



New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

Work Track 3 | 28 November 2017 | 15:00 UTC

Agenda

1

Welcome
&
Review/Revise Agenda

2

SOIs & Plenary
Updates

3

Community
Applications & CPE

GAC Views & Advice
Paper

4

Community
Applications & CPE

CC2 Question
Response Review

5

Review of Next
Steps / Action Items

6

AOB
Next Meeting



Community Based Applications & Community Priority Evaluations

GAC Views & Advice

GAC Views & Advice Relating to Community Applications

HIGHLIGHTS FROM M. CARVELL PAPER

- ❑ Applications for new gTLDs submitted by communities should be afforded a degree of prioritisation that would enhance the interests of community members - and thus the public interest.
- ❑ Subsequent Procedures PDP needs to define more precisely the intended public interest values and goals that prioritisation was originally intended to secure, together with a more coherent and readily understood definition of “community.”
- ❑ Key problem in 2012 round was lack of clarity about the types of community that would benefit from prioritisation of their applications and how persons or organisations would benefit from the use of a community-based top level domain.

GAC Advice Relating to Community Applications

HIGHLIGHTS FROM M. CARVELL PAPER

Issues of Public Interest Concern Identified by the GAC

- ❑ 75% of Community Based Applications were ultimately rejected.
- ❑ Of 1930 gTLD applications submitted only 84 (4.4%) were community-based.
- ❑ While 46 were uncontested 23 found themselves in contention with “wholly commercially-based applicants”.
- ❑ Only 5 successful CPE applicants indicates that the process “proved to be very selective with a high bar set for successful approval against commercially-based applicants in contention for the same name or term, without recourse to an effective appeals process.”
- ❑ A common feature were costly delays brought about by competing commercially-based applicants through their resorting to pre-existing ICANN review and appeal procedures such as Reconsideration Requests, CEP (Cooperative Engagement Process) and IRP (Independent Review Process Panel). These procedures in many cases intervened in the new gTLD delegation procedures requiring the applications to be put on hold and in so doing seriously disrupting communities’ business planning and timelines. In many cases these delays added pressure to their already limited financial resources and funding provision.

GAC Advice Relating to Community Applications

HIGHLIGHTS FROM M. CARVELL PAPER

Previous GAC statements and advice in support of community-based applications on public interest grounds

- ❑ due preference was given to applications with *demonstrable community support*;
- ❑ there was *consistent application of criteria* when assessing community applications for priority;
- ❑ community evaluation processes *will be improved* in the light of the experience of some community applicants in the recent round;
- ❑ the recommendations of a report facilitated by the Council Of Europe on community applications, while not endorsed by the GAC, will be considered by the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group.



Community Based Applications & Community Priority Evaluations

CC2 Question Responses

CC2 on Community Base Applications & CPE

Full Responses

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1A5uaxBAgmg7QsFuqMdVvt1HxNZ4jKXnm3Hp0gZra7U0/edit#gid=1508149002>

Themes Document

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/4.4.5+Community+Applications?preview=/58735963/69279209/CC2%20Themes%20-%20Work%20Track%203%20-%20Community%20Applications%20and%20CPE.pdf>

Next Steps / Action Items