

# New gTLD Report rt

# Table of Contents

**/01**

## **Letter From the Editor**

Learning, Good Luck, and Lunar New Year: Introducing the Q1 2025 New gTLD Report

**/03**

## **Registry Service Providers: In the Spotlight**

An Interview With Jason Loyer of GoDaddy Registry

**/06**

## **Focus on Security**

DNSSEC Under the Microscope

**/11**

## **New gTLDs 101: What's Your Type?**

Learning New gTLD Program Lingo

**/16**

## **Get Involved**

ICANN and policy work groups

**/17**

## **Upcoming ICANN Meetings**

We hope to see you there



# Letter From the Editor

## Learning, Good Luck, and Lunar New Year: the Q1 2025 New gTLD Report

At the beginning of another year, I find myself producing the Markmonitor New gTLD Quarterly Report in the middle of the Lunar New Year (which began on January 29, 2025).

With the Chinese Zodiac linked to a 12-year cycle based on animal signs, 2025 is the Year of the Snake, though more specifically the Year of the 'Wood Snake':

Each year also corresponds to one of the five basic elements (wuxing 五行) in Chinese cosmology, namely Metal (jin 金), Wood (mu 木), Water (shui 水), Fire (huo 火) or Earth (tu 土), creating a 60-year cycle.

Also forming the sexagenary cycle are the ten Heavenly Stems (tiangan 天干) and twelve Earthly Branches (dizhi 地支), each possessing different attributes. In 2025, the Heavenly Stem is Yi 乙, representing Wood, while the Earthly Branch is Si 巳, representing Fire, thus establishing the year of Yisi 乙巳. Therefore, individuals born in 2025 may be called 'Wood Snake' or 'Fire Snake' or 'Wood Fire Snake'.<sup>2</sup>

From this ethos comes the idea that children born under the 'Wood Snake' have:

resilient, courageous and positive personalities,  
keen insight and extraordinary intelligence,  
and  
an enigmatic and uncanny temperament<sup>3</sup>

As this quarter's articles were 'born' in 2025 I'm going to overlay their introduction onto to these concepts.

In this month's RSP Spotlight we open the report with an introduction of GoDaddy Registry. As with many of our industry peers, partners, and providers, we find them to be of 'keen insight and extraordinary intelligence' so check out my interview with them.

Our second article is the first in our new Focus on Security series, centered on Domain Name System Security Extensions or DNSSEC. Like anyone who wades into the digital space, one must be 'resilient, courageous, and positive' in facing the never-ending security challenges presented by bad actors. Read more to find out about how DNSSEC can help.

The ICANN community is full of jargon that is as 'enigmatic and uncanny' as anything I've seen, so in this quarter's New gTLDs 101 column, we dig into terminology that is associated with new gTLD applications as they will be important to understand in the New gTLD Program: Next Round.

As usual, we'll then finish with the ICANN Meeting schedule for this year.

With the introduction now complete, in the spirit of Lunar New Year, I wish you all health, happiness, and hope for 2025. Happy reading!



Top: Heidi Zhang, Head of Markmonitor China, enjoys fireworks while celebrating Lunar New Year with her family.

Bottom: A Lunar New Year feast.



Best Regards,  
Chris Niemi  
Manager, Strategic Initiatives

# Registry Service Providers: In the Spotlight

The domain industry has a number of members who perform different functions in respect to Top-Level Domains (TLDs). One of these important parties is the Registry Service Provider (RSP), also sometimes known as the BackEnd Registry Operator (BERO). In our RSP Spotlight series we'll introduce you to some of these key industry players.

