

# At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Closed Generics

## CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call  
Wednesday, 11 February 2020, 19:00 UTC



## APPLICATION EVALUATION/CRITERIA

Topic/Area:	<b>[24] CLOSED GENERICS [2.7.3]</b>			Priority:	<b>HIGH</b>	Settled On:	
Related:	Single Registrant / Brand TLDs						
Key Issues:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pursuant to GAC Beijing Communiqué 2013, GAC advised that, “For strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal” (the “Category 2.2 Safeguard Advice”), and proceeded to identify a non-exhaustive list of such ‘generic’ strings applicable in the 2012 round affecting 186 applicants for potential Closed Generics.</li> <li>After ICANN solicited responses from those 186 applicants on their plans to operate strings as Closed Generics (through exclusive access registries, defined as registry restricted to a single person or entity and/or that person’s or entity’s “affiliates” per section 2.9c of the RA), all but 5 of the 186 applications agreed to withdraw their applications or change their TLDs to being “open”.</li> <li>A 2015 Board resolution gave the remaining applicants 3 options: (1) change to open registry; (2) maintain plan to operate Closed Generic and be deferred to next round, thus subject to new rules; or (3) withdraw and receive appropriate refund. <b>This effectively meant that Closed Generic / Exclusive Generic TLDs were banned in the 2012 round.</b> All 5 applicants – for strings: HOTELS, GROCERY, DVR, DATA, PHONE – eventually submitted change requests to “open” and these strings have since been delegated.</li> <li>Notwithstanding, what rules should apply to Closed Generic applications in subsequent procedures?</li> </ul>						
Policy Goals:	Charged with analysing impact of Closed Generics for future policy purposes, SubPro PDP WG generally agrees that some form of policy guidance should be drafted but it hasn’t reached consensus on path forward.						
Assigned CCT-RT Rec’s:	None						
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SubPro WG Application Evaluation/Criteria_Summary Document, 7 January 2020</li> <li><a href="#">03. SubPro Reserved Names, Closed Generics &amp; Registrant Protection, 20 August 2019</a></li> </ul>						
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<b><u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u></b>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?				
1. No consensus on path forward. In addition, per Board input, still subject to how to define “public	Unclear except to confirm no consensus on path forward. The	ALAC statement AL-ALAC-ST-0926-02-01-EN to SubPro IR expressed cautious qualified support for	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Revisit with GAC to establish currency / changes to underlying</b></li> </ul>				

<p>interest” and public interest goals</p>	<p>options considered, and which received varying responses, were:</p> <p><b>Option 1: No Closed Generics</b> – Formalize GNSO policy to disallow</p> <p><b>Option 2: Closed Generics with Public Interest Application</b> – Allow but require applicants demonstrate the CG serves a public interest goal in their application subject to Objection process</p> <p><b>Option 3: Closed Generics with Code of Conduct</b> – Allow but require applicant commitment to a code of conduct addressing concerns expressed by those opposed to CG (through a Community Objection-like process)</p> <p><b>Option 4: Allow Closed Generics subject only a Community Objection-like process</b></p>	<p>Options 2 and 3 in the spirit of finding a compromise.</p> <p><i>“Closed generics should be prohibited unless coupled with a Public Interest Application. Closed generics allow an applicant to have a potentially unfair influence over registration priority in a generic term, such as “app.” Additionally, closed generics lead to a slippery slope that could enable significant security risks for those particular strings, particularly for dotless domains as the SSAC found. Closed generics can exist – but they may introduce unintended security and stability issues which the SSAC should weigh in on. Thus, to completely eliminate this competitive and security threat, ICANN must prohibit their use.”</i></p>	<p>intent of GAC Beijing Communique 2013</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check for SSAC advice or ask for their current position?</li> <li>• Given the clear lack of consensus identified by SubPro PDP WG, we may want to be more prudent and alter our position to outrightly support Option 1?</li> </ul>
<p>What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?</p>	<p><b><u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u></b></p>	<p>Is this acceptable? If not, why so?</p>	<p>What else needs to be done and by/with whom?</p>
<p>2.</p>			
<p><u>PENDING ISSUES:</u></p>	<p>SubPro PDP WG reaction</p>	<p>Anything missing?</p>	<p>What else needs to be done and by/with whom?</p>
<p>Position:</p>			

DRAFT