Dear [Insert SO/AC/SG/C Chair Name]

We write to you as the Co-Chairs of the GNSO's New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group (WG), which was chartered by the GNSO Council to conduct a Policy Development Process (PDP) to determine what, if any changes may need to be made to the existing *Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains* policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. As the original policy recommendations as adopted by the GNSO Council and ICANN Board have "been designed to produce systemized and ongoing mechanisms for 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. We are now writing to seek your input on several overarching questions as part of the Group's first Community Comment process.

1.   Background on the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

In June of 2014, the GNSO Council created the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Discussion Group, which was focused on reflecting upon the experiences gained from the 2012 New gTLD round and identifying a recommended set of subjects that should be further analyzed in an Issue Report. At the ICANN53 meeting, The GNSO Council approved a motion to request that a Preliminary Issue Report be drafted by ICANN staff, basing the report on the set of deliverables developed by the Discussion Group, to further analyze issues identified and help determine if changes or adjustments are needed for subsequent new gTLD procedures. ICANN staff completed the Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures, which was published for public comment on 31 August 2015, with the comment period closing on 30 October 2015. ICANN staff reviewed public comments received and adjusted the Issue Report accordingly. The Final Issue Report, along with the summary and analysis of public comment received, were submitted to the GNSO Council for its consideration on 4 December 2015 and a PDP on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures was initiated on 17 December 2015. The GNSO Council adopted the PDP WG charter during its 21 January 2016 meeting, with a call for volunteers issued on 27 January 2016.

The PDP WG held its first meeting on 22 February 2016 and is currently meeting on a regular basis. The PDP WG began its deliberations by preliminarily considering a set of 6 subjects that it considers high level and foundational in nature (which the PDP WG called overarching issues). As the GNSO's PDP Manual mandates that each PDP WG reach out at an early stage to all GNSO Stakeholder Groups and Constituencies to seek their input, and encourages WGs to seek input from ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees as well, the PDP WG sent a request to community (i.e., Community Comment 1) on 9 June 2016. The PDP WG appreciates input provided by the community, which it has considered and will integrate into the outcomes and deliverables related to the 6 overarching issues.

The PDP WG has created a set of 4 sub-team Work Tracks (WT) that are addressing the remaining subjects within its Charter. This communication, Community Comment 2, is in relation to these subjects now under consideration. We are now writing to update you on our activities to date, and to provide your group with an opportunity to assist the PDP WG with its assigned task, in respect of the following questions and issues that stem from our Charter and the initial deliberations of the WG. The PDP WG may provide additional updates and could possibly solicit input from the community again in the future, as the work progresses.

2.   Community Comment Request: Survey on the subjects under consideration by the 4 WTs

The subjects that the PDP WG's 4 WTs are considering at this stage are listed below. A brief description of each subject and specific questions on which the PDP WG seeks your input are included as Annex A. Your input is critical in allowing these subjects to be considered fully and to achieve a thoughtful outcome, which could be new policy recommendations, amendment of existing policy recommendations, or more simply, implementation guidance to be considered in the future. The PDP WG recognizes that this survey is extensive and understands that respondents may want to only provide answers to certain questions. The subjects are:

WT	Subject
1	Accreditation Programs
1	Applicant Support Some have suggested it could be beneficial to expand the scope of the AS program. Suggestions to date include: 1. Broadening support to IDNs or other criteria 2. Focusing AS on the "middle applicant" - defined as developed but struggling regions, as opposed to underserved or under developed regions. Do you find value in the above suggestions? Do you feel there are other areas in which the AS programs could extend?
1	Clarity of Application Process
1	Application Fees Given that fees are to be for cost recovery, and given the surplus from the last round, do you believe $185K a reasonable fee? Is it still a reasonable fee? With cost recovery in mind, should there be a floor/minimum threshold we should not cross?
1	Variable Fees Should the New gTLD application fee be variable based on such factors as application type (e.g., open or closed registries), multiple identical applications, or other factor? There seems to be support for "one fee fits all", do you agree?
1	Application Queuing

Draft as of 30 Jan 2017

1		There appears to be support for the lottery system instead of first come, first served. However, if rounds are not used, would this method still be appropriate? Would lottery work for a continuous application period or would first come first service be more appropriate?
	1	Application Submission Period Is three months the proper amount of time? Is the concept of a fixed period of time for accepting applications the right approach? Would this have implications on applicant support? If we have a few next 'rounds' followed by continuous application periods, how should the application submission period be handled?
	1	Systems
	1	Communications
	1	Applicant Guidebook
	2	Base Registry Agreement
	2	2nd Level RPM's
	2	Reserved Names
	2	Registrant Protections
	2	IGO / NGO Procedures
	2	Closed Generics
	2	Applicant Terms and Conditions
	2	Registrar Non Discrimination & Registry / Registrar Separation
	2	Registry / Registrar Standardization
	2	TLD Rollout
	2	Contractual Compliance
	2	Global Public Interest
	3	Objections
	3	New gTLD Applicant Freedom of Expression
	3	Community Applications (Community Priority Evaluations)
	3	String Similarity (Evaluations)
	3	Accountability Mechanisms
	4	Internationalized Domain Names
	4	Universal Acceptance
	4	Applicant Reviews
	4	Name Collisions
	4	Security and Stability

Draft as of 30 Jan 2017

3.   Coordination with other efforts

Finally, the PDP WG is aware of other efforts related to New gTLDs that are underway within the community, particularly the Competition, Consumer Trust & Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT-RT); the PDP WG understands that coordination with other community efforts is needed to promote comprehensive solutions and outcomes. In addition to the CCT-RT, the PDP WG has identified the following initiatives that may have an influence on the outcomes of this WG.

