

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP

April 2017 Newsletter

**Note: all upcoming meetings are subject to change. For current scheduling information, please visit the [GNSO Master Calendar](#). The Working Group [scheduling document](#) and [list of upcoming topics](#) are also useful reference materials for WG members.

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

Overall Working Group

Current Status:

The Working Group held two productive meetings at ICANN58: A face-to-face [working session](#) and a [community dialogue](#). The Working Group co-chairs attended a number of other sessions to provide updates and answer questions about the PDP, and to encourage further community dialogue on the introduction of new gTLDs.

In Copenhagen, the leadership team announced that a face-to-face working session would be held at ICANN59 to work through substantive proposals from the community and a path forward for policy development with respect to the use of geographic terms at the top level. In preparation for the face-to-face working session, the Working Group announced a [25 April webinar](#) open to the entire community, which will provide a background on the history of these issues as well an opportunity to hear the variety of positions held by different members of the ICANN community. Although we understand that issues may still exist with geographic strings at the second level, we are focusing at this point in time exclusively at the top level. All are welcome to [register](#) and participate.

The Working Group is now accepting input on specific topics in its [Charter](#) through [Community Comment 2](#) (CC2). Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, and Constituencies received letters inviting them to respond to the CC2 survey. Community members are also encouraged to submit responses using the [public comment](#) tool. Finally, applicants for the 2012 round of new gTLDs were also provided with the CC2 questions and encouraged to respond. The deadline is 1 May 2017.

The Working group is continuing to prepare [preliminary outcomes](#) for the overarching subjects in the WG's [Charter](#), incorporating input received through [Community Comment 1](#) (CC1). Three drafting teams are supporting this work, each with a specific focus: different TLD types, predictability/community engagement, and "rounds" for application assessment. These drafting groups are still open for those with knowledge on the topics.

The WG is reviewing the [Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team's](#)

[\(CCT-RT\) Draft Report](#) on the 2012 round of new gTLDs and the recommendations contained therein. The WG notes that a number of the recommendations, if finalized, will require additional work for the WG on a variety of issues. It is therefore assessing those recommendations and will likely be submitting comments on that report by the end of April.

Next Steps:

The full Working Group will be considering input from a number of sources in its upcoming meetings, including responses to [Community Comment 2](#) (CC2) and recommendations from the [Draft Report](#) of the [Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team \(CCT-RT\)](#).

Work Track 1

Current Status:

In March, the WT focused on [Registry Service Provider Accreditation/Certification](#) and [Clarity of the Application Process](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT1 [working document](#).

ICANN58 [working session](#) highlights:

- Discussed draft CC2 questions related to registry service provider accreditation/certification. The group considered the underlying problems that an RSP accreditation/certification program seeks to solve, the benefits of such a program as well as possible risks.
- Reviewed data on service level agreement monitoring of registry functions and implementation and funding of the EBERO program.
- Deliberated on draft CC2 questions related to clarity of the application process. In particular, the group discussed the importance of a comprehensive knowledge base for applicants and efficient collection of information by ICANN.

[28 March](#) meeting highlights:

- Reviewed input received during the ICANN58 face-to-face working session.
- Discussed the cost recovery model for application fees, and in particular whether cost recovery should be viewed holistically or on a “breaking even” basis for a specific application window.
- Revisited setting a price “floor” and “ceiling” for the application fee and deliberated on the potential risks of setting a fee that is too low or too high. A summary will be provided during the 11 April meeting.

Next Steps:

WT1 has meetings scheduled for 11 April (topic: [Registry Service Provider Accreditation/Certification](#) and application fee costing) and 25 April (topic: continuation of 11 April discussions).

Work Track 2

Current Status:

In March, the WT focused on policies behind the prohibition of [Closed Generics](#), as well as the need and justification for [Reserved Names](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT2 [working document](#).

[2 March](#) meeting highlights:

- Reviewed the history of closed generic application and current status.
- Discussed the definition of closed generic as a term and a category.
- Began to develop a list of possible benefits and harms associated with the operation of closed generic TLD registries.
- Raised the broader question of how to address areas of the Applicant Guidebook related to closed generics that changed or progressed after the GNSO PDP recommendations were agreed upon.