In this quarter's spotlight we interview:  **GoDaddy** Registry



**Jason** Loyer

Sr. Director, Registry Client Services  
GoDaddy Registry



**Chris** Niemi

Manager, Strategic Initiatives  
Markmonitor

## RSP Definition:

In the RSP Handbook,<sup>1</sup> a ‘main RSP’ is defined as:

A Main RSP is responsible for the registrations of domain names and the reporting functions associated with domain registration. A Main RSP will operate a domain registration database, conduct data escrow and reporting operations regarding those registrations, operate Extensible Provisioning Protocol (EPP) and Registration Data Access Protocol (RDAP) services, and conduct other functions as required by ROs through their agreements with ICANN<sup>2</sup>.

*Editor’s Note: For our purposes, we are referring to RSPs in this ‘main RSP’ context only; there are other RSP types — DNSSEC, DNS, and Proxy — but those are outside of the initial scope of this series.*

So, with that definition out of the way, let’s get a real-world example of an RSP with our guest, Jason Loyer.

## GoDaddy Registry RSP Spotlight: Interview With Jason Loyer

■ **Chris Niemi (CN):** Hi Jason, thank you for speaking with me. What is your role and how long have you been in the domain industry?

▲ **Jason Loyer (JL):** Hi Chris, thanks for having me. I own sales, business development, and registry account management for GoDaddy Registry. I’m also involved with the Brand Safety Alliance, which launched a brand protection initiative in early 2024 that focused on domain blocking across a large number of web extensions (including new gTLDs,

ccTLDs, Web3, and others). *Editor’s Note: for more information about the domain blocking concept, please see our blog post.*<sup>3</sup>

■ **CN:** How long has GoDaddy Registry been active in the domain industry?

▲ **JL:** GoDaddy acquired the registry specific assets and personnel from Neustar in 2020. However, the Neustar team was engaged in the domain industry from the very early days, operating .biz and .us as legacy TLDs before becoming a backend operator serving brand and gTLD operators for the initial ICANN ngTLD round.

■ **CN:** Now that we know a bit about GoDaddy Registry’s history, what does an RSP actually do?

— “ —————

An RSP or backend operator — as [they] are also known — manages the technology to the ‘right of the dot.’

————— ” —

▲ **JL:** An RSP or backend operator — as we are also known — manages the technology to the ‘right of dot.’ This includes providing the supporting DNS and registry platform technology to ensure registered names within the TLDs we serve resolve. To clarify, the “GoDaddy” that most folks are familiar with is the registrar — the ‘left of the dot.’ We are the registry — to the ‘right of the dot.’

■ **CN:** Why is an RSP important to a TLD applicant or registry operator?

▲ **JL:** For an applicant/registry operator to operate their TLD, they must choose a backend operator to host their TLD. GoDaddy Registry serves as the backend operator for over 300 Top-Level Domains today: including ccTLDs and 'geo' TLDs, dotBrands, and generic TLDs as well.

■ **CN:** GoDaddy Registry is actually a bit of an outlier (in a good way) in that it is an RSP that has its own dotBrand Top-Level Domain. Do you find that having your own TLD gives you a unique perspective on providing RSP services?

▲ **JL:** That's right, Chris, we are uniquely positioned in this way.

Whilst at Neustar, we applied for and won .neustar, and post-GoDaddy acquisition, we own and operate .godaddy. This means our team goes through all the same day-to-day efforts our brand clients do when it comes to running their TLDs. I led an effort to influence our senior leadership teams — both at Neustar and at GoDaddy — to use our dotBrand TLDs, not just sit on them. I faced a lot of the same challenges our fellow dotBrand owners face in this regard, so I can sympathize!

I also work with our internal team to ensure we remain 100% ICANN compliant, and we serve on multiple industry groups to remain abreast of all the latest industry developments. We like to say we “eat our own dog food” — this way we know exactly what our clients face day-to-day — the operational realities of managing TLD assets — and this also informs our account management approach since we are in the same boat they are.

■ **CN:** Before we wrap this up, is there anything else you'd like to share with our readers?

▲ **JL:** Just to say thank you again for having me, and that we truly appreciate our relationship with Markmonitor and our joint clients. I look forward to seeing you, our clients, friends, and colleagues at ICANN meetings, INTA events, and other upcoming industry meetings.

■ **CN:** Thanks, it was great to hear from you, Jason. We appreciate you sharing your experiences as an RSP and as a dotBrand owner as well!

1. [newgtldprogram.icann.org/en/application-rounds/round2/rsp/handbook](https://newgtldprogram.icann.org/en/application-rounds/round2/rsp/handbook)
2. [newgtldprogram.icann.org/sites/default/files/documents/rsp-handbook-03jun24-en.pdf](https://newgtldprogram.icann.org/sites/default/files/documents/rsp-handbook-03jun24-en.pdf); Section 1.3.1, p.7
3. [markmonitor.com/blog/globalblock-domain-blocking-defensively-protects-ip](https://markmonitor.com/blog/globalblock-domain-blocking-defensively-protects-ip)



# Focus on Security: DNSSEC Under the Microscope

In 2025, companies continue to fight the oldest of battles — the battle to protect their assets. In this case, we are talking about digital assets. Since the first domain was registered in 1985 and the 'World Wide Web' was created in 1993, a company's digital presence has often been tied to a domain name, or more accurately — a portfolio of domain names. Securing these domains became an important effort and has required the attention of domain managers in the ensuing decades.

In 2012, the game changed as a company could actually be awarded and run an entire generic Top-Level Domain (gTLD) on its own with the launch of the ICANN's New gTLD Program.

With that introduction in mind, we are going to start a new series called 'Focus on Security' and describe some of the security measures that can be put in place at both the gTLD and domain levels to protect these assets and their brand owner's reputation.

*Editor's note: The scope of this article is to provide an introductory piece on the concept; there are many online sources of information to provide details at the granular level of implementing DNSSEC so that is outside this context.*

In our first installment, we focus on one of the 'older' security measures at the domain level: Domain Name System Security Extensions (DNSSEC).

## A Brief History of DNSSEC

As early as the 1990s, the nascent internet community was trying to find ways to make the internet more secure. After much discussion, collaboration, and work, the idea of DNSSEC was formally published in 2005<sup>1</sup> and has been edited since.

The core DNSSEC extensions are specified in the following Request for Comments (RFCs)<sup>2</sup>:

- RFC 4033<sup>3</sup>: "DNS Security Introduction and Requirements"
- RFC 4034<sup>4</sup>: "Resource Records for the DNS Security Extensions"
- RFC 4035<sup>5</sup>: "Protocol Modifications for the DNS Security Extensions"

For a summary of DNSSEC RFCs, see RFC9364<sup>6</sup>: DNS Security Extensions (DNSSEC).

## What's the Purpose of DNSSEC?

As ICANN notes, the point of DNSSEC is that:

DNSSEC strengthens authentication in DNS using *digital signatures* based on *public key cryptography*. With DNSSEC, it's not DNS queries and responses themselves that are cryptographically signed, but rather DNS data itself is signed by the owner of the data.

Every DNS zone has a *public/private key pair*. The zone owner uses the zone's *private key* to sign DNS data in the zone and generate digital signatures over that data. As the name "private key" implies, this key material is kept

secret by the zone owner. The zone's *public key*, however, is published in the zone itself for anyone to retrieve. Any recursive resolver that looks up data in the zone also retrieves the zone's public key, which it uses to *validate* the authenticity of the DNS data. The resolver confirms that the digital signature over the DNS data it retrieved is valid. If so, the DNS data is legitimate and is returned to the user. If the signature does not validate, the resolver assumes an attack, discards the data, and returns an error to the user.

