

# New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG Final Report

## GNSO Council Webinar

Flip Petillion, GNSO Council Liaison  
Cheryl Langdon-Orr & Jeff Neuman, WG Co-Chairs

28 January 2021



# Agenda

---

- Welcome and Introductions
- History and Overview of the PDP and Final Report
- Council Liaison Dialogue with the Co-Chairs
- Q & A with Attendees

# History and Framework: The Past Rounds

---

- The First Round of 2000: Proof of concept round for possible future introductions
- The Second Round of 2004: The round of sponsored gTLDs
- 8 August 2007: GNSO releases final overarching recommendations for introducing new gTLDs
- June 2011: ICANN Board adopts the Applicant Guidebook
- January 2012: Third round opening the gTLD market for all interested applicants

# History and Framework: What About Future Rounds?

---

- Original policy recommendations adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board have “been designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanisms for applicants to propose new top-level domains”.
  - Those policy recommendations remain in place for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program unless the GNSO Council decides to modify those policy recommendations via a policy development process.
- 17 December 2015: Council initiated a Policy Development Process and chartered the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group.
  - Task: The Working Group was chartered to, where needed:
    - develop new policy principles, recommendations, and implementation guidance
    - clarify, amend, or replace existing elements

# History and Framework: What About Future Rounds?

---

- 22 February 2016: First meeting of the Working Group
  - Open membership model: 250 members and observers in the SubPro Working Group.
  - Dozens of issues to address regarding the 2012 New gTLD Program.
  - Active participation of all Cs, SGs, as well as GAC and ALAC. ALAC/ccNSO/GAC/GNSO had leadership roles in Geographic Names at Top Level work track.
  - Community input from **six** Public Comment periods and outreach to the ICANN community.
    - Community Comment #1: June 2016
    - Community Comment #2: March 2017
    - Comment on Initial Report: July 2018
    - Supplemental Initial Report: October 2018
    - GeoNames at Top Level Report: December 2018
    - Draft Final Report: August 2020

# The Final Report

---

- The culmination of the work completed by the Working Group over a period of nearly 5 years.
- Includes, without modification, the Final Report produced by Work Track 5.

# The Final Report: Information Per Topic

---

- a) Recommendations and/or implementation guidelines
- b) Deliberations and rationale for recommendations and/or implementation guidelines
- c) New issues raised in deliberations since publication of the Initial Report, if applicable
- d) Dependencies/relationships with other areas of this report or external efforts

# Working Group “Outputs”

---

- There are 5 types of outputs included in the report:
  - a) Affirmation: An element of the 2012 New gTLD Program was, and continues to be, appropriate/acceptable for subsequent procedures. Absent agreement for a change, the “status quo” is the default position.
  - b) Affirmation with Modification: The WG recommends a relatively small adjustment to the existing policies or implementation.
  - c) Recommendation: The WG expects these to be approved and implemented consistent with the WG’s intent; Often address what the Working Group recommends takes place.
  - d) Implementation Guidance: The WG strongly recommends the stated action, with a strong presumption that it will be implemented, but recognizes that there may exist valid reasons to not take the recommended action exactly as described; Often refers to how a recommendation should be implemented.
  - e) No Agreement: In one case, there no agreement on recommendations and no clear “status quo” or default position.



# Consensus Designations

---

- All but 1 of the topics received a designation of either Full Consensus or Consensus.
  - 25 topics received Full Consensus
  - 16 received Consensus
  - 1 received a designation of Strong Support but Significant Opposition (Topic 35: Auctions: Mechanisms of Last Resort / Private Resolution of Contention Sets)
- Within each of the topics that received either Consensus or Strong Support but Significant Opposition, outputs within the topic that achieved Full Consensus or Consensus are specified.
  - For example, in Topic 2, the overall designation for the Topic is “Consensus.” That said, Outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 had “Full Consensus”, but Output 2.3 had Consensus.
- Annex C provides detail about the consensus designations for all the topics and outputs.

# Next Steps

---

- The Final Report and outputs are being delivered to the GNSO Council for its consideration.
  - Recommendation to Council is to consider this Final Report as one Package and send to Board as is.
- Once adopted by the GNSO Council, they will be submitted to the ICANN Board for consideration.

# Final Report Highlights: Important Changes

---

- Absent agreement in the Working Group to change existing 2007 policy and/or 2012 implementation, the “status quo” prevails.
- Basic Foundation of New gTLD Program similar to 2012
- Some new highlights for changes include:
  - Registry Service Provider Pre-Evaluation
  - Predictability Model
  - More robust Applicant Support Program
  - String Similarity Review: Singular/plural versions of a word
  - Improvements to Community Priority Evaluation

# Final Report Topics for Further Discussion

---

- The following topics may require further discussion by the GNSO Council/community:
  - Mitigating DNS Abuse (included under Topic 9)
  - Public Interest Commitments / Registry Voluntary Commitments (included under Topic 9)
  - Closed Generics (Topic 23)
  - Mechanisms of Last Resort / Private Resolution of Contention Sets (Topic 35)

Questions?