QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original* *transcript*
1. Is there a timeframe laid down by ICANN for the completion of each evaluation?	Not necessarily. Our focus is on processing all of the applications across each phase and we will develop appropriate metrics to measure progress. ICANN is relying on the panelists, as experts, to devise a process that will be able to evaluate a large number of applications within a given time frame. Part of this is a learning process where you bring your expertise to the table and say to us "if we process the applications this way we can get through them all or we can get through 300 in two months or 300 in four months". Again, we are relying on you to provide an answer. If we receive several hundred applications that make it extremely difficult for teams (ICANN staff and panelists) to effectively scale, we will manage expectations in the community by indicating that it may take longer than originally anticipated to get through each phase.
2. How quickly does ICANN require applications be processed by the Evaluators? Is there a general target of X months after the close of the application period to make results public? Does ICANN have or anticipate any other general evaluation time targets that would help to set expectations for Evaluator processing rate?	What ICANN has communicated to the community is that applications would go through the Initial Evaluation phase in a 4 ½-month timeframe. We anticipate that the time from when the application period closes until the TLD is actually delegated in the root zone is a total of 7 ½ or 8 months, depending on all the other processes that need to go on. Other processes include a normalization step to get consistency across all evaluations, the opportunity to ask Applicants clarifying questions and have them respond, and publish results.
3. Based on your previous experience, how long should it take consulting companies to complete each review?	See answers to questions 1 and 2.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript
4. Is there a minimum number of resources you expect us to devote to the review tasks (both technical and financial)?	We would expect enough resources to get through the process as quickly as possible while maintaining consistency of the results. Consistency can be gained through having very few individual panelists or having some sort of normalization step after the scoring is done by several individual panelists. For example, if you get 100 applications and hand them out to 100 panelists, then you may be done in a few days but you might have 100 inconsistent results. Giving 100 applications to 1 panelist would ensure consistency but not timeliness. The EOI asks you to give us your sense of being able to process applications from 100 up to a 1,000. If you have a 4 ½-month timeframe to get through Initial Evaluation and receive 1,000 applications then you're going to need more resources to meet the time requirements.
5. Other organizations conducting similar evaluations designate that a panel can be made up of a single person. How many individual people are envisaged for each panel pertaining to each individual application in relation to the string similarity and geographical names panels?	See answer to question 4.
6. With regard to the issue of transparency, security and conflicts of interest, if a member of the management team of the appointed organization highlights either knowledge of or affiliation to an applicant is it enough that this is declared and a non-biased, external panelist appointed or would there be a requirement for more than one panelist to be appointed in this instance?	We recognize this is a general issue. It's more complicated than we can deal with fully on the conference 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. 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 to comment as 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. We will be posting that although timing has not been decided.

QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original* [transcript]
7. It is not unthinkable that during the evaluation process, the examiners will at some time have a conflict of interest. The issue that raises is: How will ICANN guarantee the independence of the examiners? Has ICANN set out the criteria defining a conflict of interest and how to proceed in case of the conflict of interest and will the evaluator be allowed to provide his view on what in his experience and business is typically perceived as a conflict? Can a remediating procedure be put in place so that in case of a conflict of interest, a process should be put into place allowing the engagement of a third party either to supervise the work of the examiners or conduct the evaluation themselves?	See answer to question 6.
8. How will ICANN initiate this project i.e. will there be kick off/progress meetings, etc. that consulting firms will have to attend?	We are in the process of designing the processes and software to handle all applications. ICANN will have probably 80% to 90% of those processes complete with the remaining work to be done with evaluation panelists as they are selected and come on board. We expect that the panelists will 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. We will provide training, including trial runs, to get a better sense of how long it's going to take to process the applications including identifying issues or concerns that need to be addressed before we start to accept the applications. We will have program management activities as well including status reporting which will be finalized as we engage with the panelists.
9. Can you provide us with a walk through detailing how the applications will be received, how they will be processed and what interaction reviewers will have with applicants and ICANN i.e. a workflow of the entire review process?	There is a high level flow chart on the very last page of Module 1 of the Draft Applicant Guidebook that provides an overview of all steps. As discussed in the response to question 8, the detail processes are still in development, and we will be working with each of the panelists to refine those.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript
10. What support will ICANN provide to consulting firms throughout the review process?	In terms of support, ICANN is ultimately responsible for coordinating all aspects of the evaluation process and we expect to provide guidance throughout the evaluation period. We'll also work on a separate normalization process to help ensure the consistency across all the applications. We'll coordinate and handle communication with the public as well as posting results. You may be involved in some of these steps, but we will certainly work through those tasks with you. At a minimum, panelist responsibilities include: -reviewing each application and any associated public commentary -asking clarifying questions where necessary -determining the score on the particular question.
11. What is the expected number of applications?	The official answer is 500 plus or minus 400. There are obviously various estimates out there, but we're building on the assumption of between 300 and 500 applications to scale our processes. But clearly, we are asking you, as the responding panelists, to give us an indication of how you're going to scale from 100 applications up to 1,000 applications.
12. Will reviewers receive applications as they come, in several batches during the application period, or in one batch after the application period closes?	That's going to depend on a number of factors; the number of applications received, your ability/capacity to process applications, and potential conflicts of interest. We will not, at least we do not foresee, sending out any of the applications to the panelists until the application submission period has closed. At that point, ICANN will complete the completeness check to make sure that all the information is actually in hand and then we will start sending them out to the panelists for review.

27 August 2009

QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original [transcript]
13. Will there be a need for any onsite work at client locations, and if so, how will expenses related to this be handled?	No. We do not anticipate the panelists performing any evaluation activities onsite at an Applicant's location. We expect the evaluation activities to be done remotely. There will be travel on occasion to meet with ICANN staff, including any formal kick-off, on-boarding, and periodic program updates. We ask that an indication of anticipated costs be included in the proposal and how these costs are expected to passed on to ICANN. In addition, with certain types of evaluations we would almost expect the panelists to be geographically dispersed or be from different regions to understand any cultural aspects that might impact the evaluation as well as meet multilingual requirements as needed.
14. Do you have a sample application with the assessment criteria that we can review?	We'll answer this in 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. There have been a few iterations of that application form along with the criteria. The latest one is an excerpt of the Draft Applicant Guidebook that was posted in May. ICANN staff can point anybody to that who hasn't seen it already. That's the latest version that we have. If the question was focused on having a sample application form filled out by somebody, meaning an example of what a completed application might look like, we haven't developed a mock up of an application to this point. That could be something that we would do as part of on-boarding the panelists. If the question is trying to get a sense of what an application might actually look like that the panelist 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.

QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript*
15. Will ICANN provide feedback to individual Applicants prior to the close of the Initial Evaluation Period or will all feedback be posted after the close of the application period? Similarly, will extended evaluations be handled in-line during the application period, or separately after the application period has closed?	The answer depends on what is meant by feedback. During the Initial Evaluation period, the panelists 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 panelists 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 the Initial Evaluation phase. So when all applicants have completed that phase then 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. Extended Evaluation is a later period, it doesn't start until the Initial Evaluation has closed and all applicants have gone through that phase. 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 to proceed to Extended Evaluation.
16. May an Applicant appeal Scenario 7 "Fail" for Extended Evaluation (Module 1, Section 1.1.4)? In general, does ICANN contemplate an appeal or reconsideration process beyond the Reviewers (i.e. directly to ICANN)?	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. 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. However, those processes are designed to address specific types of unfairness or specific types of complaints. They are not intended as an opportunity for an applicant who hasn't passed Extended Evaluation to get another opportunity to have more evaluation activities performed.

