

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

## CPWG SubPro Small Team

At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call  
Wednesday, 3 March 2020, 13:00 UTC



## OVERARCHING ISSUES

Topic/Area:	<b>[4] COST VS BENEFIT OF NEW gTLD PROGRAM</b>		Priority:	<b>HIGH</b>	Settled On:	
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Continuing Subsequent Procedures [2.2.1]</b></li> <li>• <b>Data collection, metrics, Global Public Interest – consumer trust, defensive registrations</b></li> <li>• Metrics</li> </ul>					
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"> <li>• Working Document_SubPro Draft Final Recommendations, <del>16 February 2020</del> 4 Mar 2020</li> <li>• SubPro WG Overarching Issues_Summary Document, 7 January 2020</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. 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.		Focus on addressing what must happen before the next round is launched - what must subsequent procedures address at the minimum through recommendation and implementation guidance?			

	<i>Rationale: No compelling reason to alter existing policy per CCT-RT Final Report.</i>		
2. Administration of program to be ongoing, orderly, timely and predictable	<u>Affirmation:</u> WG affirms Principle A from 2007 and recommends that the New gTLD Program must continue to be administered “in an ongoing, orderly, timely and predictable manner.”		
3. Primary purposes of new gTLDs – diversity, competition, utility	<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.		
<u>Impact of New gTLD Program – need for metrics, data collection.</u>  4. WG agrees with CCT-RT that “on balance the expansion of the DNS marketplace has demonstrated increased competition and consumer choice.”  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	<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.  <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. The WG notes that the CCT Review	Is the policy recommendation enough? The “mechanics” are being delegated to IRT as a matter for implementation.	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>a regular basis to help evaluate Program.</p> <p>6. IRT to use the initial metrics as part of the Identified Technology Health Indicators (ITHI) project<sup>1</sup></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>2018 Final Report<sup>2</sup> includes a series of recommendations regarding metrics. Work related to development of metrics should be in accordance with CCT-RT recommendations currently adopted by the Board, as well as those adopted in future.</p> <p><i>Rationale: WG noted contingency on support –</i></p> <p><i>[1] previous commitment to review, including a costs and benefits analysis advised by GAC per Helsinki Communique but points to CCT-RT commissioned studies</i></p> <p><i>[2] implementation of prerequisite and high priority CCT-RT recommendations “assigned” to SubPro PDP WG by the Board<sup>3</sup> - WG understands it is required to consider these but not necessarily required to agree with all outcomes and suggested solutions, opts to just describe the manner in which these were considered and how they were integrated into any final recommendations or not.</i></p>	<p>Were the studies commissioned by CCT-RT including economic analyses on marketplace competition and end-user/registrar surveys sufficient?</p>	<p><b>Revisit with GAC –</b></p> <p>[1] as to their push for cost-benefit analysis of new gTLDs per Helsinki Communique<sup>4</sup> – whether the lack of explicit recommendation is acceptable, or how to move forward.</p> <p>[2] as to their stance on CCT-RT recommendations per Montreal Communique<sup>5</sup> – whether the lack of explicit recommendation is acceptable, or how to move forward.</p>
--	--	--	---

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

<sup>2</sup> See: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/cct-final-08Sep18-en/pdf>

<sup>3</sup> See: ICANN Board resolution of 1 March 2019: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2019-03-01-en>

<sup>4</sup> See: <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann56-helsinki-communique>

<sup>5</sup> See: <https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann66-montreal-communique>

What has SubPro PDP WG concluded?	<b><u>What SubPro PDP WG will likely omit?</u></b>	Is this acceptable? If not, why so?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
<b><u>PENDING ISSUES:</u></b>	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
Position:			

DRAFT