

2.2.3: Applications Assessed in Rounds (full WG)			
#	Comment	Contributor	WG Response
<p>2.2.3.c.1: The Working Group recommends that the next introduction of new gTLDs shall be in the form of a “round.” With respect to subsequent introductions of the new gTLDs, although the Working Group does not have any consensus on a specific proposal, it does generally believe that it should be known prior to the launch of the next round either (a) the date in which the next introduction of new gTLDs will take place or (b) the specific set of criteria and/or events that must occur prior to the opening up of the subsequent process. For the purposes of providing an example, prior to the launch of the next round of new gTLDs, ICANN could state something like, “The subsequent introduction of new gTLDs after this round will occur on January 1, 2023 or nine months following the date in which 50% of the applications from the last round have completed Initial Evaluation.”</p>			
1	<p>Opposition to immediate FCFS and belief that regardless of mechanism, evaluation must still be batched: The ALAC believes that regardless of whether future applications are called for by way of a "round" or "rounds" or on a first come, first served (FCFS) basis, all applications must continue to be batched for assessment to allow for not only fair competition in string selection, but also to facilitate manageable review procedures by various stakeholders (from Initial Evaluation to public comment, GAC Advice / GAC Early Warning, objections) and resolution procedures for contention sets and Community Priority Evaluation (CPE).</p> <p>In any case, the ALAC strongly advocates against the immediate commencement of a permanent FCFS process of accepting New applications for the Program.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)</p>	ALAC	
2	<p>Opposition to immediate FCFS and belief that regardless of mechanism, evaluation must still be batched. Guidance on specific requirements: The ALAC believes that all applications must continue to be batched for assessment to allow for not only fair competition in string selection but also to facilitate manageable review procedures by various stakeholders (from Initial Evaluation to public comment, GAC Advice / GAC Early Warning, objections) and resolution procedures for contention sets and Community Priority Evaluation (CPE). Regardless of whether re-introduction of the Program applications is done via a “round”, “rounds” or on a FCFS basis, the ALAC advocates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the AGB accurately and comprehensively reflects the policies, rules and procedures to be relied upon by all parties – ICANN Org, applicants, evaluators, objectors, Dispute Resolution Service Providers (DRSPs) etc., and where separate rules and/or procedures are to apply, such rules and/or procedures must be made known in advance to all parties concerned, especially on applicable fees, and the applicability of criteria for evaluation; • That there be a mechanism to allow for course corrections mandated by policy development processes to make substantial, policy-driven changes to the Program (a seamless mechanism in the case of the FCFS process but where changes made would only apply to applications submitted post changes); • That community-based applications (or applications for community TLDs) be prioritized in the first instance; • That the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) procedure, in particular, be rigorously reviewed; • That there be greater transparency in ICANN Org’s selection of evaluators and DRSPs; and • That outreach efforts be undertaken to better create awareness of not only the Program but also parallel programs such as the Applicant Support Program (ASP). <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)</p>	ALAC	