27 August 2009

QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original* transcript
17. Why has the EOI process been extended to allow further organizations to express interest in the panels? Will priority and preference be given to those organizations that completed their EOIs in ICANN's originally stated timeframe?	Our goal has and continues to be to select the most qualified firms to provide evaluation services. This is not a reflection of the responses received. We value the fact that you provided responses on time and we think the responses are very well detailed in your approach. However, as we posted in our extension notice on the 31st of July, we have to manage for potential conflicts of interest while ensuring we will have the capacity to process all evaluations within our timeframes. The 4 ½-month period for the Initial Evaluation being an example of one of those timeframes. The EOI has been opened up to address those two concerns and we are moving forward with selecting a primary, a secondary, and a contingent third party firm for the panels where it makes sense.
18. Why is ICANN re-opening the EOI?	See the answer to question 17
19. In what way(s) are the current responses unsatisfactory?	See the answer to question 17
20. Are all responses from each of the organizations that completed EOIs in ICANNs originally stated timeframe being held in confidence?	Yes. We do not 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.
21. What will happen after the reopened EOI deadline, will a short list be interviewed?	We are tentatively scheduled to identify the firms in early to mid-November. We expect to identify a short list and conduct oral presentations; however we are still finalizing those details. 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. We will then notify the primary, and if applicable, the secondary and contingent third party firms shortly thereafter.

27 August 2009

QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript

22. Can ICANN clarify what the next stage(s) of the process will be for bidders who will be short listed for each of the panels? How many bidders will be short listed for each panel? What will ICANN expect each selected bidder to provide in the way of additional information and by when and when do ICANN expect to make a final decision on the bidders who will make up each of the panels?	See the answer to question 21
23. The 31-July posting on the ICANN web site introduces the concept of "primary and secondary service providers." Under what conditions does ICANN anticipate utilizing a secondary provider? Will secondary providers be selected from this same round of proposals? If so, additional guidance may be appropriate regarding economics, service levels, and other expectations as a "standby backup" model differs from a "primary" model.	The goal is to have the primary panelist handle a majority of the applications. We will evaluate conflicts of interest, capacity, quality and other minimum standards and will reserve the right to allocate applications amongst the panelists based on such criteria. The criteria will be discussed and agreed to during contract negotiations.
24. How many consulting firms will be selected as authorized application reviewers, and what, if any cooperation will there be between them?	Where possible, we expect to have a primary, secondary, and contingent third party panelist firm for each panel.
25. Is ICANN hoping that bidders will come together in revised joint responses?	No.
26. Does ICANN want to have a single prime contractor for the work?	We are not looking for a single contractor for all the work. We expect to have multiple panelist firms.

27 August 2009

QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript
27. It is understood that, at the request of the ICANN Board, further work is currently being undertaken by ICANN staff to provide greater specificity on the definition of a country or territory name. Is this work now complete and if so can the information be made available prior to the closure of the final EoI process?	ICANN sharpened the definition of what a country and territory name is so that it's now essentially defined by a list 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 Draft Applicant Guidebook is written today, it's translation into any language.

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 Draft Applicant 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 Draft Applicant Guidebook, so I would rely on that in formulating your responses. |
| 28. Is there a list of government contacts that may assist in confirming the authenticity of supporting documentation for an application or is the successfully appointed organization expected to compile its own contact database? | 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 are 83 members of the GAC, and so, GAC members can be used as a point of contact. And also, if you read the Draft Applicant Guidebook, it lists the offices within the government that should be consulted. Generally, it specifies a ministry level, although senior bureaucrats might be allowed and certain departments are preferred over others. The Draft Applicant Guidebook would tell the Applicant where they have to go and would tell the panelist to look for one of those members of government. |

QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original* [transcript](#)
29. Given the broad complexity of IDN gTLDs, there being over 7,000 languages spoken in the world today with the majority of written languages represented by in excess of 80 scripts, there may be occasions where the GNP fail to identify that an applied for gTLD is representative of a geographical name in a certain language and/or script. Would it be feasible for the GNP to devise a 2 stage process; whereby a preliminary decision on a requested gTLD is made by the panel, followed by a cooling off period (say 2 weeks) where the GNP may publish the preliminary results of its deliberations against the given criteria and solicit input from the public prior to 'rubber stamping' any decision.	The process as conceived does not have a public review period. The candidate service provider is encouraged to develop an independent review or quality assurance check into their process. While, there will be numerous combinations (with 300 possible applications and many languages), the examination in most cases is anticipated to be straightforward. There was an attempt to narrow the inquiry to the official language in every country and the six U.N. languages but that wasn't broad enough - there was significant criticism of that. One problem with a public review or a pre-evaluation is that every single evaluation ICANN does would probably benefit from a review. There are safeguards. ICANN has developed a 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. 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.
30. The string similarity algorithm currently supports the following scripts: Arabic, Chinese, Cyrillic, Devanagari, Greek, Japanese, Korean and Latin. Is there a timeframe for other scripts to be added?	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 than that's something that we would look at.

QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript
31. What level of professional indemnity insurance would ICANN require or would the appointed organization be covered under ICANN's own professional indemnity insurance policy?	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, the amount would vary. We could require that the primary technical evaluator might have a different level of insurance than the secondary geographic names panel or something. So we 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.
32. How will the newly requested financial information be used by ICANN? Given that the table for presentation is high level would ICANN accept a range of prices at this stage rather than absolute numbers? Will any quoted numbers be taken as binding on the bidder or perhaps a maximum ceiling and will there be future flexibility for the bidder to revise its costs, especially as the application and evaluation processes are not yet finalized?	We really are focused here on 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 we will say is that we would expect the estimates to be within reason. 20% to 25% of actual cost is reasonable. We 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. |
| 33. The financial template appears to suggest that organizations must submit EOIs for all of the panels. How can the template be filled out for those organizations who are responding to a subset of the panels? | Only fill out for the panels on which you would like to provide services. There is no need to complete information for all panels. |
| 34. The financial template appears to suggest that each of the evaluations by each of the panels will result in a single fixed cost. How does ICANN plan to accommodate the fact that the complexity of the evaluations may be very different across the entire population of gTLD proposals? | We realize that there are going to be complex evaluations. We suggest that you provide a list of assumptions as to how you've come up with your pricing. 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. That can certainly be one of your assumptions as you start to fill out your pricing. |

QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript
35. Design of the criteria for the evaluation of applications is ongoing at this time and this has a bearing on cost for any successfully appointed organization, e.g. a requirement for the String Similarity Panel to look into trademark collision may significantly increase the time required to evaluate each application. Will there be an opportunity to re-visit and revise costs according to the actual criteria to be employed by the successful organization?	Yes as we start negotiating contracts. However, as discussed in question 32, we expect your proposed costs to be within reason (20% to 25%) of actual. If significantly more hours are incurred then we want your proposal to be clear how this will handled. This includes describing what you expect these hours to consist of, your definition of "significant", how you will anticipate and communicate this with ICANN to seek approval before incurring the hours, and your rates per hour.
36. Will reviewers be penalized if they do not complete reviews in the allotted timeframe? If so, what form will this penalization take?	Depends on how penalized is defined. We will evaluate overall processing timelines, quality, and how well you are achieving agreed-on metrics. If metrics are not being met or quality falters we will re-allocate applications as necessary.
37. Will reviewers be responsible for handling applicant fees and how will consulting fees be paid to consulting organizations by ICANN?	ICANN will handle applicant fees. Our expectation is that consulting fees will be paid under ICANN standard terms and conditions and will be discussed during the contracting phase.
38. It will be necessary for the panels to have access to a number of facilities such as International Standards and other subscription based metadata registries. Is the cost of these facilities to be borne by the organization appointed or may these be claimed as disbursements in addition to the amounts quoted in the costs template?	We expect this to be part of your proposal. Our expectation 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
39. What is the records retention policy (time, handling etc.) for the application records?	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

QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original* [transcript](#)
	we enter.
40. Does ICANN have a policy and/or standard for records destruction?	See the answer to question 39
41. What record retention policy will ICANN require their selected service providers to maintain records of application evaluation process documentation separate from the application information?	See the answer to question 39
42. It is noted that a Content Management System (CMS) is proposed for New gTLD Applicants. Will this CMS be extended to include the relevant templates, information and databases required for the facilitation of the Geographical Names and String Similarity Panels or will the organization appointed be required to design and manage their own CMS?	Applicant data is expected to be housed in the TLD Application System (TAS), which is the online system ICANN is building. Applicants will put their data there and we'll track things, posts from there. It is intended to be the "do all" application interface for this process. 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. With 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. We 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 we don't know that we have promised that we'll cover every single aspect of what the evaluators will do in

QUESTION	RESPONSE
	Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript
	terms of data processing
43. The second part of question 29 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.	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.
44. 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.	In the interest of minimizing costs (i.e., travel to Marina del Rey) conducting oral presentations by video conference will suffice.

27 August 2009

QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original* [transcript]
45. In response to the question regarding confidentiality of applications, you said that you might need to reveal some of the information and those 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.	As mentioned in question 20, we do not have any current plans to publish the responses. We would give you a chance to object if we ever had some reason to reveal some of it. There may be situations such as 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.
46. 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	Yes. The deadline to submit your final response is 15 September, 2009. 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. So by 15 September you should either submit an addendum to your existing proposal outlining the costs from the financial template or submit a revised proposal.
47. 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?	Yes, it will be provided to the attendees of this call prior to public posting.

QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original* transcript
48. KPMG is working on a report on minimum registry criteria. When will this be published? What will be the impact of that report on: (a) the selection of gTLD evaluators; (b) the submission of gTLD bids; (c) the operation of the gTLD evaluation process? How will this report affect the current timetable? It is my understanding that these questions will be answered and published on the website. Is this correct? If so, when do you expect this to happen?	KPMG is working on a benchmarking study that will help refine the scoring criteria to be used by the panelists in evaluating applications. This report will have no bearing on the selection of panelists, the submission of gTLD applications or the timetable to begin accepting gTLD applications. The report is expected to be published in September.
49. In review of the Attachment to Module 2, Evaluation Questions and Criteria, many of the questions related to Demonstration of Technical & Operations Capacity refer to the Registry Business Plan, yet we did not see that as part of the applicants required submission. Is this something that the applicant is submitting? If so, when will it be submitted and how will it be made available to the applicant review panels?	While a single document containing the various elements of a business plan has not been requested, many of these elements are being captured through the various questions within the application itself. We are still evaluating if a formal complete business plan must be submitted by an Applicant.

27 August 2009

QUESTION	RESPONSE *Responses for questions 1 through 47 are based on the 11 August, 2009 Respondents Conference Call - see original transcript*
50. For a New gTLD String Similarity Examiners I would like to bring up the following issue as a question: I believe that a must for the examiners, especially for IDNs, is being familiar with a language alphabetic and characters in computer sciences, Unicode and related topics. I am not sure whether a unique international organization is available who can declare a full knowledge and surround on all languages. It's obvious that this panel must contain different professionals from different nations with different languages. The question is that: Can an entity express its interest in cooperation with panel in its related territory and language?	Yes. However, we will only contract with one primary, one secondary, and one contingent 3rd party panelist firm. If two or more panelist firms team up to provide a response we will expect that the panelist firms will have agreed which firm will serve as the Prime contractor and which will serve as the Sub-contractor(s) and all contractual agreements between such firms will be executed prior to signing a contract with ICANN. The Prime contractor will be responsible for the evaluation services provided by its Sub-contractor(s) in its role as a primary, secondary or contingent 3rd party panelist.
51. For a New gTLD Geographic Names Panel I would like to bring up the following issue as a question: I am not sure whether a unique international organization is available who can declare a full knowledge and surround on all geographical names even in local languages. It's obvious that this panel must contain different professionals from different nations with different languages. The question is that: Can an entity express its interest in cooperation with panel in its related territory and language?	See the answer to question 51