

At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard: Continuing Subsequent Procedures

CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call
Wednesday, 19 February 2020, 13:00 UTC



OVERARCHING ISSUES

Topic/Area:	[4] COST VS BENEFIT OF NEW gTLD PROGRAM		Priority:	HIGH	Settled On:	
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing Subsequent Procedures [2.2.1] • Data collection, metrics, Global Public Interest – consumer trust, defensive registrations • Metrics 					
Key Issues:	While the question of “Costs vs Benefits” of the New gTLD Program remains unanswered specifically, it would appear that a round of applications for New gTLDs is likely to happen sometime in 2022 at the earliest. The ensuing question for At-Large then becomes what must happen before the next round is launched? What must subsequent procedures address at the minimum through recommendation and implementation guidance?					
Policy Goals:	(Captured under first column below)					
Assigned CCT-RT Rec’s:	None					
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working Document_SubPro Draft Final Recommendations, 16 February 2020 • SubPro WG Overarching Issues_Summary Document, 7 January 2020 					
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What will/might SubPro PDP WG recommend?</u>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?			
1. ICANN should maintain existing policy calling for subsequent applications	<u>Affirmation:</u> WG recommends that the existing policy contained in the 2012 AGB that a “systematized manner of applying for gTLDs be developed in the long term” be maintained.					

<p>2. Administration of program to be ongoing, orderly, timely and predictable</p>	<p><u>Affirmation</u>: WG affirms Principle A and recommends that the New gTLD Program must continue to be administered “in an ongoing, orderly, timely and predictable manner.”</p>		
<p>3. Primary purposes of new gTLDs – diversity, competition, utility</p>	<p><u>Affirmation</u>: WG affirmed that the primary purposes of new gTLDs are to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS.</p>		
<p><u>Impact of New gTLD Program – need for metrics, data collection.</u></p> <p>4. WG agrees with CCT-RT that “on balance the expansion of the DNS marketplace has demonstrated increased competition and consumer choice.”</p> <p>5. Fostering consumer choice, consumer trust to continue to be focus of Program requirement IRT to determine appropriate metrics and data required to measure metrics on a regular basis to help evaluate Program.</p>	<p><u>Recommendation</u>: Accordingly, WG recommends that meaningful metrics must be identified to understand the impact of the New gTLD Program. To review metrics, data must be collected at a logical time to create a basis against which future data can be compared.</p> <p><u>Implementation Guidance</u>: Metrics collected to understand the impact of New gTLD Program should, broadly speaking, focus on the areas of trust, competition, and choice. These metrics should be collected and analysed in accordance with the Board-adopted outputs of the CCT-RT.</p>	<p>Is the policy recommendation enough? The “mechanics” are being delegated to IRT as a matter for implementation.</p>	<p>At the very least, to monitor work of the IRT and provide inputs through IRT (if possible) or as Advice to Board (if necessary)</p>

<p>6. IRT to use the initial metrics as part of the Identified Technology Health Indicators (ITHI) project¹</p> <p>7. WG recognizes certain metrics may require collection of additional data from contracted parties not already collected under current RA and RAA, recommends ICANN Org to enter into discussion with Contracted Parties to determine what data needed to measure metrics on an ongoing basis and to include collection and use of such data in any subsequent RA and RAA, subject to applicable law.</p>			
<p>What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?</p>	<p><u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u></p>	<p>Is this acceptable? If not, why so?</p>	<p>What else needs to be done and by/with whom?</p>
<p>8. Insufficient pressure on ICANN to complete any previously committed reviews of the Program prior to opening subsequent rounds including a cost-benefit analysis of new gTLDs</p>	<p>Explicit recommendation on a cost-benefit analysis</p> <p>In some cases, definitive response to CCT-RT Final Report recommendations save to say consideration was given.</p>		<p>Revisit with GAC as to their push for cost-benefit analysis of new gTLDs – whether the lack of a recommendation is acceptable, or how to move forward.</p>

¹ See: <https://ithi.privateoctopus.com/metrics.html>

<u>PENDING ISSUES:</u>	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
Position:			

DRAFT