DNSSEC adds two important features to the DNS protocol:

- Data origin authentication allows a resolver to cryptographically verify that the data it received actually came from the zone where it believes the data originated.
- Data integrity protection allows the resolver to know that the data hasn't been modified in transit since it was originally signed by the zone owner with the zone's private key.<sup>8</sup>



### What Does DNSSEC Provide Protection Against?

Per Infoblox, DNSSEC provides protection against the following concepts (that, depending on usage, may overlap in some ways):

- DNS hijacking (also known as DNS redirection) - any attack that tricks the end user into thinking he or she is communicating with a legitimate domain name when in reality it is communicating with a domain name or IP address that the attacker has set up.
- DNS spoofing – any attack that tries to change the DNS records returned to a querier to a response the attacker chooses (example: a man-in-the-middle style attack).
- DNS poisoning or cache poisoning – a more specific type of attack targeting caching name servers in an attempt to control the answers stored in the DNS cache.<sup>8</sup>



### What to Consider When Deciding If and How to Deploy DNSSEC

All that said, with the benefits of DNSSEC, come challenges; deployment of DNSSEC is complex with many available strategies, though ARIN suggests that an organization consider the following questions when deciding whether or not (and how) to deploy DNSSEC:

Does your organization have?

- The expertise and training to properly enable DNSSEC?
- The staff and resources to deploy and maintain DNSSEC?
- The rigorous process discipline to keep DNSSEC working?<sup>9</sup>

Taking these challenges into account might have affected whether a company utilizes DNSSEC on its domains, which may be reflected in the actual adoption of DNSSEC in the market.

### DNSSEC by the Numbers

For instance, Verisign, the registry operator for the ‘legacy’ gTLDs .com and .net shows the following numbers<sup>10</sup>:

gTLD	Domains Secured With DNSSEC
.com	6,337,764
.net	600,276

The above numbers are just under five percent of .com domains registered and just over four percent of .net domains registered, respectively.

To compare to another group of domains, the 1,113 active new gTLDs that have been introduced since 2012 show the following numbers<sup>11</sup>:

Domains	Signed Zones	Percent of Signed Zones to Domains
41,867,709	41,867,709	3.71%

However, these numbers don't tell the entire tale; there is a geographic consideration in this, especially in recent history in Europe.

Sweden was the first TLD in the world to sign its zone in 2005 and has offered DNSSEC to .se domain holders since February 2007.<sup>12</sup> More recently, SIDN, the ccTLD registry for the Netherlands, says that "currently, 62 percent of domain names under .nl are signed and almost 60 percent of incoming DNS traffic comes from validating resolvers."<sup>13</sup> Similarly, Norid, the ccTLD registry for Norway, shows that the share of .no domain names secured with DNSSEC is 60 percent.<sup>14</sup>

Pointing to the near future, Switch, the ccTLD registry for Switzerland and Liechtenstein, has implemented a DNS Resilience Programme with one goal to have "Switch's accredited registrars to protect 60% of all .ch domain names with DNSSEC by the end of 2026."<sup>15</sup>

### Why Should You Care About DNSSEC?

DNSSEC is a twenty-year-old technology solution that is both proven and complex.

It requires a high level of technical support to maintain but has distinct security advantages in handling DNS hijacking, DNS spoofing, and DNS poisoning.

DNSSEC is available for use on legacy gTLDs, ccTLDs, and new gTLDs. As such, this is a security measure that can be utilized in conjunction with gTLDs applied for by applicants in the ICANN New gTLD Program: Next Round (expected to open in 2026).<sup>16</sup> Applicants for dotBrand gTLDs who become registry operators may want to consider using DNSSEC on their dotBrand domains to maximize their overall security efficacy. Whether it makes sense to deploy might be affected by a number of factors such as your access to technical teams who can maintain and update the implementation, end user expectations (are you in Europe?), and a company's desired security risk tolerance.

That said, DNSSEC is one of many tools in a brand holder's security toolbox. Talk to your Domain Portfolio Advisor for details on using DNSSEC on today's domains or let us know if you are interested in applying for your own dotBrand gTLD of 'tomorrow.' With that, we'll continue to watch the space over time and see if DNSSEC adoption levels change.

Join us next time in our 'Focus on Security' series when we will go over other security tools that can be used to increase security coverage for the domains that you currently manage (including dotBrand if you have one) or in domains (TLDs or otherwise) you may manage in the future.

1. [dnssec-deployment.org/history/timeline](https://dnssec-deployment.org/history/timeline)
2. [learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/dns/dnssec](https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/dns/dnssec)
3. [datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc4033](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc4033)
4. [datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc4034](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc4034)
5. [datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc4035](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc4035)
6. [datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc9364](https://datatracker.ietf.org/doc/html/rfc9364)
7. [icann.org/resources/pages/dnssec-what-is-it-why-important-2019-03-05-en](https://icann.org/resources/pages/dnssec-what-is-it-why-important-2019-03-05-en)
8. [infoblox.com/dns-security-resource-center/what-are-dns-spoofing-dns-hijacking-dns-cache-poisoning](https://infoblox.com/dns-security-resource-center/what-are-dns-spoofing-dns-hijacking-dns-cache-poisoning)
9. [arin.net/resources/manage/dnssec](https://arin.net/resources/manage/dnssec)
10. [verisign.com/en\\_US/company-information/verisign-labs/internet-security-tools/dnssec-scoreboard/index.xhtml](https://verisign.com/en_US/company-information/verisign-labs/internet-security-tools/dnssec-scoreboard/index.xhtml), updated 01/28/2025
11. [ntldstats.com/tld](https://ntldstats.com/tld), pulled 02/06/2025
12. [internetstiftelsen.se/en/domains/tech-tools/dnssec](https://internetstiftelsen.se/en/domains/tech-tools/dnssec)
13. [sidn.nl/nieuws-en-blogs/geen-van-grootste-internetdiensten-beveiligd-met-dnssec](https://sidn.nl/nieuws-en-blogs/geen-van-grootste-internetdiensten-beveiligd-met-dnssec)
14. [norid.no/en/om-domenenavn/veiledere/sikrere-norske-domenenavn-med-dnssec](https://norid.no/en/om-domenenavn/veiledere/sikrere-norske-domenenavn-med-dnssec), updated 02/06/2025
15. [nic.li/security/resilience](https://nic.li/security/resilience)
16. [newgtldprogram.icann.org/en/application-rounds/round2](https://newgtldprogram.icann.org/en/application-rounds/round2)



# New gTLDs 101: What's Your Type?

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) ecosystem and community have a wealth of associated acronyms and terminology.

In our New gTLDs 101 series, we review some of these key terms to help you understand their meaning and how they affect the New gTLD Space.

## Applications, TLDs, and Geos: Foundational Next Round lingo

This report's terminology is a variety of terms that are related enough to be spoken in similar contexts but have very different yet important meanings:

- **Application: Standard vs. Community**
- **TLD by Eligible Registrant Type: Open vs. Restricted vs. Closed**
- **Special Requirement Type: Geographic and Internationalized Domain Name (IDN)**

*Editor's note: For this article, we are primarily focusing on definitions from the 2012 Applicant Guidebook (AGB) as the concepts are fairly well-defined; that said, as the Subsequent Procedures Implementation Review Team continues to drive the development of the Next Round Applicant Guidebook there will be some slight variation in how these terms may be used or defined; for an example see the **Different TLD Types** proposal<sup>1</sup> that was submitted as part of ICANN's recent **Third Proceeding for Proposed Language for Draft Sections of Next Round AGB**<sup>2</sup> Public Comment.*

Let's get right to it.

## Applicant Type

In the 2012 application round an application could be formally defined as one of two types: Standard or Community.

