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Current Status

- An *Initial Report* was published for public comment on 3 July 2018, with the period closing on 26 September.

- Comments received have been organized and collated, with *Sub Groups review (A, B, and C)* nearly complete.

- The WG also worked on a set of 5 topics that needed additional discussion, which were also published in late October for public comment in the form of a *Supplemental Initial Report*.

- The full WG is now reviewing public comments received to this Supplemental Initial Report.

- *Work Track 5 (geo names at the top-level)* published its own *Supplemental Initial Report* in December is set to begin review of public comment in late February.
Current Status, Continued

- The WG expects to begin substantive deliberations on the various subjects that were published for public comment, starting as early as at ICANN64.

- GOAL – seek to reach outcomes/conclusions on topics where there seems like consensus has been reached. Where there is more discussion necessary, focus mainly on new ideas /arguments.

- The WG Co-Chairs hope all streams of work will convene for a single Final Report.
SubPro Timeline

Q2 2018 | Q3 2018 | Q4 2018 | Q1 2019 | Q2 2019 | Q3 2019 | Q4 2019

**Work Tracks 1-4**

**New Sub Groups** (convened to review public comment)

**Supplemental Initial Report** (additional topics)

**Work Track 5**

**Full New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG** *

**KEY**

- Blue diamond: Publish Initial Report
- Green diamond: Final Report Delivered to Council
- Yellow diamond: Close of Public Comments

---

The diagram outlines the timeline for various work tracks and subgroups within the SubPro project, spanning from Q2 2018 to Q4 2019. Each track and subgroup has specific milestones and key actions planned throughout the quarters.
**SubPro Timeline – Add’l Public Comment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Tracks 1-4</th>
<th>Q2 2018</th>
<th>Q3 2018</th>
<th>Q4 2018</th>
<th>Q1 2019</th>
<th>Q2 2019</th>
<th>Q3 2019</th>
<th>Q4 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Sub Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(convened to review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public comment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Initial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report (additional topics)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Track 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full New gTLD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsequent Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDP WG *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY**
- ▲ Publish Initial Report
- ▲ Close of Public Comments
- ▲ Final Report Delivered to Council
Potential Challenges

- Where there is not consensus to recommend change, the *default position is the GNSO policy recommendations and/or the 2012 implementation.*
  - With this as a default, there may be disincentive to compromise (and this is not necessarily unique to this PDP).
  - Consensus should be necessary, even to accept default position.

- There may be agreement that there is an issue, but consensus cannot be reached on a goal / solution. **Who can recommend change in this case?**

Potential Dependencies:

- Recommendations of the Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team targeting this PDP – though these still require Board consideration and adoption, the WG has and continues to consider how to ensure they are addressed adequately, especially prerequisites.
Potential Challenges, Continued

Potential Dependencies, continued:

- Rights Protection Mechanisms – are these dependencies? If so, in what manner (policy, implementation, and/or program launch, and which RPMs)?

- Name Collision Analysis Project – effort appears to be on hold.

- IDN Variant TLD Implementation – ICANN/community recommendations seem mostly aligned with SubPro recommendations. For this specific item, can SubPro make recommendations that affect 2012 round registries, since a unified approach is recommended the staff report?

Current understanding of the WG:

- Course correction could be necessary with new developments, even after conclusion of this PDP (e.g., EPDP on specific issue?).

- However, none of these elements appear to serve as a dependency for the SubPro PDP to conclude its policy development work.
What Happens After the PDP delivers its Final Report?

- This PDP is seeking to deliver its Final Report to the GNSO Council in the third quarter of 2019.
- From that point, these are some of the expected next steps (as with the conclusion of any PDP):
  - GNSO Council consideration and adoption of the PDP recommendations in the Final Report
  - Council report to Board / Public Comment
  - ICANN Board consideration and adoption of the PDP recommendations as adopted by GNSO Council
  - ICANN org (as directed by the Board) to begin implementation of the PDP recommendations (which will likely include a revised Applicant Guidebook)
- When can/should implementation work begin? Should the PDP/Council recommend an informal implementation team, like the EPDP?
PDP Resources

- Active Project Page: https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures

- PDP Wiki: https://community.icann.org/x/RgV1Aw

- PDP Mailing List Archive: http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/gnso-newgtld-wg/

- Newsletters: https://gnso.icann.org/en/news/working-group-newsletters
Questions & Answers