

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:	[5] PREDICTABILITY FRAMEWORK (up for 1 st time public comment)	Priority:	MEDIUM	Settled On:	
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supersedes Predictability [2.2.2] & Clarity in Application Process [2.2.2.2] New entity: Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team (“SPIRT”) 				
Key Issues:	<p>How should changes to the program be introduced to address unanticipated issues after the AGB is approved?</p> <p>To recap, some significant changes were introduced after the 2012 program was launched, thus hindered predictability, eg. digital archery/ prioritization issues, name collision, RA changes, Public Interest Commitments.</p>				
Policy Goals:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principle A¹ states <i>“New generic top-level domains (gTLDs) must be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way.”</i> To the extent that issues arise, after the Applicant Guidebook is approved that may result in changes to the program and its supporting processes, those issues must be resolved in a manner that is as predictable, transparent, and as fair as possible to the impacted parties To promote the predictable resolution of issues, the community should rely on a Predictability Framework, specific to the New gTLD Program, that guides the selection of mitigation mechanisms In the event significant issues arise that require resolution via the Predictability Framework, applicants should be afforded the opportunity to withdraw their application from the process and receive an appropriate refund The Predictability Model intends to complement the existing GNSO processes and procedures and is not intended to be a substitute or replacement for those, nor should the Model be seen as supplanting the GNSO Council’s decision-making authority. In fact, the GNSO processes and procedures are incorporated into the Predictability Framework explicitly. In the event of a conflict, existing GNSO processes and procedures take precedence. 				
Assigned CCT-RT Rec’s:	None				
References:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New Predictability Framework Document, 16 February 2020 02. SubPro Predictability Framework Update to CPWG, 11 January 2020 SubPro WG Overarching Issues_Summary Document, 7 January 2020 				

¹ GNSO’s Final Report on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains

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. The need for revamped predictability framework and proposal for PC on high level details of such a framework.	Please refer to 02. SubPro Predictability Framework Update to CPWG, 11 January 2020	Thoughts?	
What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
2.			
<u>PENDING ISSUES:</u>	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
Position:			