

# 2020-01-21 New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP

The call for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group will take place on **Tuesday, 21 January 2020 at 15:00 UTC for 60 minutes**.

For other places see: <https://tinyurl.com/tsknfap>



## PROPOSED AGENDA

1. Review Agenda/Statements of Interest
2. Review draft final recommendations – see attached Working Document and here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kUlmZH8nxWTgfcRluA5FxLheMm4XhhOwkRt7om52aQU/edit?usp=sharing> [docs.google.com]. The goal of this exercise is intended to accomplish at least a couple of things, 1) Ensure that the format and level of detail, which emphasizes the recommendations /implementation guidance/affirmations and rationale rather than comprehensive deliberations (and which follows the model established by Work Track 5), is supported by the WG, and 2) Give the WG the opportunity to make substantive progress on finalizing topics.
  - a. Applicant Guidebook
  - b. Communications
  - c. Systems (time permitting)
  - d. Application Fees (time permitting)
  - e. and Variable Fees (time permitting)
3. AOB

## BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

[Working Document\\_SubPro Draft Final Recommendations\\_16Jan2020](#)



## RECORDINGS

[Audio Recording](#)

[Zoom Recording](#)

[Chat Transcript](#)

GNSO transcripts are located on the [GNSO Calendar](#)



## PARTICIPATION

[Attendance](#)

**Apologies:** Katrin Ohlmer, Alberto Soto, Maxim Alzoba,



## Notes/ Action Items

### Actions:

Applicant Guidebook:

ACTION ITEM 1: Create a bracketed new recommendation/implementation guidance and circulate to the WG for review: [There should be an affirmation that the AGB should again be published in the 6 UN languages. Recommendation that this happens at least a certain period of time before the application window opens. IG or recommendation?: All translations should be available at or as close as possible in time to the English version.]

### Notes:

1. Updates to Statements of Interest: No updates provided.

2. Review draft final recommendations – see attached Working Document and here: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1kUImZH8nxWTgfcRiuA5FxLheMm4XhhOwkRt7om52aQU/edit?usp=sharing>. The goal of this exercise is intended to accomplish at least a couple of things, 1) Ensure that the format and level of detail, which emphasizes the recommendations/implementation guidance/affirmations and rationale rather than comprehensive deliberations (and which follows the model established by Work Track 5), is supported by the WG, and 2) Give the WG the opportunity to make substantive progress on finalizing topics.

#### a. Applicant Guidebook

##### Format:

- Recommendations that we think *must* be implemented.
- Implementation guidelines -- things that we think *should* be done.

##### Sections:

- Affirmation: Will always see an affirmation in the first section -- going back to the AGB or the 2008 policy.
- Recommendation.
- Implementation Guidelines.
- Deliberations: intended to address the comments that were raised, but not in too much detail. A rationale for the recommendations and implementation guidance.
- New issues raised in recommendations.

##### Discussion:

- Question: In the beginning we talk about making the AGB more user friendly, but we don't mention that it should be published in real time in multiple languages -- where do we capture that in the deliberations? Answer: That might be in the 2.4.3 Systems section, but also should be referenced here. Affirm the publication in 6 UN languages, but the timing of publication is a new recommendation.
- Just as important to having it in UN languages is to have those translations at the same time as English version being published. In 2012 - there were some translations provided but it was several weeks after the English version so those applicants had a small application window as a result.
- Can we understand in principle how long that would take to have the English and the translations available given the AGB will be a sizable document?
- Make sure one geographic region is favored over another.
- There should be an affirmation that the AGB should again be published in the 6 UN languages. Recommendation that this happens before the application window opens.
- Authoritative version should be English.
- COMMENT I think it will be important to specify how quickly all translations will be available after the English version because otherwise the time for prep of application is not equitable.
- Why can't the non-English versions be published first?

ACTION ITEM: Create a bracketed new recommendation/implementation guidance and circulate to the WG for review: [There should be an affirmation that the AGB should again be published in the 6 UN languages. Recommendation that this happens at least a certain period of time before the application window opens. IG or recommendation?: All translations should be available at or as close as possible in time to the English version.]

#### 1. Communications

##### Discussion:

- Question: Is the implementation guidance something that must be done? Answer: Could be considered a strong should, but will depend on feasibility. Should provide that context in the preamble.
- Sounds like the group is recommending that the comms period starts 6 months before the window opens and AGB is published at least 4 months before. Tighten the text accordingly.

"Implementation Guidance xx.a: For **timeliness**, the Working Group believes that for the next subsequent round there should continue to be a minimum of four (4) months from the time when the final Applicant Guidebook is published and the application submission period begins. While this Implementation Guidance should serve as the minimum, additional time may be needed based on other factors such as the RSP pre-approval process, the level of substantive change to the program during implementation, etc. In addition, the Communications Period should begin at least six months prior to the window opening. Essentially, the communications plan should be commensurate with the time needed to perform elements like the non-exhaustive list below:

- Outreach related to Applicant Support
- Establishing and allowing interested parties to engage in the RSP pre-approval process"

-- This is not talking about the communications period.

-- Question: Thought we decided at least 6 months? Answer: There is a recommendation for a 6-month communications period. You could make them the same, or you could have the communications period start before the final AGB is published (so different time periods).

-- Start at this point on the next call.