

ICANN | GNSO

Generic Names Supporting Organization

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP

February 2018 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 refine [preliminary outcomes](#) for the overarching subjects in the WG's [Charter](#), leveraging input received through [Community Comment 1](#) (CC1) and additional input received through a number of Working Group calls. Three streams of work are currently underway, each with a specific focus: [different TLD types](#), [predictability/community engagement](#), and [application submission periods](#). In January, the Working Group focused on progressing deliberations on [different TLD types](#) and a framework for [predictability/community engagement](#).

The Work Tracks are working to develop draft recommendations for changes, if any, to the existing policy or implementation.

Next Steps:

The full Working Group will finalize documentation reflecting deliberations on the overarching issues. The Working Group plans to complete recommendations on the overarching issues in the coming months. The Work Tracks are preparing material for the Initial Report, which is aimed for completion by April 2018.

Work Track 1

Current Status:

In January, the WT focused on [Clarity of the Application Process](#), [Application Fees](#), [Variable Fees](#) and [Application Submission Period](#).

[9 January](#) meeting highlights:

- Reviewed [potential recommendations](#) on [Clarity of the Application Process](#). The WT has reached preliminary consensus on the following: “The Application Guidebook (AGB) along with all of the associated processes and policies (including the Registry Agreement) must be finalized before the application period commences. Any changes to the AGB or application process should be minimized. However, when changes are necessary, a mechanism that allows impacted applicants the chance to either receive a full refund or be tracked into a parallel process that deals with the issues directly without impacting the rest of the program. The systems should allow an applicant to streamline their answer submissions by allowing for the dissemination of information across all applications associated to the applicant.”
- Reviewed [potential recommendations](#) on [Application Fees](#). The WT reached preliminary consensus that the application fee should follow the ‘revenue-cost neutral’ principal while improving application fee accuracy. The WT further agreed on considerations for setting the cost, principles for setting a price floor, and recommendations for managing fee excess or shortfall.

[16 January](#) meeting highlights:

- Reviewed [potential recommendations](#) on [Variable Fees](#). Work Track members raised a number of suggestions and questions on this topic, indicating that further discussion and refinement of the proposed text may be needed.
- Reviewed [potential recommendations](#) on [Application Submission Period](#). WT members provided comments on the proposed consensus text: “The application submission window was too quick and too short. Due to uncertainty related to demand, the WG suggests a Hybrid approach where a single round is set (with a minimum 3 months' notice) followed by an annual window, e.g., three months of application acceptance (potential publication/objection period??), remaining 9 months to complete evaluation, repeat on a yearly basis. Evaluations are conducted on a rolling basis. The set application window timeline provides predictability, with post application to delegation steps running in parallel with any subsequent window. This process could lead into a “continuous” application process. The Lead-up round should closely reflect end-goal of continuous/annual application process. Rounds should be a means of refining the continuous application process. Applicants in the next round (regardless whether delegated or not) have priority over additional/subsequent round applicants.”

WT1 had a meeting on 6 February, which focused on [Applicant Support](#) and [RSP Programs](#). The discussion will be summarized in the following edition of the newsletter.

Next Steps:

WT1 has a meeting scheduled for 20 February (topic: review of consensus items).

All members are encouraged to add their feedback to the working document summarizing each of the WT1 topics including the issues posed, past discussions, consensus items along with additional areas to address. The document is available [here](#).

Work Track 2

Current Status:

In January, the WT focused on Applicant Terms and Conditions and [Reserved Names](#).

[18 January](#) meeting highlights:

- Reviewed the [progress document](#) on Applicant Terms and Conditions and discussed [suggested revisions](#) to language in the document regarding Section 3, Section 6, and Section 14 of the Terms and Conditions.
- Reviewed the [progress document](#) on [Reserved Names](#) as well as [potential recommendations](#) regarding specific items on the reserved names lists at the [top](#) and [second level](#). At the top level, suggestions have been made regarding adjustments to the list in the following areas:
 - Acronyms related to the IANA transition
 - Single character IDNs
 - Acronyms RDS and/or RDDS
 - Letter and digit combinations
 - Controversial names
 - Special Use Domain Names
 - Suggestion to allow any string that does not pose a security and stability risk

WT2 had a meeting on 1 February, which focused on [Closed Generics](#). The discussion will be summarized in the following edition of the newsletter.

Next Steps:

WT2 has a meeting scheduled for 22 February (topic: [Vertical Integration](#)).

Work Track 3

Current Status:

In January, the WT focused on [Objections](#) and [Applicant Freedom of Expression](#).

[9 January](#) meeting highlights:

- Reviewed the [status of deliberations](#) on Legal Rights Objections. In general, Work Track members raised few concerns with existing policy and Applicant Guidebook language, but some WT members noted issues with the scope of the objection, particularly related to the basis for infringement, which requires proving usage.
- Work Track members revisited a [proposal](#) to adjust language in the Applicant Guidebook to move from an infringement based policy to a bad-faith based policy.

[30 January](#) meeting highlights:

- Reviewed [status of deliberations](#) on Limited Public Interest Objections. WT members generally agreed that existing policy and Applicant Guidebook provisions are in good order.
- Discussed suggestions regarding Community Objections, including an initial test of standing to eliminate frivolous objections and additional training for panelists handling the objection to ensure more consistent panel results.
- Considered [potential recommendations](#) regarding the Independent Objector with a focus on mechanisms to address conflicts of interest.
- Deliberated on whether the implementation guidance is needed with respect to Applicant Freedom of Expression.

Next Steps:

WT3 has meetings scheduled for 13 February (topics: [Accountability Mechanisms](#), [Applicant Freedom of Expression](#), [String Similarity](#)) and 27 February (Remaining Topic Review for Plenary Report).

Work Track 4

Current Status:

In January, the WT focused on [Financial Evaluation](#).

[11 January](#) meeting highlights:

- Reviewed challenges associated with applicant financial evaluation in the 2012 application round and considered a series of [revised proposals](#) to address these challenges in subsequent procedures.
- Deliberated on the merits of the three alternative models and discussed launching a poll to better understand Work Track members' opinions about the proposals.

WT2 had a meeting on 5 February, which focused on responses from ICANN Org and other ACs to questions raised by WT4. The discussion will be summarized in the following edition of the newsletter.

Next Steps:

WT4 has a meeting scheduled for 12 February (topics: TBD).

Work Track 5

Current Status:

In January, the WT focused on finalizing the Terms of Reference and discussing the definition of geographic names.

[17 January](#) meeting highlights:

- Finalized and agreed upon the Work Track 5 [Terms of Reference](#) document.
- Began to review feedback received from Work Track members on [proposed changes](#) to the Applicant Guidebook provisions on geographic names.

WT5 had a meeting on 7 February, in which the WT began to discuss and compare the definitions and treatment of geographic terms included in the 2007 GNSO policy and the final Applicant Guidebook issued in 2012. WT5 also had a webinar on 8 February on the history of geographic names at the top level at ICANN. These discussions will be summarized in the following edition of the newsletter.

Next Steps:

WT5 has a meeting scheduled for 21 February. In the upcoming meeting, the group will continue to discuss and compare the definitions and treatment of geographic terms included in the 2007 GNSO policy and the final Applicant Guidebook issued in 2012, before considering other geographic terms.

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 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>