3	<p>Support for the recommendation but concern with the length of time expected before the next application window is opened: The BRG supports this recommendation. A predictable and achievable date for subsequent rounds is required to avoid prolonged delays and to be fair to future applicants to pursue opportunities for competition and innovation. However, the BRG is deeply concerned with the length of time expected before the next application window is opened. Despite ICANN's promise of launching "subsequent gTLD application rounds as quickly as possible" after the 2012 round was launched and "within one year of the close of the application submission period", there is no clear indication from ICANN when the next opportunity to apply will begin, with six years having already passed. Organisations that did not apply in 2012 in the anticipation that they could apply 12-24 months after, have been misled by ICANN's intent. Before risking further loss of faith from prospective applicants, ICANN should set a deadline for the next application window to start. ICANN should be more proactive in meeting its commitments and allow new applications to commence within a reasonable published timeframe. The BRG expressed these concerns to the ICANN Board in its letter of 8 May (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/smith-to-chalaby-15may18-en.pdf). Absent of a suitable early date for the next round and assuming the lengthy period ahead of the community to agree and implement any proposals from the policy development work and reviews conducted, the BRG recommends that alternative options are explored urgently to undertake smaller rounds for specific categories of registry models introduced in the 2012 round. Appreciating the complexities of the policy work, a succession of smaller, targeted application rounds could be completed in parallel to the ongoing improvements programme; this would avoid unreasonable and unpredictable delays, thus allowing progress and innovation to continue in the domain industry.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000038.html)</p>	Brand Registry Group	
4	<p>Support for the recommendation, and belief that rounds are better for underserved countries: We support the Preliminary Recommendation, as it will help businesses and communities to plan their involvement and use of the gTLD program.</p> <p>From the perspective of historically underserved communities, a series of clearly defined rounds is likely better than an ongoing open window.</p> <p>However, as noted above, ICANN should show that it can scale to handle thousands of applications in a scheduled round.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000041.html)</p>	Business Constituency	
5	<p>Support for the option that it should be known prior to the launch of the next round the date in which the next introduction of new gTLDs will take place, unless the aim is to eventually get to an ongoing application process, using the criteria/event provided of "completion of 50% of applications completing initial evaluation" could allow the program to accomplish that: Preliminary recommendation 2.2.3.c.1 provides two options to determine timing for future rounds of gTLDs: setting a specific date, or completion of a specific criteria/event. From a program operations perspective, a predictable and specific window of time (i.e. 12 months between opening of each application window) would allow ICANN org to better plan for internal and external vendor resources to support the program. It would also provide prospective applicants with more certainty than using program criteria/events because completion date of the program criteria/events could vary depending on a number of factors including volume of applications, number of application change requests, number of re-evaluations, etc. However, if the aim is to eventually get to an ongoing application process, using the criteria/event provided of "completion of 50% of applications completing initial evaluation" could allow the program to accomplish that. It is conceivable that if the volume of applications decreases over time, a point may be reached where initial evaluation periods would be so short that application windows would be opened almost successively, in essence creating an ongoing application process.</p> <p>If a set of criteria/events are to be used, they should be very specific so as to prevent differing interpretations. For example, "completion of 50% of applications completing initial evaluation" could mean publication of initial evaluation results of 50% of the total applications submitted, or publication of initial evaluation results of 50% of applications not counting withdrawals, or 50% not counting those applications that fail initial evaluation, or a combination of the two, or some other combination of criteria.</p> <p>With regards to the questions posed in section 2.2.3.d of the Initial Report, it would be helpful to understand how the PDP Working Group envisions the Bylaws mandated Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review fit (or does not fit) in the context of the reviews contemplated in these questions.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000037.html)</p>	ICANN Org	

6	<p>General support for discrete, regular, and predictably-timed rounds, but newly formed brands should be able to apply outside of the normal cycle: Generally, INTA prefers the concept of discrete, regular and predictably-timed rounds of gTLD applications with one exception. This exception should be for a new company or brand to apply for a .Brand gTLD outside the normal cycle.</p> <p>Discrete rounds allow applicants certainty when preparing for new gTLDs. They also assist with the monitoring of applied-for new gTLDs by brand owners, governments and associations and provide parties the opportunity to decide on objections during a definite period. Depending on the timing and regularity of future application rounds, there may need to be a mechanism in place to allow a new company or brand to apply for a new .Brand gTLD outside the normal window. This is because new products and or companies arise very quickly and become ubiquitous throughout the world. For example, some of the current most popular and widely used social media and digital brands were relatively small companies at the time of the first round of gTLD applications. ICANN should recognize that situations like This can occur and provide a mechanism for provisional applications outside the normal windows, if those normal windows will not open with sufficient predictability and regularity.</p>	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)	INTA
7	<p>Suggestion to consider round closure and to consider criteria and mechanism for determining when and how to close: Regarding timelines for future rounds, the Board requests that the PDP Working Group consider the issue of round closure and what criteria or mechanism could be used to close a round.</p>	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000046.html)	ICANN Board
8	<p>Supports certain date or set of criteria: FairWinds supports the notion of setting out a certain date or a set of criteria after which a next round of new gTLD applications could and would commence. FairWinds would like to emphasize the importance of clarifying these parameters before launching the next round.</p>	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000050.html)	FairWinds Partners
9	<p>Support for this recommendation and suggestion that criteria may need to be based on volume of applications received: The RySG supports the notion of setting out either a date certain or a set of definitive criteria to determine when the next new gTLD Round commences. This may need to be volume based. For example, in the ideal world, the RySG would like to see a set schedule whereby each year a new round is launched. For example, Q1 of each year could be for accepting applications, Q2 of each year for filing public comments / objections, Q3 for evaluations, etc. That said, we recognize that if there is an extraordinary amount of volume (which would need to be determined what would constitute that volume in advance), then ICANN may elect to skip the next round in the following year (provided it gives at least 4 months notice prior to the commencement of the next round). For example, the Applicant Guidebook could state that the subsequent round will start in Q1 of the following year, unless there are more than 10,000 applications received. In such event, the subsequent round will begin in Q1 of the second year following the then-current round.</p>	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)	RySG
10	<p>Support for rounds on an ongoing basis, with defined criteria for when subsequent rounds can be initiated: We agree that future introductions of new gTLDs should be in the form of application rounds. This will provide a more workable means for the community to monitor applications for potential objections, comments, etc. We also agree that, prior to the launch of the next round, a date or criteria based deadline should be agreed for the commencement of the round after that. In other words, as recommended in the Initial Report, if there are more than a certain number of applications received and it is apparent that the processing of the first round will take longer than the original date set for the next round, then we would support a criteria based approach to commencing the next round (eg., 1 year following the date in which 50% of the applications are through Initial Evaluation). This will be important in providing predictability to potential future applicants and the community at large. Due to the considerable work being done in this very PDP, it may not be necessary to conduct further PDP reviews of the application process after subsequent application rounds, meaning it should be possible to commence subsequent rounds fairly quickly.</p>	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000056.html)	Valideus
2.2.3.d.1: Conduct one additional "round" followed by an undefined review period to determine how future applications for new gTLDs should be accepted.			
1	See our response to Preliminary Recommendation 2.2.3 above.	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)	ALAC

2	<p>Does not support the option: The BRG does not support this option. It is not predictable and could cause prolonged delays which is unfair to future applicants that wish to pursue opportunities for competition and innovation.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000038.html)</p>	Brand Registry Group	
3	<p>Does not support the option. Does not support the undefined element and believes that Specific Reviews are needed: The BC does not agree with the undefined review period. We should perform the Specific Review (from AoC and now in ICANN Bylaws) that is already defined for new rounds of gTLD expansion.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000041.html)</p>	Business Constituency	
4	<p>Does not support this option: INTA is opposed to this option. There should not be a continuous stop and start of the rounds particularly when periods of no applications can stretch on for an indeterminate time. This risks generating an unreal demand when the next application window opens, due to the uncertainty of when further application opportunities will exist. It also impacts business planning and implementation making it nearly impossible to predict outcomes.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)</p>	INTA	
5	<p>Provides two viewpoints from the RySG on this option: The RySG has two viewpoints on the best way to conduct future application rounds.</p> <p>Viewpoint 1: The long-term strategic goal for future applications should be the implementation of a continuous process (which may realistically mean scheduled "application submission windows"). This may be achieved through one or two further 'application rounds' imposed before this goal can be realistically achieved. The RySG members that support this viewpoint (one or two rounds, followed by an open or window- based schedule) recommend that a clear commitment is given to a schedule of further application rounds, with shorter timespans between each round, in line with the original target of one year.</p> <p>Viewpoint 2: The PDP's charter instructs the WG to explain if the scale of demand has been made clear and asks if the concept of rounds affects market behavior. As we have only experienced one round since 2012 we believe it is too early to answer the question as asked in the charter. "Model 1: Conduct one additional "round" followed by an undefined review period to determine how future applications for new gTLDs should be accepted" is the most appropriate way to answer the question. This enables the community to assess future behavior – the community needs more time and more rounds to have taken place before it can definitively answer the question posed in the charter. There was some opposition to this viewpoint from within the RySG.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)</p>	RySG	
<p>2.2.3.d.2: Conduct two or three additional application "rounds" separated by predictable periods for the purpose of major "course corrections," to determine the permanent process for the acceptance of new gTLDs in the future. For illustration purposes only, this could include commencing an application window in Q1 of Year 1, a second application window in Q1 of Year 2, and a final application window in Q1 of Year 3 followed by a lengthy gap to determine the permanent process moving forward after Year 3.</p>			
1	<p>See our response to Preliminary Recommendation 2.2.3 above.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)</p>	ALAC	
2	<p>General support for this option, if the gap between rounds is not too long: INTA largely approves this option. Giving both ICANN and applicants three rounds should be enough time to identify any additional issues and to begin creating solutions to newly discovered issues in the permanent process. However, this envisages a lengthy pause after the last of these application rounds, which reduces the predictability of timing of further application windows. INTA would like to think that this review/evaluation exercise could be an ongoing process, so that, going into the final of these initial windows there would already be some certainty about the duration of an "gap" and the likely permanent mechanism.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)</p>	INTA	
3	<p>See 2.2.3.d.1 above</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)</p>	RySG	
<p>2.2.3.d.3: Conduct all future new gTLD procedures in "rounds" separated by predictable periods for the purpose of course corrections indefinitely. Policy development processes would then be required to make substantial, policy-driven changes to the program and would then only apply to the opening of the application round following the date in which the PDP recommendations were adopted by the ICANN Board.</p>			

