**GNSO/GAC Facilitated Dialogue on Closed Generics**
**15 May 2023 Meeting Notes**

During this meeting, Closed Generic (CG) Dialogue Participants discussed the new gTLD Application Comment period in the context of closed generic gTLDs. The group also discussed how a proposed scoring system may be applied, and how to best ask an applicant to explain why operating their generic gTLD in a closed manner best serves the public interest.

**Participants discussed the following:**

- Participants discussed whether the current Application Comment period, as laid out by the 2012 new gTLD Applicant Guidebook and the new gTLD SubPro PDP Final Report, is sufficiently applicable to closed generic gTLDs.

- Participants in support of maintaining a single comment period for all gTLD applications, including closed generic gTLDs, noted that the SubPro PDP Working Group discussed the addition of other categories of gTLDs but recommended a single Application Comment Period (Rec. 28.14). Participants also noted greater awareness of closed generic gTLDs ahead of this subsequent round, therefore a 60 day comment period is sufficient for closed generic gTLDs. Participants expressed concerns that the addition of another comment period would delay other New gTLD Program processes.

- Participants in support of an additional comment period dedicated to closed generic gTLDs noted that the standard 60 day comment period is not enough time for competitors or the public to understand and formulate responses regarding the impacts of a closed generic gTLD application. Participants also noted the unique nature of closed generic gTLDs, necessitating more time to obtain useful feedback for evaluators to consider. This dedicated comment period could potentially follow or be in parallel with the Early Warnings step of the new gTLD evaluation process.

- Participants discussed the proposed scoring system and whether it should entail weighted criteria, pass-fail criteria, a threshold score to meet, or whether such details should be left for subsequent policy development. Participants expressed concerns about the predictability of a scoring system that is too subjective, and the challenges that may result from how a failed application was scored. It was suggested to provide potential indicia of how particular criteria might be scored/weighed for subsequent policy group consideration.

- Participants discussed whether an applicant must explain why their public interest goal(s) is best served by operating the gTLD in a closed manner. Some participants expressed support for this concept, while others expressed concern about stipulating "best" served as opposed to just "served". Potential compromise language was discussed and will be revisited for group feedback.

**Participants generally came to agreement on the following:**

- The group broadly agreed that a list of closed generic gTLD application submissions should be published, which is aligned with the standard process for all new gTLD applications.
- The group broadly agreed there should be a scoring system, but recommendations for how this scoring system should be applied are still under discussion.

**ACTION ITEMS:**
- Participants to review the Closed Generics Framework v3 document and add comments for how to address any notable concerns with the framework elements
- Participants to review the materials shared on the mailing list regarding application Objections and Challenges, in preparation for the next meeting.
- Staff to propose updated text based on the group's discussion.