

GNSO/GAC Facilitated Dialogue on Closed Generics

05 June 2023 Meeting Notes

During this meeting, Closed Generic (CG) Dialogue Participants discussed the definitions section of their preliminary draft framework¹, which is a remaining “red line” item for participants. The group discussed how to address current definitions (such as “Affiliates”) as they relate to identifying closed generic gTLDs.

Participants discussed the following:

- The group reviewed four possible options of text denoting what a “closed” generic gTLD entails. The first option was drafted by staff based on the participants’ discussions so far, which the group provided input on via the mailing list. The second option was the same as the first but shorter, in consideration of comments requesting the latter part of option 1 to be removed. The third and fourth options were alternative text proposed by participants via the mailing list, providing more details than the first or second options.
- Several participants noted their preference for option 4 as it provided examples of entities that the group discussed are not technically “affiliates” but could nevertheless be part of the overall registry entity that qualifies for a CG gTLD. Some participants expressed concern that it was not clear in option 4 that the group is not proposing changes to the existing definition of “Affiliates”, which could impact other types of gTLDs.
- Participants discussed supplemental language to add to option 4 in order to clarify that other non-affiliate entities may be identified in policy work, but these should only apply to closed generic gTLDs and not open, community, geographic, or other types of gTLDs.
- The group discussed the timing of sharing a draft framework with the community and briefly what should be presented during their two open sessions at ICANN77.
- It was inquired whether participants must agree or disagree to a final framework after community feedback is considered, or whether participants may choose to abstain. Some participants noted that abstention may be an option, but would hopefully not be necessary.

Participants generally came to agreement on the following:

- Bearing in mind relevant definitions found in the Base gTLD Registry Agreement, (e.g. “Affiliate” and “Generic String”), the group agreed that there are several other relationships and entities beyond the narrow definition of “Affiliates” that must be included as potential registrants and beneficiaries in a closed generic gTLD, depending on the operational model of the gTLD.
- Specifically, the group identified (a) members of a trade association, where the trade association is the registry operator, (b) independent chapters that are members of a larger federation or organization where that federation/organization is the registry

¹ Note: As a result of this call, the “Definitions” section of the Draft Framework was retitled to the “Approach to a Broad Understanding of Closed Generic gTLDs”.

operator, and (c) members of a consortium of similar organizations, where the consortium is the registry operator.

- The policy group that takes up the Closed Generics issue may identify additional relationships and entities. These additional categories would be their own sub-group (separate from Affiliates) that applies only to Closed Generic gTLDs. These should not impact any other types of new gTLDs including Open, Community, Geographic or other types of new gTLDs set forth in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Final Report.
- The group broadly agreed that their draft framework should be shared with the GNSO Council and the community for consultation prior to ICANN77.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Participants to prepare for their next meeting when they will discuss a way forward on Public Comments for closed generic gTLDs and decide whether their Draft Framework is ready to be shared with the community for feedback.
- Staff to update the Closed Generics Framework v4 document based on today's discussion and comments submitted by participants.