1	<p>Support for system of predictable rounds described in 2.2.3.d.3: Although larger brands can cope with a first come, first served permanently open application process, MARQUES advocates a permanently open application system featuring predictable rounds as described in 2.2.3. d.3. For example, this might feature a three-month window of application between 1 January – 31 March in any year followed by a nine month closed period from 1 April – 31 December before the window opens again. We believe that all applications submitted in the open window should be treated equally (e.g. not on a first come first served basis). We think this offers all brands, large and small as well as governments and members of civil society the best opportunity to monitor applications</p> <p>To the extent that ICANN is not able to complete the evaluation and processing of applications in any given round prior to the opening of the application window for the next round, it must complete the evaluation and processing of those applications submitted in the preceding round prior to commencing the evaluation and processing of new applications in the subsequent round.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000025.html)</p>	MARQUES	
2	<p>See our response to Preliminary Recommendation 2.2.3 above.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)</p>	ALAC	
3	<p>Support for system of predictable rounds described in 2.2.3.d.3 but rounds could overlap: The BRG considers this option to be the most reasonable approach. The "rounds" could also overlap, triggering each new round at a specified point being reached for the previous application process (e.g. 40% delegated, or a time period), to minimise gaps between each round. Introducing a first-come, first-served continuous process could still be considered in the future.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000038.html)</p>	Brand Registry Group	
4	<p>With regards to the questions posed in section 2.2.3.d of the Initial Report, it would be helpful to understand how the PDP Working Group envisions the Bylaws mandated Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review fit (or does not fit) in the context of the reviews contemplated in these questions.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000037.html)</p>	ICANN Org	
5	<p>See our comments at 2.2.3.d.2 above.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)</p>	INTA	
6	<p>See 2.2.3.d.1 above</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)</p>	RySG	
7	<p>Support for batches: 4. The Economic and market context for the new gTLD programme:</p> <p>AS far as one can see, ICANN does not benefit from any systematic measurement and analysis of the DNS markets. Whether their size, structure, languages, growth-rates (or not), and their consequent capacity to absorb the services of new gTLDs. This lacuna has been pointed out to ICANN on several occasions over the past twenty years.</p> <p>Cursory inspection of the results of the 2012 Round suggests that rather too many new gTLDs were authorized, all at once, indeed more than the DNS market could absorb at that time. There is no assurance that the next rounds will be any better off in this respect.</p> <p>ICANN should take this matter in hand. Note that (a) ALAC will recommend that there is no urgency to open additional rounds, and (b) there is strong support for managing future rounds in batches of applications.</p> <p>Note, also, that the apparent short term saturation of the DNS market, applies particularly to generic strings in the English language, whereas most of the recent growth in the Internet has been in non-English speaking countries. The rationale for this bias escapes me, it may well have contributed to the modest performance of new gTLDs from the last round..</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000054.html)</p>	Christopher Wilkinson	
<p>2.2.3.d.4: Conduct one additional "round" followed by the permanent opening up of a first-come, first-served process of new gTLD applications.</p>			

