

# At-Large's Subsequent Procedures Scorecard:

## Different Types of TLDs

CPWG SubPro Small Team

Post At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group (CPWG) Call  
Wednesday, 4 March 2020, 13:00 UTC



## OVERARCHING ISSUES

Topic/Area:	<b>[7] DIFFERENT TYPES OF TLDs [2.2.4]</b>		Priority:	<b>MEDIUM</b>	Settled On:	
Related:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continuing Subsequent Procedures</li> <li>Community Applications [2.9.1]</li> <li>Feedback to Neustar's proposal for a 3-phased application model</li> </ul>					
Key Issues:	Assuming that there will be a next round of applications for new gTLDs (which looks to be recommended), should there be differential treatment and/or priority given to different categories of applicants and/or types of new gTLDs applied for?					
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, 16 February 2020</li> <li>SubPro WG Overarching Issues_Summary Document, 7 January 2020</li> <li><a href="#">At-Large feedback on Neustar's Proposal for 3-Phased New gTLD Application Model, 6 February 2019</a></li> <li><a href="#">01. SubPro WT1-4 IR – Neustar proposal ppt, 5 January 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?			
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support to maintain existing TLD types and to not create additional types.</li> <li>There were lots of different comments received via the last PC process. However, many of these relate to type of strings</li> </ol>	Affirming a difference between the <u>type of application</u> versus the <u>type of string</u> , and they are not necessarily dependent on one another. For eg, a standard application can apply for a geographic name string. In addition, the <u>type of applicant</u> may attract	Firstly, there needs to be elimination of confusion between differences in the 3 parameters of application vs string vs applicant. Once that is sorted, <b>is there any compelling reason to add to Standard vs Community-Based application type?</b>	Monitor implementation by ICANN Org of IRT recommendations.			

<p>and type of applicant, rather than (the 2 existing) types of applications.</p>	<p>additional impact within the evaluation process or contracting.</p> <p>Thus, per 2012 AGB, maintain only 2 types of applications – standard and community-based.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Further, creation of any additional application types should be done under exceptional circumstances and should be done via community processes.</p> <p>Any creation of additional application types, string types, or applicant types is done solely when differential treatment is warranted and is not intended to validate or invalidate any other differences in applications.</p>		
<p>3. Recognition of need for differential treatment of applications based on string type, applicant, or registry focus</p>	<p>WG recognises there may be circumstances where it makes sense to have differential treatment for an application based on either the type of string, the type of applicant, or registry focus. Such differential treatment may apply in one or more of the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Applicant eligibility</li> <li>• Application evaluation process/ requirements</li> </ul>	<p>Makes sense in theory. Could be an implementation issue.</p>	<p>Monitor implementation by ICANN Org of IRT recommendations.</p>

<sup>1</sup> Per 2012 AGB, “A standard gTLD can be used for any purpose consistent with the requirements of the application and evaluation criteria, and with the RA. A standard applicant may or may not have a formal relationship with an exclusive registrant or user population. It may or may not employ eligibility or use restrictions. Standard simply means that the applicant has not designated the application as community-based”.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Order of processing</li> <li>• String contention</li> <li>• Objections and appeals</li> <li>• Contractual provisions</li> </ul>		
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?
4. <a href="#">Insufficient consensus on recommending priority rounds for certain types of TLDs, even though discussion undertaken on idea for rounds consisting only of .brands, geonames, IDNs and/or community-based TLDs prior to general open application period.</a>	<p>Any recommendation on priority rounds for specific categories of TLDs.</p> <p>As presented in Applications Assessed in Rounds [2.2.3]</p>	Inconclusive since we did not reach consensus ourselves per <a href="#">At-Large feedback on Neustar’s Proposal for 3-Phased New gTLD Application Model, 6 February 2019</a> . Perhaps, this needs to be revisited given any new information.	
<b><u>PENDING ISSUES:</u></b>	SubPro PDP WG reaction	Anything missing?	What else needs to be done and by/with whom?
5. ICANN Org asked WG to explicitly state the requirements for each TLD type, whether applicants must declare the TLD type when submitting application, and whether changes to TLD types are permitted during the application process, prior to signing RA.	Unclear at this point. Could be an implementation issue.		

6. Possibly related to the topic of Application Queueing, is the question whether either type of applications or any type of string or any type of applicant should be “treated preferentially”	<a href="#">Refer to Application Queueing [2.6.1]</a>		<a href="#">Check on Application Queueing topic</a>
Position:			

DRAFT