

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP

May 2017 Newsletter

**Note: all upcoming meetings are subject to change. For current scheduling information, please see the [GNSO Master Calendar](#), Working Group [scheduling document](#), and list of [upcoming Work Track topics](#).

CURRENT STATUS AND NEXT STEPS

Overall Working Group

Current Status:

The Working Group is continuing to accept input on specific topics in its [Charter](#) through [Community Comment 2](#) (CC2). The deadline for submissions has been extended to 22 May 2017, though there is no need to wait until then to submit comments. The WG has begun to receive comments and looks forward to additional input from Supporting Organizations, Advisory Committees, Stakeholder Groups, Constituencies, and individuals. Community members, including applicants for the 2012 round of new gTLDs, are encouraged to provide input using the [public comment forum](#).

The [webinar](#) on geographic names at the top level took place on 25 April, drawing 125 unique participants across two sessions and featuring 11 guest presenters. The webinar, which was open to the entire community, provided a background on the history of these issues as well an opportunity to hear the variety of positions held by different members of the ICANN community. Any community member with a position to share was welcome to sign up and present. The webinar sets the stage for a face-to-face working session that will be held at ICANN59 to work through substantive proposals from the community and a path forward for policy development with respect to the use of geographic terms at the top level.

The Working Group is preparing a [public comment](#) in response to the CCT Review Team report on the 2012 round of new gTLDs and the recommendations contained therein. The purpose of the comment is to pose clarifying questions and make suggestions about the language of the Draft Recommendations to help the CCT-RT refine the text for the Final Report, noting that a number of the recommendations, if finalized, will require additional work for the WG on a variety of issues.

The Working Group is continuing to prepare [preliminary outcomes](#) for the overarching subjects in the WG's [Charter](#), incorporating input received through [Community Comment 1](#) (CC1). Three drafting teams are supporting this work, each with a specific focus: [different](#)

[TLD types](#), [predictability/community engagement](#), and [“rounds” for application assessment](#). These drafting groups are still open for those with interest and knowledge on the topics.

Next Steps:

The full Working Group will be considering input from a number of sources in its upcoming meetings, including responses to [Community Comment 2](#) (CC2) and recommendations from the [Draft Report](#) of the [Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team \(CCT-RT\)](#).

Work Track 1

Current Status:

In April, the WT focused on [Registry Service Provider Accreditation/Certification](#) and [Application Fees](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT1 [working document](#).

[11 April](#) meeting highlights:

- Continued to deliberate on the model for application fees.
- Discussed costs and benefits of a price “floor” and “ceiling” for the application fee.
- Revisited a [proposal](#) on the provision of back-end registry services for future rounds of new gTLDs that includes options for the pre-approval of existing providers and new providers while at the same time allowing for approval of new providers post submission of an application.

[25 April](#) meeting highlights:

- Discussed [draft principles and requirements](#) for a potential registry service provider accreditation/certification program.
- Encouraged all WT members to review the [draft principles and requirements](#) and suggest edits to make the document more clear and cohesive, noting that the draft is intended to serve as a springboard for further discussion.
- Reviewed status of discussions on Applications Fees (see [slides](#) for summary).

Next Steps:

WT1 has meetings scheduled for 16 May (topics: [Registry Service Provider Accreditation/Certification](#) and [Application Fees](#)) and 30 May (topics: check [upcoming Work Track topics](#)).

Work Track 2

Current Status:

In April, the WT focused on policies behind the prohibition of [Closed Generics](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT2 [working document](#).

[13 April](#) meeting highlights:

- Took a “deep dive” into the alleged harms associated with closed generic TLDs, following a discussion in the previous meeting that focused on potential benefits.
- Reviewed [public comments](#) submitted by opponents of closed generics in 2013.
- Examined text of the Registry Agreement Code of Conduct and discussed the validity of arguments that closed generic TLDs would violate the Code of Conduct.

27 April meeting highlights:

- Reviewed the WT’s work so far on the topic of closed generics.
- Deliberated on a presentation by Milton Mueller, which reflected the [position some Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group members](#) expressed in the 2013 public comment.
- Agreed to continue developing the list of potential [pros and cons](#) for closed generics and begin discussing possible opportunities for compromise on the topic.

Next Steps:

WT2 has meetings scheduled for May 18 (topic: [Registrar Non Discrimination & Registry/Registrar Separation](#)) and May 25 (topic: [Registry/Registrar Standardization](#)).

Work Track 3

Current Status:

In April, the WT focused on [Community Applications](#) and [Applicant Freedom of Expression](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the WT3 [working document](#).

10 April meeting highlights:

- Reviewed and discussed recommendations included in the [Council of Europe report](#) on community applications.
- Agreed on the importance of having a clear and consistent definition of “community” for the purposes of new gTLD applications.

18 April meeting highlights:

- Deliberated on benefits and challenges of defining “community” in different ways, for example requiring community applicants to operate on a not-for-profit basis.
- Discussed the relationship between the definition of “community” and issues related to freedom of expression and the public interest.
- Reviewed and [summary of community applications](#) from the 2012 round, including a breakdown of Community Priority Evaluation scores.

WT3 had a meeting on 2 May on the topic of [Applicant Freedom of Expression](#). The discussion will be summarized in the following edition of the newsletter.

Next Steps:

WT3 has a meeting scheduled for 23 May (topics: [Accountability Mechanisms](#) and CCT-RT Recommendations for WT3).

Work Track 4

Current Status:

In April, the WT focused on [Name Collisions](#). A full record of deliberations is available in the [WT4 working document](#).

[20 April](#) meeting highlights:

- Deliberated on possible policy recommendations regarding name collisions:
 - Revisiting existing requirement on contracted parties to take collision domains away from users.
 - Revising policy related to expired domain deletion and expired registration recovery.
- Discussed additional sources of data and expertise that the WT may want to leverage as members consider possible policy changes.

WT3 had a meeting on 4 May on the topic of [Name Collisions](#). The discussion will be summarized in the following edition of the newsletter.

Next Steps:

WT4 has meeting scheduled for 25 May (topic: [Name Collisions](#)).

WHAT IS THIS ABOUT?

In June 2014, the GNSO Council established a Discussion Group that was intended to evaluate the experiences of the 2012 round gTLD Program and to identify possible areas for future GNSO policy development. The Discussion Group's [deliverables](#) served as the basis for the GNSO Council's request for a Preliminary Issue Report in June of 2015.

Following the publication of the [Final Issue Report](#), the GNSO Council adopted the [Charter](#) for the PDP Working Group, which began its work in February 2016. The Working Group initially concentrated on a set of overarching issues, and has since established four separate Work Tracks to consider specific topic areas: Work Track 1 - Overall Process/Support/Outreach, Work Track 2 - Legal/Regulatory, Work Track 3: String Contention/Objections & Disputes, Work Track 4: Internationalized Domain Names/Technical & Operations.

WHY IS THIS IMPORTANT?

The [Discussion Group](#) on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures identified a number of subjects that may require further analysis and possible formulation of policy language. There are [existing policy recommendations](#) adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board, which will remain in place unless the PDP WG determines that changes are needed.

To join this effort, please email the GNSO Secretariat: gnso-secs@icann.org
All are welcome!

MORE INFORMATION

- PDP Working Group Workspace Wiki: <https://community.icann.org/x/RgV1Aw>
- PDP Working Group Charter: <https://community.icann.org/x/KAp1Aw>
- PDP Working Group Active Project Page: <https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures>