Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: **Planning Assumptions for Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs**

Date statement submitted: **30 Aug 2019**

Reference url:
Planning Assumptions for Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/readiness-support-future-rounds-new-gtlds-07jun19-en.pdf

---

Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) comment:

The Registries Stakeholder Group (RySG) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the document "Planning Assumptions for Subsequent Procedures for New gTLDs." We believe that this is an important milestone for ICANN to begin to plan and budget for the continuation of ICANN's New gTLD Program.

The RySG notes that several groups have criticized the release of this document prior to the completion of the Subsequent Procedures for the Introduction of Subsequent New gTLDs Policy Development Process ("SubPro PDP"). However, our stakeholder group would like to remind the community that this type of readiness planning began for the 2012 round of new gTLDs as early as FY 2006-2007[1], well over one year prior to the ICANN Board's approval of the then-current new gTLD policy. Although at the time it was believed that the round would launch shortly after the approval of the policy, the point is that ICANN began planning, budgeting and designing its new gTLD program years in advance of the ultimate launch.

The RySG appreciates the fact that GDD has elected for transparency in this effort and thanks them for publishing this list of assumptions. It not only takes a step forward in terms of transparency, but also gives the community more insight into everything that needs to happen prior to commencing an application window for a new gTLD round.

---

[1] See https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/adopted-budget-fy6-07-30jun06-en.pdf, where ICANN allocated nearly $360,000 towards planning for what became the 2012 round of new gTLDs (approx. 4% of the total overall ICANN budget), and then in FY 2007-2008 another $1.65 million (representing approximately 3.3% of the overall ICANN budget) (See https://www.icann.org/resources/unthemed-pages/adopted-budget-2007-06-29-en)

The RySG urges ICANN to move forward with this set of assumptions, even though some of them may ultimately need to be modified based on the final recommendations of the SubPro PDP.

If ICANN were to produce a second version of this document or were to include these in a subsequent business plan, we believe it should include an expanded analysis. We all realise that assumptions may prove to be incorrect and the question is, "by how much and how will we respond." ICANN might reflect the degree of certainty it has in each of the assumptions and also might develop a plan for addressing situations that vary with the assumptions. E.g., if there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding the number of applications, what is plan B if the number of applications is 10% of the number predicted (or, 100% greater? 500% greater)? Some contingency planning will be beneficial in the event that, as most certainly will occur, that some of the assumptions are off.

In summary, we urge ICANN to continue this planning process even in advance of the completion of the SubPro PDP. The planning process not only makes sense from a business perspective, but also is the only way that ICANN will be in a position to ultimately launch the program without undue delay.