●   [PDP on gTLD Registration Data Services](#)
●   [PDP IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms](#)
●   [Non-PDP CWG on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs](#)
●   [PDP Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs](#)
●   [CCT-RT and the associated New gTLD Program Reviews](#)
●   The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) working groups on the topics of: a) public safety, b) underserved regions, and c) geographic names.
●   Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC) reviews of guidance provided regarding the New gTLD Program and determining if new recommendations are needed.

We ask that you consider and clarify the extent to which the above-identified efforts, or any additional efforts within the community, should be considered by this PDP WG during its deliberations.

Thank you for the [Insert Constituency Name] consideration of this request. We look forward to any comments and any input that you and the organization you Chair are able to provide to our WG. If possible, please forward your comments and input to us by Date so that we may fully consider it in our further deliberations.

Best regards,

Avri Doria and Jeff Neuman (WG Co-Chairs)

Draft as of 30 Jan 2017

Annex A - Work Track Subjects

Work Track 1 - Overall Process, Support, and Outreach

Work Track 2 - Legal, Regulatory, and Contractual Requirements

Work Track 3 - String Contention Objections and Disputes

1) Please provide any evidence you are aware of where any party or parties attempted to 'game' the Objections procedures in the 2012 round?
2) Do you believe that the use of an Independent Objector is warranted in future rounds? If not, then why? If yes, then would you propose any restrictions or modifications be place on the IO in future rounds?
3) Do you believe that parties do disputes should be able to choose between 1 and 3 member panels and should the costs of objections reflect that choice?
4) What can be done to improve consistency and predictability with regard to string similarity in future rounds?
5) Given the general understanding that CPE process did not provide consistency and predictability in the 2012 round do you believe there is a need for community priority in subsequent procedures?
6) Should "community" simply be an additional category that will be in string contention sets on equal footing as a 'brand' or 'open generic" applications?

Work Track 4 - Internationalized Domains Names and Technical & Operations

4.1 Internationalized Domain Names
4.1.1 - Do you agree or disagree with allowing 1-char IDN TLDs, in specific combinations of scripts and languages where a single character can mean a whole idea or a whole word (ideograms and logograms) ?
4.1.2 - Do you have any general guidance or would like to flag an issue requiring policy work for subsequent procedures regarding IDNs ?
4.1.3 - How do you envision the policy and process to allow IDN Variant TLDs to be delegated and operated ? Possible options include but are not limited to bundling(allowing but requiring procedures similar to .ngo/.org/.ong where only the same registrant can register a name across TLDs , disallowing (as it was in the 2012-round) or allowing without restrictions.

4.2 Universal Acceptance(UA)
4.2.1 - Do you see any UA issue that would warrant policy work, different from the coordination work already being done by the UASG ?

4.3 Application Evaluation
4.3.1 Technical Evaluation

Draft as of 30 Jan 2017

4.3.1.1 - Do you believe that technical capability should be demonstrated at application time, or could be demonstrated at, or just before, contract-signing time ?

4.3.1.2 - Do you believe that technical evaluation should be done per application, per cluster of similar technical infrastructure of a single applicant entity/group, or per cluster of similar infrastructure among all applicants in a procedure (e.g, consolidate as much as possible) ?

4.3.1.2.1 - If consolidated, should the aggregate requirements of applied-for TLDs and currently operated TLDs be taken in consideration for evaluation ?

4.3.2 Financial Evaluation

4.3.2.1 - Do you believe that financial capability should be demonstrated at application time, or could be demonstrated at, or just before, contract-signing time ?

4.3.2.2 - Do you believe that financial evaluation should be done per application or per possible registry family considering all applied-for strings are won ?

4.3.3 General Questions

4.3.1.1 - What suggestions do you have for improving the application evaluation process that you would like the community to consider ?

4.4 Name Collision

4.4.1 - What general guidance for namespace collisions would you like the community to consider for subsequent procedures, and why ?

4.4.2 - Were there non-applied for strings that would fall into a high risk category, and then would be suggested to not be allowed for the time being in subsequent procedures ? If yes, which ones ?

4.4.3 - What data sources could/should be used for analyzing namespace collisions for subsequent procedures ?

4.4.4 - Based on data from the first round, can the controlled interruption period be reduced in future rounds ?

4.4.5 - Should any measures be suggested or requested from TLDs that already ended or will end their emergency readiness after two years of delegation ?

4.5 Security and Stability

4.5.1 Considering that, different from the 2012-round, we now have Top-Level Label Generation Rules available for most, if not all, scripts and languages, does the per-label security and stability review still makes sense ?

4.5.2 Considering the already published CDAR study and comments to that study, do you have any comments regarding root zone scaling ?