



UPDATE & CONSULTATION ON  
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures  
*Summary for Consensus Building/Affirmation*

**CONTINUING SUBSEQUENT  
PROCEDURES,  
METRICS & MONITORING (v03)**

Justine Chew  
29 June 2020

# Reminder of Key Issues in SubPro

---

## Continuing Subsequent Procedures

- Do we really need another round of new gTLDs?
- What's the cost vs benefit of expanding the DNS space?  
How are we measuring this?
- If new round proceeds, then prerequisite and high priority recommendations of the CCT-RT must be implemented first



## COMPETITION, CONSUMER CHOICE & TRUST (CCT) RECOMMENDATIONS

- To do with Metrics!!

- **What is the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures (“SubPro”)?**
  - ❖ The set of rules and mechanisms applicable to the next round for New gTLDs, i.e. they DO NOT apply to legacy TLDs, ccTLDs, or delegated new gTLDs or those still unresolved from the 2012 application round
  - ❖ “An update” to the 2012 Round rules and mechanisms

# Summary of Consensus Positions

## SubPro PDP WG on “Continuing Subsequent Procedures”

### Affirmation #1

- WG recommends that the existing policy contained in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, that a “systematized manner of applying for gTLDs be developed in the long term,” be maintained

#### Part of WG’s Rationale

*“WG understands that it is required to consider all CCT-RT recommendations directed to it via the 01 March 2019 ICANN Board resolution, but is not necessarily required to agree with all outcomes and suggested solutions. Accordingly, final report will describe manner in which all relevant CCT-RT recommendations were considered and how they were or were not integrated into any final recommendations.”*

### Affirmation #2

- WG affirms Principle A from the 2007 policy and recommends that the New gTLD Program must continue to be administered “in an ongoing, orderly, timely and predictable way”.

### Affirmation #3

- WG affirms that the primary purposes of new gTLDs are to foster diversity, encourage competition, and enhance the utility of the DNS.

### For At-Large Consensus Building/Affirmation

Agree that there is no compelling reason to override policy for continuing the Program – administration, application process – however, we maintain:-

- There is no rush to have new applications, more important to improve application process – “get it right” than have ad hoc fixes post implementation which have not undergone community input
- In principle, prerequisite and high priority recommendations of the CCT (and RPM?) Reviews need to be implemented first (*with specifics to be taken up during deliberation on CCT-RT recommendations*)
- Policy developed by SubPro PDP must continue to be subject to future review(s) based on issues stemming from implementation of SubPro as well as community input
- Affirmation #3 must permeate all aspects of Program

# SubPro WG Rationale for Affirmation #1

---

## Affirmation #1

- WG recommends that the existing policy contained in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, that a “systematized manner of applying for gTLDs be developed in the long term,” be maintained

### WG Rationale

- The existing policy for New gTLDs states that there will be a “systemized manner of applying for gTLDs to be developed in the long term.” In affirming the continuation of this policy WG applied the consistent approach outlined in Section xx [the introduction] of this report.
- WG took note of the Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust Review Team (CCT-RT) Final Report, which states that “on balance the expansion of the DNS marketplace has demonstrated increased competition and consumer choice”. While it recognizes that some parties believe the New gTLD market to already be saturated others have indicated that they are aware of interested potential applicants, including dot Brands. Overall, WG did not agree that a compelling reason was identified to override existing policy.
- WG also took note that support from some parties was contingent on the basis of other elements being completed prior to the eventual launch of subsequent New gTLDs (e.g., previous commitments for review of the New gTLD Program, including a costs and benefits analysis as advised by the GAC in its Helsinki Communiqué). WG agreed that determining what dependencies might need to be completed prior to program launch is outside of its remit and should be decided elsewhere (e.g., ICANN Board).
- In addition, WG believes that the number of studies commissioned on behalf of the CCT-RT, including economic analyses on marketplace competition and end-user/registrar surveys, and which ultimately fed into the CCT-RT’s determination of increased competition and consumer choice, address at least in part the GAC’s request for a costs and benefits analysis.
- WG took note of the GAC Advice contained in the Montréal Communiqué, which states that future rounds should not begin until the prerequisite and high priority recommendations of the CCT-RT are implemented. WG understands that it is required to consider all CCT-RT recommendations directed to it via the 01 March 2019 ICANN Board resolution, but is not necessarily required to agree with all outcomes and suggested solutions. Accordingly, this report will describe the manner in which all relevant CCT-RT recommendations were considered and how they were or were not integrated into any final recommendations.

# Summary of Consensus Positions

---

SubPro PDP WG on “Metrics & Monitoring”

## Recommendation #1

- 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.