**Standard** being defined as:

“An application that has not been designated as community-based will be referred to hereinafter in this document as a standard application.”<sup>3</sup>

**Community** being defined as:

“A community-based gTLD is a gTLD that is operated for the benefit of a clearly delineated community. Designation or non-designation of an application as community-based is entirely at the discretion of the applicant. Any applicant may designate its application as community-based; however, each applicant making this designation is asked to substantiate its status as representative of the community it names in the application by submission of written endorsements in support of the application. Additional information may be requested in the event of a community priority evaluation (refer to section 4.2 of Module 4).”<sup>4</sup>

So, the delineating factor was whether your application was either a ‘community’ application or not a ‘community’ application and thus a ‘standard’ application by default. Of the 1,930 original applications, only 84 were submitted as ‘community’ applications,<sup>5</sup> so the remainder were considered ‘standard’ applications.

As noted above, the community application was important as it allowed an application that successfully passed ‘Community Priority Evaluation (CPE)’ to win a contention set with

other applications for the same gTLD string if it was in one.<sup>6</sup>

That said, CPE was very difficult to pass as it required community applications to be evaluated by a ‘community priority panel’ that scored four different criteria on a scale of up to 4 points per criterion; to be successful required receiving 14 points or higher of the possible 16 points. Of the 84 community applications submitted, only 61 successfully passed and made it to the point of contracting with ICANN; as of this writing, only 56 community new gTLDs are now active.<sup>7</sup>

## TLD by Eligible Registrant Type

This community idea played into the next concept that has existed since the beginning of Top-Level Domains: TLDs being defined by their eligible registrant classes (for example, .gov domains being used by the U.S. government or .mil being used by the U.S. military in the 1980s). The idea was expanded upon as part of the 2012 application round.

This concept means that a TLD with no limitations on potential registrants is considered **Open** as it is open to be registered by any party, organization, or individual. The .com legacy gTLD is the classic example of an open TLD.

On the opposite side of the continuum is a TLD with a registrant class that is limited in some way — requiring a local contact or local business registration, a particular certification or industry nexus, or other pre-defined condition or status — that is considered **Restricted**. Prior to the 2012 application window, examples of restricted TLDs would be the sponsored TLD .aero (for members of the civil aviation community<sup>8</sup> only) or the ccTLD

extension .co.jp (limited to 'companies (kaisha) having an official corporate registration in Japan').<sup>9</sup>

New to the 2012 New gTLD Program was the notion of a **Closed** TLD. There were discussions of this concept going back to the policy work that the ICANN Community began in 2007 that resulted in the 2012 application round. However, the final completion of the newly defined "Specification 13 process" was not completed until 2014,<sup>10</sup> well after the 2012 application window closed. The requirements to apply for a 'Specification 13' TLD were:

The TLD string is identical to the textual elements protectable under applicable law, of a registered trademark valid under applicable law;

Only Registry Operator, its Affiliates or Trademark Licensees are registrants of domain names in the TLD and control the DNS records associated with domain names at any level in the TLD;

The TLD is not a Generic String TLD (as defined in Specification 11);

Registry Operator has provided ICANN with an accurate and complete copy of such trademark registration.<sup>11</sup>

These types of gTLDs became known as 'closed' given that they were limited to a very tightly defined or 'closed' class of registrant: the brand holder (the registry operator), its affiliates, or its trademark licensees. Over time, these came to be called ".Brands," "dotBrands," "Brand TLDs," or "Spec 13 TLDs" (as the registry operators who met the requirements had to sign a newly created

Specification 13 that was added to the ICANN Registry Agreement).

### Special Requirement Type

The Applicant Guidebook refers to **Geographic** names such that:

If an applicant has applied for a gTLD string that is a geographic name (as defined in [the Guidebook]), the applicant is required to submit documentation of support for or non-objection to its application from the relevant governments or public authorities.<sup>12</sup>

Functionally, the types of accepted geographic names included capital city names, city names, sub-national place names (listed in ISO 3166), a UNESCO region, or members of the "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings" list.<sup>13</sup>

All applications would complete the Geographic Name Review as part of the evaluation.

