

Initial Assumptions | Subsequent Procedures Operational Design Phase

28 February 2022

Prepared by ICANN org

The Subsequent Procedures Operational Design Phase (SubPro ODP) Work Track Leads have reviewed the 300+ outputs of the [SubPro Final Report](#) and have collaboratively developed a set of initial assumptions for presentation and discussion during the ICANN73 SubPro ODP webinar. The purpose of these assumptions is to ensure that there is shared understanding of the meaning and implications of the outputs.

Overarching/cross-functional assumptions

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
<p>Affirmations of 2007 policy recommendations equate to current policy recommendations.</p> <p>Affirmations of 2007 Implementation Guidelines will be treated as Implementation Guidance.</p>	<p>Affirmation 36.1: The Working Group affirms the following recommendations and implementation guidelines from the 2007 policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Principle F: “A set of operational criteria must be set out in contractual conditions in the registry agreement to ensure compliance with ICANN policies.” ● Recommendation 10: “There must be a base contract provided to applicants at the beginning of the application process.” ... ● Implementation Guideline J: “The base contract should balance market certainty and flexibility for ICANN to accommodate a rapidly changing marketplace.” 	<p>Clarification of what constitutes current policy, even if the output is not indicated as a ‘recommendation’</p> <p>Example: Affirmation 36.1 affirms both 2007 recommendations and 2007 implementation guidelines</p>

IRT and SPIRT (Predictability) (Topic 2)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
Implementation decisions should skew toward the most simple, clear, precise solution.		In the rationale discussion for Topic 2, Predictability, the Final Report states that “As the IRT considers implementation details, it should keep in mind that the solution should be as clear, simple, and precise as possible.”
<p>The Predictability Framework does not change the roles and responsibilities of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the ICANN Board. ● the ICANN organization in relation to implementation of policies. ● the Implementation Review Team in relation to implementation of policies. 		The roles and responsibilities of the ICANN Board, Community, and Org are defined in the Bylaws and other procedural documentation. We don’t read anything in the Final Report that suggests a change to these roles.

Applications Assessed in Rounds (Topic 3)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
Applications must be assessed in rounds unless or until the GNSO Council revises this policy recommendation to allow for a different methodology of application submission and assessment.		<p>The PDP WG’s rationale for this requirement is that “rounds enhance the predictability for applicants, the ICANN community, and other third-party observers to the program.”</p> <p>The 2007 policy recommendations required that applications be</p>

		<p>assessed in rounds, “until the scale of demand is clear.” The SubPro PDP Working Group considered and affirmed this recommendation, in Topic 3, Applications Assessed in Rounds, noting that “Given the period of time between the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program and the eventual launch of the next application procedure, the scale of demand is unclear. Accordingly, at a minimum, the next application procedure should be processed in the form of a round.” Per these recommendations, there is no policy basis for a different methodology.</p>
<p>It is not necessary for org to close out all applications from a round before a new round can be opened.</p>		<p>In consideration of Final Report outputs for topic #3, and specifically IG 3.3.</p>
<p>It is up to the org to develop a round closure and/or transition procedure as needed in line with these recommendations.</p>		<p>It may not be feasible for org to maintain and support numerous simultaneous rounds. Recommendation 3.2 allows for the establishment of criteria for opening future rounds which may include the need to close prior rounds.</p>

Different TLD Types (Topic 4)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
The priority order of processing for IDN strings should continue in future rounds.		Given the outputs 4.1 and 19.3, IDN applications should continue to receive priority.

Registry Voluntary Commitments/Public Interest Commitments (Topic 9)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
We will develop a process to include a newly developed process to determine if an applied-for string falls into 1 of 4 groups as noted in the NGPC Framework .	Recommendation 9.4: The Working Group recommends establishing a process to determine if an applied-for string falls into one of four groups defined by the NGPC framework for new gTLD strings deemed to be applicable to highly sensitive or regulated industries. This process must be included in the Applicant Guidebook along with information about the ramifications of a string being found to fall into one of the four groups.	Policy requires a process to be established.
The AGB will be updated to address the criteria for the newly proposed evaluation panel to determine which of the four categories (as outlined in the NGPC Framework) an applied-for string falls under.	Implementation Guidance 9.6: During the evaluation process, each applied-for string should be evaluated to determine whether it falls into one of the four groups, and therefore is subject to the applicable Safeguards. An evaluation panel should be established for this purpose, the details of which will be determined in the implementation phase. The	The current NGPC Framework will be utilized as a supporting document/reference for this recommendation.

	panel should be composed of experts in regulated industries, who will also be empowered to draw on the input of other experts in relevant fields.	
--	---	--

Application Fees (Topic 15)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
The application fee will be calculated according to the same three components as in 2012 (historical development costs, expected application processing costs, and risk costs).		Affirmation 15.1 and Affirmation with Modification 15.3 and 15.4 reaffirm the approach used in the 2012 round.

