# New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

ICANN

13 August 2018

# Agenda

**1** Welcome/Agenda Review/SOI Updates (5 mins)

**2** Registrar Support For New Registries (50 minutes)

**3** Process to Achieve Consensus (20 mins)

**4** ICANN63 Session Planning (10 mins)

**5** AOB (5 mins)

# Welcome/Agenda Review/SOI Updates

Agenda Item #1

# Registrar Support for New Registries

Agenda Item #2

# ICANN Channel model

- Started in 1998 when Network Solutions, now Verisign, agreed with USG to build a registry-registrar model on what is now known as gTLDs
    - There were approximately 2 million gTLD domains at the time
    - After ICANN was created, it was tasked with overseeing the transition to the registry-registrar model

- Initial test-bed started April 1999; other registrars started December 1999
    - By July 1999 there were ~ 7 million gTLD domains
    - By Jan 2000 there were ~ 10 million gTLD domains

- No 2012 gTLD registry family has achieved 7 million DUM to date

- Besides economies of scale applying to registry infrastructure, it also applies to domain sales channels

- While Vertical Integration is allowed, cost and obligations for selling own-TLD are equal to selling all TLDs, without the scale of selling legacy gTLDs

## Foundational Questions

⊙Policy issue x market forces

⊙"Product defect" x "Channel Defect"

# Angles of the issue

- Registrants
  - Prefer concentrating in a single registrar

- Registrars
  - Favor registry standardization
  - Are less likely to onboard niche or differently-run TLDs

- Registries
  - With a few exceptions, most are trying to differentiate or focus on specific verticals or geographies

# Possible solutions: not approved

- Registrars above a certain size would have "must-carry" obligations
  - Adopted in some industry/jurisdictions combinations (like Pay TV)
  - Group felt it would only be warranted if a "channel defect" could be demonstrated

- Wholesale registrar to carry all gTLDs that want it
  - Paid by ICANN to develop and support integration
  - Would allow jurisdictions or verticals with no or few accredited-registrars to have local / niche resellers

- Increase self-allocation limit
  - Registries can currently manage up to 100 domains (with minor restrictions), and have to follow RAA on those registrations
  - That limit could be expanded to 5,000 or 10,000 ; after that, registrars would, in theory, have commercial interest
  - Different implementation of this idea would be for all registry contracts to include a registrar license

# Self-allocation Impact Assessment

- 44 registry families have more than 20,000 dd

- 11 between 10,000 and 20,000

- 16 between 5,000 and 10,000

- 30+ launched non-brand less than 5,000

- Not launched TLDs might be awaiting better channel conditions or better overall demand/maturity

⊙ Registry-Registrar Clearinghouse

- ○ Would ease up requirement of pre-paid deposits or post-paid invoicing in different registries, by consolidating money flow

- ○ Would tackle currency conversion issues

  - • Local currency would be used by both registry and registrar

# Process to Achieve Consensus

Agenda Item #3

# Consensus Call Process

⊙ Next steps and considerations:

- Review and consider **public comment** in order to review, draft, or revise recommendations, based on WG deliberations, likely in sub teams.

- The default position is generally understood to be the 2012 implementation. The WG should affirmatively recommend that default position where applicable, rather than remaining silent.

- All recommendations, including those developed in sub teams, must go through a consensus call in the full Working Group.

- Careful reconciliation between recommendations of this WG and existing 2007 recommendations needed.

- Refinement of recommendations versus implementation guidance may be needed.

# More on the Consensus Call Process

◉ Standard Methodology for Making Decisions is included in section 3.6 of the GNSO Working Group Guidelines: https://gnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/annex-1-gnso-wg-guidelines-18jun18-en.pdf

◉ Standard steps of a consensus call:

i. After the group has discussed an issue long enough for all issues to have been raised, understood and discussed, the **Chair, or Co-Chairs**, make an evaluation of the **designation** and **publish it for the group to review**. Possible designations: **Full consensus, Consensus, Strong support but significant opposition, Divergence**. **Minority View** may occur in response to any designation except Full consensus.

ii. After the group has discussed the Chair's estimation of designation, the Chair, or Co-Chairs, should reevaluate and publish an updated evaluation.

iii. Steps (i) and (ii) should continue until the Chair/Co-Chairs make an evaluation that is accepted by the group.

iv. Consensus calls are **not** votes, though in rare cases, the Chair may determine that the use of a poll may be reasonable.

# More on the Consensus Call Process

- "**Full consensus**" exists when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings.

- The designation **"consensus"** is a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree. It does not require full agreement by every individual.

- **"Strong Support but significant opposition"** is a position where most support a recommendation, but a significant number do not support.

- **"Divergence"** is a position where there is not strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view.

- **"Minority view"** refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation and can happen in response to all designations except Full consensus.

# ICANN63 Session Planning

Agenda Item #4

# Tentative ICANN63 Session Timing

**Day 1: Saturday, 20 Oct 2018:**

⦿ **Full WG: 09:00-13:15**

*Day 3: Monday, 22 Oct 2018:*

⦿ *Work Track 5: 09:00-12:00*

Questions for the full WG session:

⦿ Where do we envision we will be at this stage?

⦿ What should the purpose/anticipated outcome be?

# AOB

Agenda Item #5

ICANN