Of the 1,930 original applications, only 66 were submitted as 'geographic names' and 57 of those applications made it to 'delegated' status.<sup>14</sup>

Since 2012, the description of a geographic TLD has been colloquially expanded:

As the international not-for-profit membership association, geoTLD.group, calls them: "geoTLDs are a type of TLDs that are intended to serve a geographic place, language or culture."<sup>15</sup>

As for **Internationalized Domain Names** (IDNs), the 2012 AGB stated:

Some applied-for gTLD strings are expected to be Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs). IDNs are domain names including characters used in the local representation of languages not written with the basic Latin alphabet (a - z), European-Arabic digits (0 - 9), and the hyphen (-). As described below, IDNs require the insertion of A-labels into the DNS root zone.<sup>16</sup>

Detailed analysis of the IDN requirements is beyond the scope of this piece; suffice it to say that the AGB specifically laid out the complex technical requirements that an IDN application needed to meet to pass the evaluation. IDN applications were also allowed to be processed at the beginning of the application queue ahead of the applications for traditional Latin gTLDs to 'encourage' their submission.

Of the 116 total IDN applications<sup>17</sup> submitted in 2012, 98 successfully passed and reached the point of contracting with ICANN; as of this writing, only 89 IDN new gTLDs are now active.

### Why Does Understanding These Terms Matter?

It's wise to understand these terms and how they interact; for instance:

A geographic TLD is generally restricted by definition and may also be a community TLD, see:

.barcelona<sup>18</sup>

An IDN TLD can be a community TLD and is thus restricted by definition, see:

.天主教 ('Catholic' in Chinese)<sup>19</sup>

An open TLD would have been a standard application, see:

.app<sup>20</sup>

A closed TLD (a dotBrand) can be an IDN, see:

.アマゾン ('Amazon' in Japanese)<sup>21</sup>

Perhaps most important to a potential dotBrand applicant in the New gTLD Program: Next Round is the notion of a 'closed generic.' As listed in the Closed Generics proposal that was submitted as part of ICANN's **Second Proceeding for Proposed Language for Draft Sections of Next Round AGB Public Comment:**

Applicants should be aware that the ICANN Board has resolved that 'closed generic gTLD applications will not be permitted until such time as there is an approved methodology and criteria to evaluate whether or not a proposed closed domain is in the public interest.'

Based on the relevant text in the [Base Registry Agreement] a 'closed' TLD imposes eligibility criteria for registering names in the TLD that limit registrations exclusively to a single person or entity and/or that person's or entity's "Affiliates". The Base Registry Agreement defines 'generic' as 'a string consisting of a word or term that denominates or describes a general class of goods, services, groups, organizations or things, as opposed to distinguishing a

specific brand of goods, services, groups, organizations or things from those of others’.

Applicants will be required to affirm during the application process that they are not applying for, nor intend to operate a closed generic gTLD.

## How Is Understanding These Terms Important?

Understanding the opportunities available in the Next Round is paramount, as you may be able to apply for open, restricted, or closed (dotBrand) gTLDs. It is also important to be aware of geographic name review and the potential advantages that community applications may have in contention sets if they pass CPE. If you are interested in applying for an IDN, please note that it will likely involve a high level of technical complexity.

Further, if your company is considering applying for a gTLD(s) in the Next Round, careful consideration will need to be taken in determining whether the gTLD(s) in question could be considered a Closed Generic before applying. A review of trademark portfolios, past usage, future use cases, and other relevant information will need to be analyzed to make a go or no-go decision on applying. Please be aware that Markmonitor will be able to assist you in undertaking this review.

## New gTLDs 101: Understanding the Terminology

And just like that, we’ve learned about seven more terms in our New gTLDs 101 series: standard application, community application,

open TLD, restricted TLD, closed TLD, geographic TLD, and IDN.

Join us next quarter to learn more information about the domain industry, and don’t hesitate to reach out and let us know if there is an abbreviation, acronym, or initialism you’d like to learn about!

