

## SUBSEQUENT APPLICATION ROUND

ICANN works towards future rounds of new gTLDs taking place at regular and predictable intervals without indeterminable periods of review and, absent extraordinary circumstances, application procedures will take place as such. A new round may be initiated even if steps related to application processing and delegation from previous application rounds have not been fully completed.

The ICANN Board will begin deliberations to determine the specific timing of future rounds as soon as the the following criteria have been met:

1. The list of applied-for strings for the ongoing round has been confirmed and the window for string change requests has closed. This will provide applicants in a subsequent round with an understanding of which strings can be applied for.
2. ICANN org is operationally prepared to receive and process a new batch of applications.

Absent extraordinary circumstances, future reviews and/or policy development processes, including the next Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust (CCT) Review, should take place concurrently with subsequent application rounds. In other words, future reviews and/or policy development processes must not stop or delay subsequent new gTLD rounds.

If the outputs of any reviews and/or policy development processes has, or could reasonably have, a material impact on the manner in which application procedures are conducted, such changes will apply to the opening of the application procedure subsequent to the adoption of the relevant recommendations by the ICANN Board.

Deleted: is committed to

Deleted: subsequent

Commented [1]: Rec 3.5 and impl guidance 3.3

Commented [2]: To make this consistent with rec 3.2, rephrase this so that there is a presumption that the next round will open 12 months (or some other specified time period) after the applied-for strings for the ongoing round have been confirmed and string change requests have closed. Then replace (2) with exception language to allow the Board to pause/delay the next round in extraordinary circumstances (recs 3.5-3.7) if needed. To ensure predictability, the decision to pause/delay should be reviewed at specified time intervals with a cap on the overall pause/delay between rounds.

Commented [3]: Hi Sophie - i took a look at 3.2 and there is no reference to a timeframe. it asks to either provide a timing or provide criteria. so the two criteria above are, imo, fulfilling the recommendation. what am i missing?

you comment re: 3.5 - 3.7 is well noted, we will include language from the recs .

Commented [4]: Hi Lars.  
Apologies for not being clearer above, I can see where you are coming from reading back my input. I was reading 3.2 in conjunction with 3.5-3.7.  
Rec 3.2 requires "timing and/or criteria for initiating subsequent procedures from that point forth".  
Rec 3.5 provides that "Absent extraordinary circumstances application procedures must take place at predictable, regularly occurring intervals without indeterminable periods of review..."  
So to facilitate the predictable, regularly occurring intervals set out in 3.5, I am proposing a rebuttable presumption of a time period for the next window once the two criteria set out have been met. Another option could be to say that the next window will not open more than X period of time after the criteria have been met, unless...  
So while the current language in (1) may satisfy 3.2 on its own, I don't think it is implementing 3 as a whole.

Commented [5]: recs 3.6 and 3.7