1	See our response to Preliminary Recommendation 2.2.3 above. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)	ALAC	
2	Does not support the approach: The BRG does not support this approach which is too ambitious for ICANN based on experiences of the 2012 round. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000038.html)	Brand Registry Group	
3	Opposes this option: INTA is opposed to this option as it creates an additional burden on both ICANN, governments and brand owners who are monitoring new gTLDs and their impact. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)	INTA	
3	See 2.2.3.d.1 above (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)	RySG	
4	Support for a single round followed by a continuous application process: Incorporating greater predictability in the application process is critical to the success of the New gTLD Program, and will encourage greater adoption by business users. We believe that the introduction of a continuous process, preceded by one clearly-delineated round to resolve pent up demand, offers strong benefits to prospective applicants in terms of predictability, by allowing them to apply for a TLD when internal demand and concrete use cases exist, rather than having to predict demand and apply preemptively in case business plans develop between discrete windows. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000058.html)	Google	
2.2.3.d.5: Commence two or three additional application "rounds" separated by predictable periods for the purpose of major course corrections, followed shortly thereafter by the permanent opening up of a first-come, first-served process of accepting new gTLD applications.			
1	See our response to Preliminary Recommendation 2.2.3 above. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)	ALAC	
2	Support for two or three application "rounds" separated by predictable periods: The BRG considers this option to be a reasonable and progressive approach. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000038.html)	Brand Registry Group	
3	Finds some merit in this option, but notes additional burden on ICANN, governments and brand owners who are monitoring new gTLD applications: INTA considers that this option has some merit. The additional three rounds ought to be enough to confirm that the new policy adopted is operating as expected. Any further changes will more than likely be minor in the future. INTA does note however that this option will create an additional burden on ICANN, governments and brand owners who are monitoring new gTLD applications. For that reason, this would not be INTA's favored option. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)	INTA	
3	See 2.2.3.d.1 above (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)	RySG	
2.2.3.d.6: Immediately commence a permanent first-come, first-served process of accepting new gTLD Applications.			
1	See our response to Preliminary Recommendation 2.2.3 above. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)	ALAC	
2	Does not support the approach: The BRG does not support this approach which is too ambitious for ICANN based on experiences of the 2012 round. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000038.html)	Brand Registry Group	

3	Does not support this option: INTA does not support this option. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)	INTA	
3	See 2.2.3.d.1 above (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)	RySG	
2.2.3.e.1: Of the models described above, which model do you believe should be employed, if any? Please explain.			
1	See our response to Preliminary Recommendation 2.2.3 above. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)	ALAC	
2	Support for system of predictable rounds described in 2.2.3.d.3 but rounds could overlap: Support for The BRG considers 2.2.3 to be the most optimal choice. The "rounds" could also overlap, triggering each new round at a specified point being reached for the previous application process (e.g. 40% delegated, or a time period), to minimise gaps between each round. Introducing a first-come, first-served continuous process could still be considered in the future. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000038.html)	Brand Registry Group	
3	Support for rounds with review in between: Clearly defined rounds with a short period of review scheduled in between. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000041.html)	Business Constituency	
4	Support for options in 2.2.3.d1, 2, or 3 and opposition options in 2.2.3.d.4, 5, and 6: XYZ agrees with The Working Group's recommendation that the next introduction of new gTLDs shall be in the form of a "round." Following such a round, XYZ is strongly against 2.2.3.d.4, 5 and 6, which each involve permanently opening up a first-come, first-served process of new gTLD applications. The future supply and demand for additional new gTLDs is currently too hard to predict and an indefinite opening up of the supply could potentially crash the whole market. Accordingly, XYZ recommends any of 2.2.3.d.1, 2, 3. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000042.html)	XYZ	
5	Appears to be a combination fo support for option in 2.2.3.d.1 and 2.2.3.d.4: While an excruciating amount of definition is yet to be done, in line with 2.2.3.d.1, the RrSG believes that moving forward with one additional round of Applications followed immediately by Open, FCFS Registration of TLDs should be supported. That said, until a reliable, robust and fair FCFS model can be defined, Application Rounds should continue to be the preferred method of allocation for all Categories of TLDs. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000045.html)	RrSG	
6	Support for options 2.2.3.d.2: INTA approves of Option 2.2.3.d.2. This option allows applicants who were or are considering obtaining a gTLD several chances to prepare for the application process. At the end of the third round there should be an expectation that any issues will have been spotted and can then be addressed in the creation of the permanent process. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)	INTA	
7	See 2.2.3.d.1 above	RySG	

<p>8</p>	<p>Appears to support option 3, stating that FCFS should never happen. Believes that system benefits biggest industry players. Believes also that predictable times help "watchers" of the program. [reference to application limits, which could be considered under section 2.2.5]: First-come, first-served applications (which SubPro WG appears to reject in one part of its report and put out for public comment in another part) should simply be rejected. It gives the largest Internet companies unlimited opportunity to apply for New gTLDs before anyone else has a true chance to apply. It goes against the ICANN Community's goal of opening up New gTLDs to the Global South and smaller communities by bypassing the opportunity for education and outreach. Whoever knows about the New gTLD applications can file thousands of applications when the round opens, and thereby eliminate opportunities from the rest of the world.</p> <p>Accordingly, New gTLDs should be opened in future "rounds" and applications must be limited.</p> <p>a) Future rounds - we agree that there must be specific times when applications can be submitted, when the acceptance window closes, and when the process for review by the public begins.</p> <p>As part of the community of "watchers," we need specific times to check new lists of gTLD Applications, to file public comments and to assist with objections (as appropriate). There should be years between each round of New gTLDs to be fair to everyone, including the public and the watchers who serve as volunteers in this process. Full and fair public review is a part of the legitimacy of the New gTLD process.</p> <p>b) Limit Applications - In a similar vein, applications by a single company, partnership or venture must be limited. There are incumbents in this community who have the time, resources and interest to submit thousands of new gTLD applications. Such unlimited applications are not fair to the rest of the world (still learning about the New gTLD process) or to the Community which needs to comment on them. Strict limits on the number of applications per company and in cooperation with other companies is both fair and allows for adequate oversight and public review. We recommend that ICANN allow no more than 2 dozen applications for each company, including its parent company, subsidiaries, and affiliates.</p> <p>The few gTLD companies of today must not be allowed to dominate the DNS resources of tomorrow.</p>	<p>Public Interest Community</p>	
----------	---	--------------------------------------	--

(<https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000062.html>)

	<p>Supports option 2.2.3.d.3 above. Believes rounds better support training, planning, provision of information. Rounds also support evaluation process, as well as objections, comments. Rounds support review and policy development process: The NCSG supports the introduction of new gTLDs in rounds, and not on a rolling or ongoing basis. Rounds allow ICANN to publicize a fixed event with an application deadline and to engage in focused training, outreach, and encouragement of organizations to apply.</p> <p>Rounds also allow the public and worldwide community to have a date fixed at which to view all newly-applied for and 'newly-revealed' applications (since applications are likely to be secret in subsequent rounds, as they were in the first round, until a 'reveal day' at a date following the submission deadline). Also, as highlighted in the NCSG input to Community Comment 2, the introduction of new gTLDs in rounds would allow ICANN to better advertise the process and announce the new round via a webinar or an open call for an application tutoring process prior to the submission dates directed to the different regions and communities. Holding rounds of applications would enable clearer evaluation periods, instead of a single continuous process, as well as clearer dates in which the PDP recommendations were adopted by the ICANN Board. So rounds are a critical part of the public notice and comment of new gTLDs, and for notice of commentary and objections. We will always need this process of review and input. [see footnote in original comment]</p> <p>It is this worldwide community oversight that played an important role in the first round of new gTLDs. The global community reviewed the applications, and the proposed commitments and proposals of the public portion of the new gTLD applications, for the very purpose of this form of public review is to gather commentary and critique. Accordingly, the only optional answer to 2.2.3.d.3 is Yes: conduct all future new gTLD procedures in rounds separated by predictable periods for the purpose of course corrections indefinitely, for the reasons mentioned above.</p> <p>" We note that such an orderly process keeps policy-making authority where it belongs, provides time for it, and eliminates the need to have an Implementation Review Team empowered to use the implementation process to adjust the policies in alternative directions. Policy control must be tight and through the appropriate mechanisms put in place by the multistakeholder community.</p> <p>" We note further, given the huge imbalance of applications between the Global North and the Global South in the first round of new gTLDs, that 'first-come, first-served applications' is a way of ensuring that companies in the US and Western Europe will continue to dominate the applications, and delegations, of new gTLDs and will take virtually all interesting and available top level domains before the Global South can meaningfully and fully participate. This problem needs to be addressed.</p> <p>9 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000066.html)</p>	NCSG	
2.2.3.e.2: For the model you have selected, what are some mechanisms that can be employed to mitigate any of the listed (or unlisted) downsides.			
1	<p>Describes benefits of option 2.2.3.d.2 for brands and first-time applicants, as well as on relieving pent up-demand: This model provided allows potential applicants the opportunity to decide whether they wish to pursue a new gTLD. This model would be beneficial to brand owners who did not participate in the 2012 round and now wish to do so, or those who applied for one or a small number of their brands and wish to now apply for others. Having three rounds also relieves the pent-up demand for gTLDs. If applicants know they have three opportunities to apply there should be less of a bottleneck of pending applications once the first round opens. The three rounds also provide potential first-time applicants the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the requirements and benefits of obtaining a new gTLD.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)</p>	INTA	
2	<p>Suggests that ICANN must clearly define the number and frequency of application rounds prior to a continuous process: The RySG believes that it is essential for ICANN to clearly define the number and frequency of application rounds prior to the implementation of this continuous first-come first-served process in order to avoid any uncertainty around that process and the eventual roll-out of a continuous process.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)</p>	RySG	
2.2.3.e.3: Is there a way to assess the demand for new gTLDs to help us determine whether the subsequent new gTLD process should be a "round" or a "first-come first-served process? (e.g. Do we introduce an Expressions of Interest process?)			

1	<p>Suggests that and Expression of Interest process or market surveys may be a good way to assess demand in the future: The ALAC opines that Expressions of Interest process normally only yields useful insight for mature, well-educated markets and hence, may be a good way to assess demand for New gTLDs in future. Further, the resources required for an Expressions of Interest process may, in the first instance, be better applied to rectify several identified deficiencies of the Program, namely, promoting greater awareness of the Program in regions where numbers of applications from the 2012 round were comparatively very low (e.g. "Global South"), using appropriate means and channels. Ideally, improving clarity in application process and access to as well as breadth of the Applicant Support Program (ASP) should precede any market outreach efforts in order to help establish a more genuine assessment of demand. Perhaps a simpler form of market surveys which can be used at the ICANN roadshows and other outreach efforts could be the basis to gauge demand for New gTLDs in the next round. Such surveys ought to incorporate questions targeted at establishing on the one hand, awareness of key aspects of the Program, and on the other hand, basic expectations of potential applicants.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000035.html)</p>	ALAC	
2	<p>Does not believe companies will announce before applying: We doubt many companies would want to announce their interest until they are able to apply.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000041.html)</p>	Business Constituency	
3	<p>Does not believe an EOI process would be helpful and could be problematic: While understanding the potential demand for additional new TLDs and the categories in which the TLDs would apply is beneficial for scaling operationally, the RrSG does not believe that an Expression of Interest process would produce meaningful results and would potentially introduce complications regarding confidentiality of data to avoid frontrunning, etc.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000045.html)</p>	RrSG	
4	<p>Does not support an EOI process and identifies downsides: INTA is opposed to the introduction of Expressions of Interest as it could force brand owners to release confidential information about new products. Further, given that 1930 applications were filed in the most recent round, the assumption might be that a similar number will be applied for in the upcoming rounds. In any event, introducing a set of (at a minimum) two or three further rounds after the next one already envisaged should provide adequate data as to the demand.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000048.html)</p>	INTA	
5	<p>The strategic goal for future applications should be to implement a continuous process regardless of demand: The RySG believes that the decision of whether to continue via a future round or continuous process should not be based on an assessment of interest. As the RySG has already stated, the strategic goal for future applications should be to implement a continuous process, not a process based on subsequent rounds. A limited set of rounds should be used only to resolve issues prior to the release of the continuous process.</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000052.html)</p>	RySG	
<p>2.2.3.e.4: If we were to have a process where a certain date was announced for the next subsequent procedure, what would be the threshold for the community to override that certain date (i.e., is a different process needed if the number of applications exceeds a certain threshold in a given period of time?)</p>			
1	<p>Suggests limited circumstances under which an override could be triggered: The ALAC finds in principle the idea of overriding an announced date to be undesirable. However, in the event ICANN Org has not been able to account for the unexpected, then if at all, and only on an as-needed basis, thresholds triggering an override would be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where the actual number of applications exceeded the expected number (for a round) which would then negatively impact on resources assigned based on the expected number (e.g. availability of ICANN staff resources, evaluation panels etc.), or • If the anticipated number of New gTLD delegations exceed the number which SSAC considers as the tipping point to maintaining the stability, security and resiliency of the DNS and root zone system. 	ALAC	
2	<p>Question about ICANN's ability to scale: To the issue of scale, has ICANN expressed any thoughts on how many applications they are capable of processing in one round?</p> <p>(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-gtld-subsequent-procedures-initial-03jul18/2018q3/000041.html)</p>	Business Constituency	

