applications coming from countries with members in ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee, the GAC, there's 83 members of the GAC, and so, GAC members can be used as a point of contact. And also, if you read the Guidebook, it lists the offices within the government that should be consulted. So generally, it specifies a ministry level, although I think senior

bureaucrats are allowed and that certain departments are preferred over others. So the Guidebook would tell the applicant where they have to go and would tell the evaluator to look for one of those members of government.

Is that helpful?

Mike Salazar: Yes. I think there's one last question here under geographic names. You may have already covered it.

Kurt Pritz: Yes, 7,000 languages and **80** scripts. So reading the first sentence, you'd want to put in a possible way, but I think the reality of it is, with 300 applications and there's 700 languages, but once you get a language in a certain script, you really need to only look across other languages in that script for the same word. So, I think that skinnies down the number of combinations a lot, and we will be trying to write language that limits that consideration a little bit more. But as you might guess, it's really hard to write that sentence, so we originally had in the Guidebook the inquiry was limited to the official language in that country and the six U.N. languages, and that really wasn't broad enough and there was significant criticism of that. And to find a spot between that and everything is kind of hard, but that's what we're seeking to do.

Also, the second part of that question is whether there should be a preliminary decision and a cooling off period. So that's one really good idea. Another really good idea somebody had was a pre-evaluation evaluation, so those interested in applying for a TLD could have a pre-check done before they went to the expense and effort of applying.

Generally, if you expand that out though, you'd find that every single evaluation we do would probably benefit from a pre-evaluation, and then every evaluation we would do would profit from a cooling off and sort of public comment period. So instead, we've hit on the plan where if an applicant fails initial evaluation, then there's an opportunity for extended evaluation where the applicant can come back with the, in this case, with the approval of the government or some sort of statement why it shouldn't be a country name and that would go into extended evaluation.

And then finally, in cases where they do apply for a name and does happen to be a country name, then they can get most of their money back in a refund.

Debbie: Hi. Can I just come back on that? Really, the second part of that question is in relation to the GNP perhaps making a mistake and not realizing that something is a geographic name, sort of giving the go ahead, if you like, for it

and then somebody in the public highlighting something that the panel may have missed.

Michael Salazar: Debbie, can we hold off until we get through all the questions and then we'll give you the opportunity to ask that.

Debbie: Okay.

Kurt Pritz: You know, Michael, I can answer that really briefly, I think.

Michael Salazar: Okay.

Kurt Pritz: So that's worth considering. Right now, the application, the applied for names will be published right at the start, and so country, government and GAC participants would have a month before the real evaluation starts to make a comment that this is their country name.

Debbie: (37:03 unintelligible). Okay, thanks.

Michael Salazar: Thank you, Kurt. On the string similarity, Karen, I think this was you.

Karen Lentz: The next question is concerning the string similarity algorithm that we have for use as a tool, being part of the string similarity review by the panel. So, one thing to note here is that the algorithm itself is really just one tool that's used in that part of the evaluation. It's just one part of the inquiry, one set of data. The algorithm that we developed to compare strings to one another and get the test score on similarity, and there are eight scripts in it right now. The question is about whether more scripts are going to be added.

The eight scripts that are in there now we think will cover the majority of strings in the applications that we receive. So for now, the development of the algorithm is complete. If there are, and I think it's contemplated that we can be adding other scripts at later stages if we have a need for it. So if it starts to emerge that there's a lot of interest in another particular script that's not covered by the algorithm that that's something that we would look at.

Michael Salazar: Great. Thank you, Karen. Dan, I think the next one is yours.

Dan Halloran: Yes, this is Dan Halloran again. The next question is on insurance, generally for the evaluators. ICANN does not expect to cover the evaluator's insurance under ICANN's insurance, so we would expect each evaluation organization to carry its own insurance, and the level would be commercially reasonable. We would work it out as part of the contracting phase, and for one thing, I think the amount would vary. We could require, the primary

technical evaluator might have a different level of insurance than the secondary geographic names panel or something. So I can't give any standard answer to the exact level, but it would be commercially reasonable and we would expect evaluators to carry it on their own.

Michael Salazar: Thank you, Dan. The next set of questions focus on the financial template that was added as an appendix to the revised EOIs. In terms of the information, how will be information be used? It's really more a way of allowing us to compare apples to apples, if you will.

We really are focused here on, I would like to understand what the total expected costs are to conduct these reviews from startup, which would be your one-time cost, to how much it's going to cost to complete the analysis during the initial evaluation phase, and then any other costs based on your experience as a consultant providing similar services.

In terms of whether or not the quoted numbers will be taken as binding, no. But what I will say is that we would expect the estimates to be within reason. Twenty Percent to 25% of actual cost would seem to be reasonable. I know that can be difficult, but we certainly want that to be as close to reality as possible just so that we have a sense of what we think the costs are going to be, what your proposed costs are given your ability to process. It certainly will be a factor in how we evaluate all the responses. But we will definitely work with the firms to solidify the costs and negotiate the terms of each contract once we get to that point.

