

# New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Planning Assumptions



Prepared by Global Domains Division  
2 November 2019

# Agenda

---

1. Background
2. Areas of Feedback
3. Next Steps
4. Questions/Discussion

# 1. Background

# Preamble

---

ICANN org's readiness to support future rounds of new gTLDs requires an upfront commitment to design and build an operational infrastructure (people, processes, systems). However, the demand and the number of applications in the next and subsequent rounds is not known; therefore, assumptions must be made to determine the scope and level of investment. ICANN org has defined a set of assumptions for use in its preliminary planning work. The assumptions are developed based upon a number of factors, including but not limited to current policy and implementation guidelines as well as lessons learned from the 2012 round. The goal in defining these assumptions is to identify any areas of misalignment and any assumptions that should be added or adjusted to drive the work going forward.

# Categories of Assumptions

---

Timeline to next round

Application planning

Policy implementation

Readiness activities

Systems & tools

Operational processes

People

Costs

# Planning Assumptions Engagement

## Engagement with the ICANN Board and community



## 2. Feedback Received

# Feedback: Timeline to Next Round

## 1.2 Completion of Processes

Policy implementation, readiness activities and operational processes will be completed prior to the opening of the next round.

### Feedback From: ALAC

- Questions about timeline for reviews and prerequisites for opening of next round
- Suggestions that process is rushed while still open issues to be addressed



# Feedback: Application Planning (1)

## 2.2 Application Volume

The application volume, in the next round, will be roughly the same number of applications as in the 2012 round: ~2,000 applications.

Feedback From: SubPro PDP WG members, BC, GNSO Council

- Questions about rationale, data, or other basis for using 2,000 applications as assumption
- Suggestions for deriving more information to inform demand/volume estimates, e.g., market research, outreach campaign as system design has cost implications
- Suggestions to use more ranges or volume tranches for planning scenarios rather than a single number

# Feedback: Application Planning (2)

## 2.4 Prioritization

Application prioritization will be required to effectively sequence application processing.

Feedback From: SubPro PDP WG members

- Noted that it will be up to the PDP group to provide a recommendation on prioritization

# Feedback: Application Planning (3)

## 2.5 Delegation Rate

There will be no changes to the 1,000 TLDs/year maximum delegation rate.

Feedback From: ALAC, RSSAC, SSAC

- 1000 TLDs/yr limit had administrative basis, not relevant to root zone security
- Numerical limit not the right approach
- Rate of change more important than absolute magnitude; more study needed on safe pace of new strings
- Recommendations to ensure new gTLD delegations can be delayed if instabilities arise, develop monitoring/early warning capabilities, investigate long-term obligations of maintaining larger root zone

# Feedback: Application Planning (4)

## 2.6 Ongoing Procedures

For ongoing subsequent procedures, ICANN org assumes an annual application window of one to three months in duration, with subsequent application windows opening during the same timeframe, once per calendar year.

### Feedback From: SubPro PDP WG members

- Questions about this assumption as no conclusion from PDP on this
- Suggestion that specific windows for pre-defined categories are not considered

# Feedback: Policy Implementation

## 3.1 Policy Implementation

There will be changes to the program implementation, based on the preliminary recommendations of the three (3) initial reports published by the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group.

Feedback From: SubPro PDP WG members

- Question about whether ICANN org has considered using multiple Implementation Review Teams (IRTs) to assist with implementation

# Feedback: People

## 7.3 Outsourcing

Org will outsource critical application functions such as application evaluation and objection processing, to expert firms with requisite subject matter expertise.

Feedback From: ALAC, SubPro PDP WG members

- Questions about this in relation to assumption 5.6 in Systems, “Internal knowledge and expertise will be prioritized, and as little as possible will be outsourced.”
- Suggestion that evaluation and objection functions are most important for accountability of process

# Feedback: Costs

## 8.2 Cost Tracking

Tracking of program readiness costs should begin as rapidly as possible, in order to capture development costs prior to the launch of the next round. Comprehensive cost planning for program readiness and operations is critical to accurate reporting and management of costs.

Feedback From: ALAC

- Questions about how ICANN org is currently tracking costs in relation to and how this tracking is expected to proceed.

# Other Questions & Suggestions

---

- Support for the transparency in sharing planning assumptions (General)
- Include assumptions that safeguards and DNS abuse issues will be addressed before developing new round (BC)
- We ask that the Org provides a realistic, goal-oriented plan of how it intends to help more Universal Acceptance (UA) compliance to be achieved (BC)
- Before opening the next round, all previously committed reviews of the prior round should be completed, and recommendations from those reviews should be approved by the ICANN Board (BC)
- Consider including the degree of certainty in each of the assumptions and develop a plan for addressing situations that vary with the assumptions (contingency planning) (RySG)
- We urge ICANN to continue this planning process even in advance of the completion of the SubPro PDP (RySG)
- Significant concern that last round of new gTLDs appears to have introduced the phenomenon of TLDs with exceptionally high rates of abusive registrations; concern that a further round of new gTLDs could be delegated prior to comprehensive metrics and mitigations being put in place (SSAC)



# 3. Next Steps

# Next Steps

---

Following discussion at ICANN66, looking at how to:

- Publish summary and analysis from this cycle of feedback.
- Continue to monitor feedback and discussions impacting assumptions
- Review assumptions on a regular basis to determine if changes are warranted

## 4. Discussion/Questions

# Annex: Slides ALAC Webinar August 2019

---

# New Round Operational Prep

Presentation by Jonathan Zuck

# Issues Still Outstanding

- Critical Exercise for sure, but...
- Makes assumptions that are still open issues in SubProc
- Need more study on safe pace of new strings
- An Arbitrarily Volume of New Applications
- Fails to Establish a Critical Path Beyond SubProc
- Inconsistent Outsourcing
- Confusing Estimations for Cost and Application Support
  - Should there be targeted funding for AS?
  - Should AS applications be given priority?
- Assumptions on 2,000 Applicants
  - Based on arbitrary standard
  - Estimates range from 500 to 25,000 applicants