ICANN58 [working session](#) highlights:

- Revisited draft CC2 questions regarding closed generics. The group discussed its potential scope of work under the Charter on this topic and further inputs to be considered.
- Reviewed draft CC2 questions related to reserved Names and a request from registries to have a definitive list of reserved names under Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement.

[30 March](#) meeting highlights:

- Examined arguments included comments from the [2013 Report of Public Comments on Closed Generic gTLD Applications](#).
- Deliberated on possible benefits and harms associated with the operation of closed generic TLD registries.
- Analyzed the application of broader concepts, such as public interest, in the context of policy related to closed generics.

Next Steps:

WT2 has meetings scheduled for 13 April (topic: [Closed Generics](#)) and 27 April (topic: [Registrar Non-Discrimination](#) & [Registry/Registrar Separation](#)).

Work Track 3

Current Status:

In March, the WT focused on [Community Applications](#), [String Similarity Reviews](#), and [String Confusion Objections](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT3 [working document](#).

[7 March](#) meeting highlights:

- [Introduced the topic of community applications](#), including the Community Priority Evaluation process.
- Heard a presentation about the [Council of Europe report](#) on community applications from report co-author Kinanya Pijl.

- Continued to discuss a [proposal from the Registry Stakeholder Group](#) on the String Similarity Review and String Confusion Objections.

ICANN58 [working session](#) highlights:

- Reviewed draft CC2 questions about community applications. The group discussed some of the recommendations in the Council of Europe report, including the proposal that prospective applicants submit an expression of interest for a community TLD, after which objections may be raised.
- Revisited draft CC2 questions on String Confusion Objections. The group highlighted arguments on both sides of the discussion about consumer confusion with respect to singular and plural versions of a TLD. The group also discussed the challenges of building a consistent framework for addressing singulars and plurals across languages, and particularly for IDN TLDs.

Next Steps:

WT3 had a meeting scheduled for 4 April, which was rescheduled for 10 April (topics: [Community Objections](#), [Community Applications & Community Priority Evaluations](#)). The WT will also meet on 18 April (topics: [Community Applications](#), [Community Priority Evaluations](#) and [Applicant Freedom of Expression](#)).

Work Track 4

Current Status:

In March, the WT focused on [Name Collisions](#) and [Applicant Evaluations](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT4 [working document](#).

[6 March](#) meeting highlights:

- Discussed the status quo related to name collisions in legacy TLDs under different circumstances: 1. use of a previously unregistered domain 2. use of DNS suffix list and 3. use of a previously registered domain.
- Reviewed the name collision framework for the 2012 round, which required passing a controlled interruption period and being able to respond within two hours for life-threatening collision reports for the first two years of delegation.
- Several participants expressed support for developing no new policy on this topic.

ICANN58 [working session](#) highlights:

- Reviewed draft CC2 questions on the issue of name collisions. The group discussed the importance of predictability in procedures related to this issue.
- Revisited draft CC2 questions related to applicant evaluation. Participants shared some potential responses to the questions in this section of CC2.

Next Steps:

The WT4 call originally scheduled for 6 April was canceled. The WT will meet on 20 April (topics: [IDNs](#), [Security and Stability](#), [Name Collisions](#)).

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

In June 2014, the GNSO Council established a Discussion Group that was intended to evaluate the experiences of the 2012 round gTLD Program and to identify possible areas for future GNSO policy development. The Discussion Group's [deliverables](#) served as the basis for the GNSO Council's request for a Preliminary Issue Report in June of 2015.

Following the publication of the [Final Issue Report](#), the GNSO Council adopted the [Charter](#) for the PDP Working Group, which began its work in February 2016. The Working Group initially concentrated on a set of overarching issues, and has since established four separate Work Tracks to consider specific topic areas: Work Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach, Work Track 2 - Legal/Regulatory, Work Track 3: String Contention/Objections & Disputes, Work Track 4: Internationalized Domain Names/Technical & Operations.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The [Discussion Group](#) on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures identified a number of subjects that may require further analysis and possible formulation of policy language. There are [existing policy recommendations](#) adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board, which will remain in place unless the PDP WG determines that changes are needed.

To join this effort, please email the GNSO Secretariat: gns0-secs@icann.org
All are welcome!

MORE INFORMATION

- PDP Working Group Workspace Wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/RgV1Aw>
- PDP Working Group Charter: <https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw>
- PDP Working Group Active Project Page: <https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures>