GNSO SUBSEQUENT PROCEDURES PDP WG

OVERVIEW OF ITS WORK AND OUTPUTS TO DATE

WHY THE OF WG

- A Policy Development Process Working Group chartered to evaluate what changes or additions need to be made to existing new gTLD policy recommendations

- Those policies are laid out in two documents: **Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains** from August 2007 and the final **Applicant Guidebook** dated June 2012.

- The GNSO Council and the ICANN Board agree both reflect the "systemized and ongoing mechanisms for applicants to propose new top-level domains".

PDP WG ORGANIZATION

- GNSO Discussion Group started in **June 2014** to examine what happened in the **2012 gTLD Round** to extract a set of subjects that required further analysis and study

- Those issues were brought together in a **Issues Report** finalized in December 2015

- The WG was chartered in **January 2016, call for volunteers issued January 2016** and the WG began its work in **February 2016**

- WG Leadership: Co-chaired by Jeff Neuman & Cheryl Langdon Orr

- Membership: **Over 180 from the community and 65 Observers**

PDP WG ORGANIZATION

- Organized in six (6) **Work Tracks**, each with an **extensive scope of work:**
  - **OVERARCHING ISSUES WT**
  - Work Track 1 – OVERALL PROCESS/SUPPORT/OUTREACH
  - Work Track 2 – LEGAL/REGULATORY
    - **(Global Public Interest; Closed Generics; 2nd Level Rights Protection Mechanisms)**
  - Work Track 3 – STRING CONTENTION/OBJECTIONS & DISPUTES
    - (**Community Applications; Applicant's Freedom of Expression)**
  - Work Track 4 – IDNs/ TECHNICAL & OPERATIONS
  - Work Track 5 – GEOGRAPHIC NAMES AT THE TOP LEVEL

SCOPE OF WORK FOR WT1
[PER ISSUES REPORT]

- **Principles A and C; Recommendations 1, 9, 10, 12 and 13; Implementation Guidance A, B, C, D, E, M, N, O and Q; New Topics "Different TLD Types", "Application Submission Limits" and "Variable Fees"**

- **Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice**: Did the implementation meet or discourage these goals?

  - *Note that per Section 9.3 of the Affirmation of Commitments, there is to be a community driven review of the New gTLD Program's impact on Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice, taking into account the recommended metrics as identified by the Implementation Advisory Group for Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice (IAG-CCT).*

- **Applicant Guidebook (AGB):** Is the AGB the right implementation of the GNSO recommendations? If so, how can it be improved to ensure that it meets the needs of multiple audiences (e.g., applicants, those monitoring the policy implementation, registry service providers, escrow providers, etc.)

SCOPE OF WORK FOR WT1

- **Clarity of Application Process**: How can the application process avoid developing processes on an as-needed basis (e.g., clarifying question process, change request process, customer support, etc.)

- **Accreditation Programs**: As there appears to be a limited set of technical service and Escrow providers, would the program benefit from an accreditation program for third party service providers? If so, would this simplify the application process with a set of pre-qualified providers to choose from? Are there other impacts that an accreditation program may have on the application process?

SCOPE OF WORK FOR WT1

- Systems: How can the systems used to support the New gTLD Program, such as TAS, Centralized Zone Data Service, Portal, etc. be made more robust, user friendly, and better integrated?

- **Application Fees:** Evaluate accuracy of cost estimates and/or review the methodology to develop the cost model, while still adhering to the principle of cost recovery. Examine how payment processing can be improved.

SCOPE OF WORK FOR WT1

- **Communications**: Examine access to and content within knowledge base as well as communication methods between ICANN and the community.

- Application Queuing: Review whether first come first served guidance remains relevant and if not, whether another mechanism is more appropriate.

- **Application Submission Period**: Is three months the proper amount of time? Is the concept of a fixed period of time for accepting applications the right approach.

SCOPE OF WORK FOR WT1

- **Support for Applicants From Developing Countries**: Evaluate effectiveness of Applicant Support program to assess if the criteria were properly designed, outreach sufficient, monetary support sufficient, etc. In particular, was there enough outreach in developing economies to 1) contribute to the design and nature of the process and 2) to ensure awareness of the opportunity afforded?

- Variable Fees: Should the New gTLD application fee be variable based on such factors as application type (e.g., open or closed registries), multiple identical applications, or other factor?

- Misc - Ways to provide comment and role of public comments

PDP WG OUTPUT

- **[Initial Report](#) for community input** issued **July 2018** covering **Overarching Issues + outputs from WT1-4**; WT5 is to issue a separate report

- It does not contain a "*Statement of level of consensus for the recommendations presented in the Initial Report.*"

- Community is asked to respond to

- Over 150 Questions posed by the WG

- Some 20 Options on various matters for the community to select (Application Accessed in rounds; Variable Fees; Objections; Closed Generics; IDNs;)

PDP WG OUT PUT

- Over **140 Preliminary Recommendations** for community analysis and response
- Community is free to make comments on anything in the report.
- WG agrees while it may be too early to make a call on the benefits and/or negative effects from the 2012 round, **no compelling reason to alter the existing policy** (i.e., a continuing mechanism for new gTLDs).

NEXT STEPS

- Comment period closed on **26 September 2018**
- Staff Report due on 29 October 2018
- **A Draft Supplemental Report** to the Initial Report is in process starting **28 September 2018 and will be available for 40 days comment period**
- **Ongoing arguments in the WG**
  - Resolution of contention sets
  - Variable fees