

GNSO/GAC Facilitated Dialogue on Closed Generics

24 May 2023 Meeting Notes

During this meeting, Closed Generic (CG) Dialogue Participants discussed the annex to their preliminary framework, as well as their proposed scoring criteria. Participants next discussed the evaluation process for CG gTLDs, specifically pertaining to evaluation challenges and Public Comments.

Participants discussed the following:

- The group discussed the disclaimer text that would precede the annex portion of their draft framework. Some participants wished to clarify in this disclaimer that the questions contained in the annex were not all discussed by the group, in scope for the group's work, nor checked for duplication with the work conducted by the SubPro Working Group. Participants also clarified that the annexed questions should be included for illustrative purposes and not intended to be answered by a subsequent policy group.
- Participants discussed whether a scoring system “may”, “will”, or “should” allow for a range of possible scores based on the CG applicant's answers to application questions.
- Participants discussed their proposed scoring indicia and whether they should be included in the framework as potential guidance for future policy work. Some participants objected to the idea of scoring a string's “genericness”, opting instead for the specificity or scale of a given string, so as not to impact existing definitions of “generic”.
- The group discussed whether evaluation challenges are appropriate for closed generic gTLDs, and it affirmed that they are.
- Participants discussed the new gTLD evaluation process and whether an extended or secondary Public Comment period for CG gTLDs is necessary. Participants expressed that interested parties should have a reasonable amount of time to understand, formulate, and provide Public Comments, however the delay to the initial evaluation process remains a concern. As a compromise, it was proposed that if a certain threshold of CG gTLD applications is met, then the Public Comment period could be extended.
- The group discussed their timeline for producing a draft framework for community input.
- Participants requested ICANN staff to reorganize the draft framework document, flag potentially duplicative elements, and suggest how to make the document more readable and understandable.

Participants generally came to agreement on the following:

- An annex containing the questions that were proposed but not answered by the group is appropriate for inclusion in the draft framework, but only for informational purposes, not as questions that subsequent policy work must address.
- Participants agreed that a scoring system should allow for a range of possible scores based on the applicant's answers to application questions.

- Evaluation challenges are appropriate for closed generic gTLDs.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Participants to work asynchronously on the Remaining Red Lines document
- Staff to update the Closed Generics Framework v3 document with additional broadly-agreed framework elements based on the group's discussion.
- Staff to suggest updates to the Closed Generics Framework v3 document to make it more readable, logical, and cohesively present the group's agreements so far.