### Implementation Guidance

- Metrics collected to understand the impact of New gTLD Program should, broadly speaking, **focus on the areas of trust, competition, and choice.**
- WG notes that the CCT-RT 2018 Final Report includes a series of recommendations regarding metrics.
- Work related to the development of metrics should be in accordance with CCT-RT recommendations currently adopted by the Board, as well as those adopted in the future.

### For At-Large Consensus Building/Affirmation

Agree in principle.

Even though there is guidance to refer to metrics highlighted in CCT-RT report and elsewhere, this area is very much the scope of IRT. So we input there and monitor?

# SubPro WG Rationale for Recommendation #1

---

## Recommendation #1

- 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.

### Implementation Guidance

- Metrics collected to understand the impact of New gTLD Program should, broadly speaking, **focus on the areas of trust, competition, and choice**.
- WG notes that the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review's 2018 Final Report includes a series of recommendations regarding metrics.
- Work related to the development of metrics should be in accordance with CCT-RT recommendations currently adopted by the Board, as well as those adopted in the future.

### WG Rationale

- Agreed that fostering consumer choice, consumer trust, and market differentiation must continue to primary focal points for the New gTLD Program, and therefore areas around which measures of success should be established, data collected, and effectiveness measured.
- The PDP briefly sought to try and identify metrics for success but ultimately determined that this exercise is more appropriately completed during the implementation phase, in accordance with Board-approved recommendations of the CCT-RT. WG believes that an implementation review team should determine the appropriate metrics, and the data required, to measure such metrics on a regular basis to help evaluate the New gTLD Program.
- WG recognizes that certain metrics may require the collection of additional data from the contracted parties which may not already be collected under the current Registry and Registrar Agreements. The Working Group therefore recognizes that ICANN Org may need to enter into discussions with the Contracted Parties during implementation to determine what, if any, data may be needed in the future to measure these metrics on an ongoing basis, and to include the collection and use of such data in any subsequent Registry and Registrar Agreements, provided that such collection and use is in accordance with applicable law

# Summary of Consensus Positions

---

SubPro PDP WG on “Metrics & Monitoring”

## Recommendation #2

- ICANN org must establish metrics and service level requirements for each phase of the application process including each during the review, evaluation, contracting and transition to delegation stages. ICANN must report on a monthly basis on its performance with respect to these key performance indicators.

### For At-Large Consensus Building/Affirmation

Agree. ICANN must be able to report on the performance of each phase of the application process.

## Recommendation #3

- ICANN org must further develop its Service Level Agreement (SLA) monitoring to allow for more robust ongoing monitoring of TLD operations.
- ICANN org must publish anonymized, aggregate SLA monitoring data on a regular basis.

### For At-Large Consensus Building/Affirmation

Agree. ICANN must have better and more actionable reporting for monitoring TLD operations, especially to support pre-emptive actions against RO failure and any triggering of EBERO.

# SubPro WG Rationale for Recommendation #2

---

## Recommendation #2

- ICANN org must establish metrics and service level requirements for each phase of the application process including each during the review, evaluation, contracting and transition to delegation stages. ICANN must report on a monthly basis on its performance with respect to these key performance indicators.

### WG Rationale

- Predictability is a key factor supporting the success of applicants as they proceed through contracting and delegation phases of the New gTLD Program.
- Registries will be better positioned to successfully implement business plans if they have a clear understanding of how long steps of the contracting and delegation process will take.
- Therefore, WG recommends that the ICANN Org publish and adhere to specific timeframes and deadlines throughout these processes to ensure predictability for registries and allow them to plan effectively.



# SubPro WG Rationale for Recommendation #3

---

## Recommendation #3

- ICANN org must further develop its Service Level Agreement (SLA) monitoring to allow for more robust ongoing monitoring of TLD operations.
- ICANN org must publish anonymized, aggregate SLA monitoring data on a regular basis.

### WG Rationale

- WG agreed with ICANN org's recommendation that in order to streamline RST by removing certain tests, ICANN should be relying on ongoing monitoring of TLD operations against existing contractual requirements.
- In a public comment to the WG's Initial Report, the SSAC noted that, "In general, it is preferable to discover major failures before delegation instead of after the TLD is in operation. Past performance is not a guarantee of future performance." However, WG believes that expanded operational testing in conjunction with more robust ongoing monitoring will better ensure that registries are able to meet SLAs.
- To support the development of recommendations on this topic and related topics, WG requested that ICANN org provide WG with statistics resulting from SLA monitoring and data on EBERO thresholds reached.
- WG believes that from a transparency perspective and to support future policy development, the ongoing publication of similar data will benefit the ICANN community and the New gTLD Program.
- WG noted that it could be beneficial to publish anonymized responses given in relation to failures in order to provide context for the statistics, for example if there was an error in the monitoring process.
- WG encourages further consideration of this issue during the implementation phase.