1. [itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/new-generic-top-level-domain-g-tld-program/pc-final-topic-4-tld-types-18-12-2024-en.pdf](https://itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/new-generic-top-level-domain-g-tld-program/pc-final-topic-4-tld-types-18-12-2024-en.pdf)
2. [icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/third-proceeding-for-proposed-language-for-draft-sections-of-next-round-agb-19-12-2024](https://icann.org/en/public-comment/proceeding/third-proceeding-for-proposed-language-for-draft-sections-of-next-round-agb-19-12-2024)
3. [newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), p.1-27 (please note that means ‘Module 1,’ ‘page 27’)
4. [Ibid.](#), p1-26 and p. 1-27
5. [gtdresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/viewstatus](https://gtdresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/viewstatus), with filter ‘Type’ > ‘Community’
6. [newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), p.4-2
7. [icann.org/en/registry-agreements](https://icann.org/en/registry-agreements), with filter ‘Agreement Type’ > ‘Community (Spec 12)’
8. [information.aero/registration](https://information.aero/registration)
9. [jprs.co.jp/en/jpdomain.html](https://jprs.co.jp/en/jpdomain.html)
10. [newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-14apr14-en](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/announcements-and-media/announcement-14apr14-en)
11. [Ibid.](#)
12. [newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), p.1-26
13. [Ibid.](#), p. 2-17 and 2-18
14. [gtdresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/viewstatus](https://gtdresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/viewstatus), with filter ‘Type’ > ‘Geographic’ and ‘Application Status’ > ‘Delegated’
15. [geotld.group/geotld](https://geotld.group/geotld)
16. [newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf](https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/guidebook-full-04jun12-en.pdf), p.1-32
17. [gtdresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/viewstatus](https://gtdresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/viewstatus), with filter ‘Type’ > ‘IDN’
18. [itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/registry-agreements/barcelona/barcelona-agmt-pdf-24jul14-en.pdf](https://itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/registry-agreements/barcelona/barcelona-agmt-pdf-24jul14-en.pdf)
19. [itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/registry-agreements/xn--tiq49xqyj/xn--tiq49xqyj-agmt-pdf-21oct15-en.pdf](https://itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/registry-agreements/xn--tiq49xqyj/xn--tiq49xqyj-agmt-pdf-21oct15-en.pdf)
20. [gtdresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1343](https://gtdresult.icann.org/applicationstatus/applicationdetails/1343)
21. [itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/registry-agreements/xn--cckwxcxetd/xn--cckwxcxetd-agmt-pdf-19dec19-en.pdf](https://itp.cdn.icann.org/en/files/registry-agreements/xn--cckwxcxetd/xn--cckwxcxetd-agmt-pdf-19dec19-en.pdf)

# Get Involved

## Interested in getting more involved with ICANN and policy work?

Consider joining the following groups (as relevant to your business):

- ICANN Business Constituency, [icannbc.org](https://icannbc.org)
- Intellectual Property Constituency, [ipconstituency.org](https://ipconstituency.org)
- Brand Registry Group, [brandregistrygroup.org](https://brandregistrygroup.org)



# Upcoming ICANN Meetings

Community Forum .....

8 - 13 March, 2025



Seattle, Washington, USA




Prague, Czech Republic

..... Policy Forum

9 - 12 June, 2025

Annual General Meeting .....

25 - 30 October, 2025



Muscat,  
Oman



Should you need any further information or assistance, please contact your Domain Portfolio Advisor (DPA) or email [customer.service@markmonitor.com](mailto:customer.service@markmonitor.com)

Markmonitor provides strategic domain management solutions that help protect the revenue and reputation of the world's leading brands.

Since 1999, Markmonitor has served the domain portfolio needs of businesses around the globe, including many of the most visited websites in the world. An ICANN accredited domain registrar since its establishment, Markmonitor leverages its extensive industry relationships, innovative technology, and broad expertise to manage and protect company domain portfolios, all with data-driven, white-glove consultation designed to maximize domain portfolio value.