The next question, essentially the same thing here. The financial template appears to suggest that each of the evaluations by each of the panels will result in a single fixed cost. Yes, we realize that there are going to be complex evaluations. What I would suggest, as you fill this out, is to make sure that you're providing your list of assumptions as to how you've come up with your pricing. I think if you look at the financial template, which is really just meant to be a guide, a very quick assumption you can make is that there's going to be an even split between simple, medium and complex applications that you will be evaluating. So that can certainly be one of your assumptions as you start to fill out your pricing for us.

Question Number 34 appears to suggest that organizations must submit EOIs for all panels. No. That's incorrect. Only fill out for the panels that you actually want to provide services for. You do not need to fill out for all the panels.

Next set of questions. Kurt, I believe this goes to you. Well, let me go back actually, Number 35 here, Kurt, is very similar to the previous set of

questions. The very last sentence there is will the panelists have an opportunity to revisit and revise costs according to actual criteria? Yes, I think, as we get down to nailing down the contracts, absolutely. But we certainly want to have the parameters and understand what your rates per hour are going to be if we go down a path of substantially more hours are going to be incurred. I think that's going to be part of the negotiating process, but we very clearly want to understand how you propose on handling in your proposal.

So Kurt, if you could start with Question 36.

Karen Lentz: Michael, Kurt actually just stepped out.

Kurt Pritz: I wonder if we could take like a few minute break?

Michael Salazar: Yes, why don't we take a five-minute break? We will be back on at 9:02 a.m. here. I'm not sure what the UTC time is. Hayley, do you know?

(Break)

Michael Salazar: Okay, guys. Let's reconvene here. We only have, I'm letting my screen, there we go. Is Kurt back on? You know what, I'll answer these and Kurt, if he gets back on, he can add some more information here. But, will reviewers if you penalize if they do not complete reviews in the allotted timeframe?

So, I thought that was a very interesting idea. We hadn't thought about penalizing. But to be quite frank, no, we don't expect there to be "a penalty." What I would do, or would say is we're going to look at, obviously, the overall processing timeline and where you're at, and are you able to, as a firm, meet the processing deadlines for the applications that have been handed to you for review. If you are falling behind or we get a sense that you're falling behind, we will start to take some of the applications and move them on to the secondary just to have them get processed through the allotted timeframe. So I think that's probably where the form of penalty might come from.

Will reviewers be responsible for handling applicant fees and how will consulting fees be paid? The reviewers or the panelists will not be responsible for handling the applicant fees. We will be responsible for handling the applicant fees.

In terms of the consulting fees and how those get paid, I think that's part of negotiating the contract. My assumption is that it will fall under standard

terms and conditions with ICANN and how we normally pay consultants, but again, I think the finalization of how that will be done will be during the contracting phase.

Question Number 38: Will it be necessary for panelists to have access to a number of facilities such as International Standards or other subscription material and what will happen with the cost for that?

That's actually part of your proposal. The way I see it, the way we see it is that we're hiring you as the panelists to deliver a score, to get through the review. Whatever resources you deem are necessary to provide a proper score that you can stand on, then absolutely, you should have access to those and we can talk again during the contracting phase what those costs look like. And it would be helpful for us if you could list in your proposal what you believe those anticipated costs are to deliver your services.

The last section is application management. Dan, I think this section's yours.

Dan Halloran: Yes, this is Dan Halloran again. So the records retention questions, we'd have to work out the details with each applicant. We will collaborate with you on something reasonable. In general, we expect that we will have the evaluators retain their work papers for at least throughout the evaluation period, and also for several years thereafter. There is some chance that some of these application evaluations could result in litigation and we would want you to maintain your records and make them available for that. And again, it's more complicated than we can go into on this phone call, and we would work out the details and specify them in collaboration with you as part of the contract that we enter. And I think that's all I've got on that.

Michael Salazar: Thanks Dan. Well that covers all the questions that were submitted to us. I'm now going to open it up for questions from the attendees on the call here. Again, on the bottom left hand corner of your screen is an icon that allows you to raise your hand. We will take questions using the raised hand icon approach. I would also remind you that please, limit your questions to asking any clarifying questions on our responses to the 42 questions that have been submitted.

Shahid?

Shahid: Yes. I just wanted to ask, you said that we would have to conduct presentations. I was just wondering what forms those presentations would actually take. Would they be done remotely or would we come to your offices and do them? If you could just clarify that, that would be great.

Michael Salazar: Would that be oral presentations, you mean?

Shahid: Yes.

Michael Salazar: Yes. I certainly we're keenly aware of the cost to travel here. If we can do them by video conference, I think that would be fine.

Shahid: Great.

Michael Salazar: If you're available to come on site, that's also fine.

Shahid: Great.

Michael Salazar: Eric?

Eric: Hi there. In response to the question regarding confidentiality of applications, you said that you might need to reveal some of the information and that applicants would be sort of consulted prior to that happening. I just wondered what circumstances you thought that might be necessary to reveal such information and if we, as applicants, would have the opportunity to say no.

