



## The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

James Bladel  
Chair, GNSO Council

5 August 2016

Dear James,

I write in regards to the GNSO policy development process on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures. As noted in Board resolution [2015.09.28.13](#) of September 2015, the Board appreciates the community work on reviews of the New gTLD Program and continues to follow this work with interest.

In November 2014, the Board passed a [resolution](#) noting an effort in progress within the GNSO to identify areas where policy advice could be clarified or where it wished to provide additional policy advice applicable to future application rounds, and providing a response to a request from the GNSO with a set of topics the Board believed would be appropriate for policy discussion. The GNSO Council Chair [responded](#) in January 2015 describing how the topics provided by the Board were being considered, and inviting participation from Board members in the discussions.

We note that the PDP has since been initiated, and that the work plan includes consideration of the previously identified topics, and is expected to complete in approximately Q3 2018. We are glad to see that discussions and work in the PDP appear to be progressing well and are cognizant of relevant parallel efforts within the community.

The Board is interested in the GNSO's view of its current work in light of the existing policy recommendations and related review activities. As noted in the Working Group's [charter](#):

As the original policy recommendations as adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board have 'been designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanisms for



## The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

applicants to propose new top-level domains,' those policy recommendations remain in place for subsequent rounds of the New gTLD Program unless the GNSO Council would decide to modify those policy recommendations via a policy development process.

For example, assuming all other review activities are completed, it would be helpful to understand whether the GNSO believes that the entirety of the current Subsequent Procedures PDP must be completed prior to advancing a new application process under the current policy recommendations. The Board is cognizant that it may be difficult to provide a firm answer at this stage of the process as the reviews are still underway and the PDP is in its initial stages of work, but if any consideration has been given in relation to whether a future application process could proceed while policy work continues and be iteratively applied to the process for allocating new gTLDs, or that a set of critical issues could be identified to be addressed prior to a new application process, the Board would welcome that input.

The Board would also welcome any elaboration on the expected time frame outlined in the PDP Work Plan, as well as any additional points the GNSO might wish to clarify for the Board in its efforts to support the various areas of work underway in the multistakeholder community.

On behalf of the ICANN Board, I thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to read "Stephen D. Crocker".

Dr. Stephen D. Crocker  
Chair, ICANN Board of Directors