SUBSEQUENT APPLICATION ROUNDS

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 without pause. 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 determine the timing of the initiation of a subsequent application round of the New gTLD Program as soon as feasible, but preferably not later than the second Board meeting after the following conditions 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 independent of 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 round, subsequent to the adoption of the relevant recommendations by the ICANN Board. The implementation of that policy will then become a dependency for the timing of that subsequent round of applications.

Deleted: is committed to

Deleted: subsequent

Commented [1]: Is it possible to say" indeterminable or extended" or similar?

Commented [2]: Rec 3.5 says "Absent extraordinary circumstances application procedures must take place at predictable regularly occurring intervals without indeterminable periods of review ....."   no mention of "or extended", I'm afraid.

Commented [3]: The entire section says it in many words. e.g. in 3.6 " in other words , future …must not stop or delay subsequent …"
or in the rationale for 3.5-3.7 speaks again of avoiding pauses.

extended was a single word for saying 'without pause.' but perhaps it is better to include the phrase 'without pause'

Deleted: as such

Commented [4]: Rec 3.5 and impl guidance 3.3

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

Commented [5]: 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 [6]: Hi Sophie - i took a look at 3.2 and there is no reference to a timeframe. it asks to eitehr provide a timing or provide criteria. so the two criteria above are, imo, fulfilling the recommendation. what am i missing?
... [1]

Commented [7]: Hi Lars.
Apologies for not being clearer above, I can see w[... [2]

Commented [8]: I'm not sure the "criterion" of "ICANN is operationally prepared" is consistent with the ... [3]

Commented [9]: How about this: "ICANN org has not encountered significant barriers to its ability to rece[... [4]

Commented [10]: Rec 3.2 talks about (b) specific set of criteria and/or events that must occur prior to the ... [5]

Deleted: concurrently with

Deleted: procedure

Commented [11]: recs 3.6 and 3.7

Commented [12]: The ideal is to get to a steady state of operations

Page 1: [1] Commented [6]	Lars Hoffmann	30/11/2023 19:51:00

Hi Sophie - i took a look at 3.2 and there is no reference to a timeframe. it asks to eitehr 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 .

Page 1: [2] Commented [7]	Sophie Hey	01/12/2023 09:45:00

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.

Page 1: [3] Commented [8]	Anne ICANN	28/03/2024 17:54:00

I'm not sure the "criterion" of "ICANN is operationally prepared" is consistent with the Recommendation. This seems vague in that it would appear that ICANN is responsible for being operationally prepared - rather than leaving this open to question?

Page 1: [4] Commented [9]	Anne ICANN	28/03/2024 20:13:00

How about this: "ICANN org has not encountered significant barriers to its ability to receive and process a new batch of applications."

Page 1: [5] Commented [10]	Justine Chew	30/03/2024 04:15:00

Rec 3.2 talks about (b) specific set of criteria and/or events that must occur prior to the opening up of the next subsequent round. So, arguably, (2) can be an event. However, to safeguard against ICANN org taking too much time to be fully operationally prepared, I personally think your alternative text of "has not encountered significant barriers" is a good compromise.