Michael Salazar: Karen, I think that was, Karen or Kurt, I think that goes to you.

Karen Lentz: Just to clarify, you are talking about the, not a TLD application but the application's meeting the responses from all of you?

Eric: Yes. It is (50:50 unintelligible) of interest that we've currently submitted to you.

Dan Halloran: This is Dan Halloran. I think the question is just asking might you go through again what you verbally said about if we might ever need to release some of the information included in the submissions in response to our request for expressions of interest. I think Mike covered that. We can go back, if we can't provide additional detail or lay it out. The general idea, maybe I'll just leave it to Mike to restate, but we don't have any current plans to publish it. We would give you a chance to object if we ever had some reason to reveal some of it. The (51:34 unintelligible) if we received a subpoena, we might have to release some of that information, and we would give you a chance to object. We don't foresee other reasons right now where (51:48 unintelligible).

Michael Salazar: No, that's pretty much it, Dan.

Eric: Thanks for the clarification.

Michael Salazar: Debbie, you have the mic.

Debbie: I just wanted to clarify about the content management system. I don't know whether I missed the response to that question. Will ICANN CMS be extended?

Dan Halloran: This is Dan Halloran again, sorry about that. I was supposed to talk about Question 42 about the CMS and I missed that. Sorry.

I believe this is the question, is it about what we call the tasks, I forget with the acronym is. TLD Application System, which is the big online system that we're building to handle all the information. That's where applicants will put information. That's where we'll track things, posts from there. It's going to be the be all do all application interface for this whole system.

We do expect that the evaluators will work directly with that system and we will extend it to include some templates, ways for evaluators to upload information about the results maybe. But that said, the question here is pretty broad about all information and databases required to handle it.

So, especially in geographic names, we don't envision to build into our application processing system every single geographic names database or whatever you might need to handle that work. I imagine that would require the evaluators to build their own systems, and it might be as simple as searching already available databases that they already have subscriptions to, or maybe they would just use public internet search engines.

So our system will go out to the evaluators and they will be able to interface with it directly, but I don't know that we have promised that we'll cover every single aspect of what the evaluators will do in terms of data processing.

Debbie: Thanks.

Michael Salazar: Shahid, you have another question?

Shahid: Hi. I just thought it would be good if you could just maybe summarize what the next step is for companies that have already submitted their EOIs. If you could just give us like a brief summary so that we could (54:16 unintelligible) that would be great.

Michael Salazar: Yes. So obviously, the deadline is 15 September. I would suggest that you look through your current proposals. There is the financial template that has

been added as of 31 July. We would like you to either add an addendum to your existing proposal or if you want to resubmit the entire proposal, that's fine. But certainly, there's been some good dialogue on this call, which may or may not, impact your proposal. But, yes. So by 15 September, either submit or revise or update a proposal or at least submit information that goes along with what the financial template is asking for.

Shahid: Sure. Great.

Michael Salazar: Are there any other questions? I don't see any hands raised here so -well, one more.

Female: Sorry, just a quick question. When do you think the transcription of this call will be available? I'm hoping for early next week. First of all, it has to be transcribed, and then we have to go through it and review it, and then we will obviously post, but I'm hoping for early next week.

Female: And can I just clarify that we can still send questions in up until the 24th of August?

Michael Salazar: Yes.

Female: That's great. Thanks.

Michael Salazar: There was another hand raised. I think I just missed it here. I've got Jim.

Jim: Hi there. It's just a follow up on the question about the transcription. Will the participants of this call get a chance to see the transcript before it gets published? Do we get a chance to comment on, or check it for accuracy before it finally goes on the ICANN website?

Michael Salazar: No. That's not the intent. I think in terms of the accuracy, we've answered all the questions, so it's really being accurate, I believe, to our responses.

Dan Halloran: I think though that it's okay that the questioners also get a chance to look at how their questions are worded to make sure that's okay. Jim, if you think, and everybody on the call, if you think you could do that in a really brief period of time?

Jim: Yes. I was just thinking (56:48 unintelligible) see it a day beforehand just in case there's a possibility, let's see, that something has been overlooked or there's a wrong emphasis. I'm not suggesting for a second that it would be anything inaccurate in the transcription or what's published, but I do think

that it would be fair to give us a chance to at least review it before it goes out for general public consumption.

Dan Halloran: Sure. Yes, we can certainly accommodate that.

Jim: Thank you.

Michael Salazar: Are there any more questions? Going once. Going twice. All right. Well, listen everybody, thank you very much. Again, thank you for taking time out of your busy schedules to attend. Thank you for submitting the questions to us so that we could go through them online with you. And again, obviously, thank you very much for providing your responses by the original due date of June 11th. I hope we've been able to clearly answer all of your questions. As we just discussed, we will get this transcribed. We will send it out to everybody for comment before we post, and then we will have it publicly available for everybody.

And if you do have additional questions, yes, please feel free to ask those questions up through August 24th.

Kurt Pritz: This is Kurt, thank you.

Michael Salazar: Thank you very much.

END TRANSCRIPT