Applicant Support (Topic 17)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
Fee reduction will be available to eligible applicants. The Applicant Guidebook will contain a list of enforceable eligibility criteria for the Applicant Support Program.	Recommendation 17.1: The Working Group recommends that as was the case in the 2012 round, fee reduction must be available for select applicants who meet evaluation criteria through the Applicant Support Program...The Working Group believes that the high level goals and eligibility requirements for the Applicant Support Program remain appropriate. The Working Group notes, however, that the Applicant Support Program was not limited to least developed countries in the 2012 round and believes that the	This also relates to Output 15.3 (Application Fees): "Application fees may differ for applicants that qualify for applicant support." Continuing/expanding the Applicant Support Program goes hand-in-hand with ICANN's commitment to making IDN/UA the focus of the next round. Global engagement cannot be achieved without providing additional opportunities for assistance (both financial and non-financial) to those who need it. It is important that ICANN develops the criteria/framework for the Applicant Support Program prior to opening of the

	Program should continue to be open to applicants regardless of their location as long as they meet other program criteria.	application round so that eligibility and evaluation criteria can be detailed in the Applicant Guidebook, as was the case with other evaluation panels/procedures in the previous round.
--	--	--

Closed Generics (Topic 23)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
We will not develop specific proposed solutions for Closed Generics as part of the ODP until the GAC/GNSO Council process has been completed.	No outputs in the final report.	The Board is currently waiting on the completion of the GAC-GNSO process prior to making a decision on this recommendation.

IDNs (Topic 25)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
IDNs will be an integral part of the next round.	Affirmation with Modification 25.1: With the change in italicized text, the Working Group affirms Principle B from the 2007 policy: “Internationalised domain name (IDNs) new generic top-level domains should continue to be an integral part of the New gTLD Program.” Principle B originally stated, “Some new generic top-level domains should be internationalised domain names (IDNs) subject to the approval of IDNs being available in the root.”	Diversification of the gTLD space is a key priority for ICANN, and ensuring there are IDN applicants is essential in achieving ICANN’s goals of increasing diversity.
Compliance with Root Zone Label Generation Rules will	Recommendation 25.2: Compliance with Root Zone	The RZ-LGR is the authority for generation of IDN labels

<p>be required for IDN TLDs and variants and IDN TLDs must also be compliant with IDNA2008</p>	<p>Label Generation Rules (RZLGR , RZ-LGR-2, and any future RZ-LGR rules sets) must be required for the generation of TLDs and variants labels, including the determination of whether the label is blocked or allocatable. IDN TLDs must comply with IDNA2008 (RFCs 5890- 5895) or its successor(s). To the extent possible, and consistent with Implementation Guidance 26.10, algorithmic checking of TLDs should be utilized.</p>	<p>and should be followed in developing of procedures for IDNs in the next round</p>
--	---	--

Security and Stability (Topic 26)

Assumption	Relevant Output	Rationale & Supporting References
<p>ICANN will honor the principle of conservatism when adding new gTLDs to the root zone and will focus on the rate of change for the root zone rather than the total number of delegated strings. ICANN will delegate TLDs at a rate such that the overall amount of TLDs in the root zone does not increase by more than 5 percent per month</p>	<p>Recommendation 26.2: ICANN must honor and review the principle of conservatism when adding new gTLDs to the root zone.</p> <p>Recommendation 26.3: ICANN must focus on the rate of change for the root zone over smaller periods of time (e.g., monthly) rather than the total number of delegated strings for a given calendar year.</p> <p>Implementation Guidance 26.4: The number of TLDs delegated in the root zone should not increase by more than approximately 5 percent per month, with the understanding that there may be minor variations from time-to-time.</p>	<p>To ensure security and stability, ICANN must ensure that TLDs are added at a consistent and conservative rate, and that rate of change must be monitored over a smaller period of time.</p> <p>In line with the principle of conservatism and monitoring the rate of increase of TLDs in the root, ICANN should not allow the amount of TLDs in the root zone to increase by more than 5 percent per month.</p> <p>RSSAC031: The rate of change is more important than absolute magnitude. Based on historical trends since 2014 and our operational experiences, the RSSAC strongly recommends that the number of TLDs delegated in the root zone</p>

		<p>should not increase by more than about 5% per month, with the understanding that there may be minor variations from time-to-time. The Appendix provides some data and context for this recommendation.</p> <p>https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/rssac-031-02feb18-en.pdf</p> <p>The recommendations in topic 26 seem to come directly from this and SAC100:</p> <p>https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/sac-100-en.pdf</p>
--	--	--

End of document.



One World, One Internet

Visit us at icann.org



[@icann](https://twitter.com/icann)



facebook.com/icannorg



youtube.com/icannnews



flickr.com/icann



linkedin/company/icann



soundcloud/icann



instagram.com/icannorg