Proposal for a new model -- conducting the initial application window in three phases, followed by an open round:

Neustar recognizes the challenges associated with finding a viable solution to this problem because of a number of unknown variables, the most prominent of which being the unknown level of demand for new gTLDs, or how much pent up demand there is for new gTLDs, and the skepticism some hold in relation to this question.

We believe that the issues of pent-up demand can be addressed by conducting the initial application window in three phases, followed by an open round. We believe that the key benefits of this approach are that it will:

1. Enable the ICANN Board to deliver on its commitments to introduce the next round of new gTLDs as expeditiously as possible;
2. Allow the community to finalize the prerequisite policy and other work efforts in accordance with the phased application process;
3. Provide ICANN organization with a process that would allow them to develop the requisite systems and processes over time rather than needing everything in place on a single date;
4. Reduce the resourcing impact on ICANN staff and third party vendors by not undertaking the phases concurrently;
5. Provide predictability and certainty for potential applicants;
6. Reduce the risk of excessive demand by spreading applications over three distinct phases.

Three Phase new gTLD Application Window

Recognizing Preliminary Recommendation 2.2.4.c.1, the three phase application window uses the categories of TLDs as a basis for the phases. We propose the following:

Phase 1 – .Brand TLDs

Application Period: 1 October 2019 to 12 January 2020 Phase 2 – Geographic TLDs

Application Period: 1 April 2020 to 31 July 2020 Phase 3 – Generic and Community TLDs

Application Period: 1 October 2020 to 12 January 2021

Neustar believes that adopting this three phased approach to the next application window will address the question of ‘pent up demand’, and this should then be followed by an Open Round commencing on 1 October 2021.

Rationale for .Brand Applications in Phase 1:

- .Brand TLDs are clearly defined by objective criteria and will be required to accept the conditions of Specification 13 of the Registry Agreement.
- There is known demand for new .Brand TLDs.
- Assist with building program awareness for subsequent application phases.
- .Brand TLDs accounted for the lowest level of contention sets within the previous application round.
- With the exception of a few notable exceptions, .Brands were not subject to objections or other review processes.
- Historically low rates of abuse and concern for ICANN.

Rationale for Geographic TLDs in Phase 2:

- The significance of providing cities around the world with the opportunity to build an online presence for their respective communities.
- Clearly defined eligibility criteria as outlined in the Applicant Guidebook.
- Non-existent contention sets during the 2012 application process.
- With a few notable exceptions, were not subject to other review processes.

Rationale for Generic and Community TLDs in Phase 3:

- In the 2012 round, generic and community TLD applications were the source of the most controversy and delays due to:
- Contention sets and auction processes;
- Objections;
- GAC advice;
- Community Priority Evaluation.
- It is anticipated that the generic and community TLDs in any subsequent application window will continue to provide the biggest challenge in terms of application processing.
- Moving these applications to Phase 3 of the application window will allow the less- controversial strings to be processed in a timely manner and not unnecessarily delayed while solutions are being developed for any potential issues that may arise.
- Provide greater data points and confidence around the likely number of applications and market demand.

Open Round Commencing on 1 October 2021:

It is intended that this open round would have a three month window to submit applications consistent with the application windows in the phased application process.

On 1 October 2022, a first-come first-served open application process would commence.

