

Review of current status of draft report recommendations

Jean-Baptiste Deroulez

Review of current status of draft report recommendations

Recommendations format

Recommendation #:

Rationale/related findings:

To:

Prerequisite or Priority Level*:

Consensus within team:

Details:

Success Measures:

****Prerequisite or Priority Level:** Per the ICANN Bylaws, the CCT Review Team indicated whether each recommendation must be implemented prior to the launch of subsequent procedures for new gTLDs. The Review Team agreed that those recommendations that were not categorized as prerequisites would be given a time-bound priority level:*

***High priority:** Must be implemented within 18 months of the issuance of a final report*

***Medium priority:** Must be implemented with 36 months of the issuance of a final report*

***Low priority:** Must be implemented prior to the start of the next CCT Review*

Review of current status of draft report recommendations

Relevant questions to ask yourself when updating recommendations

Recommendation:

- What observed fact-based issue is the recommendation intending to solve? What is the “problem statement”?
- What is the intent of the recommendation?
- How significant would the impact be if not addressed?

Rationale/related findings:

- What are the findings that support the recommendation?

To:

- Does this recommendation require new policies to be adopted? If yes, what stakeholders need to be engaged in the policy development process to support successful implementation of this recommendation?
- Who are the (responsible) parties that need to be involved in the implementation work for this recommendation? Community? ICANN org? Board? All?
- Is related work already underway? If so, what is it and who is carrying it out?

Review of current status of draft report recommendations

Prerequisite or Priority Level:

- What is the target for a successful implementation?
- Is the recommendation aligned with ICANN's strategic plan and ICANN mission? If yes, how?

Success Measures:

- What outcome is the Review Team seeking? How will the effectiveness of implemented improvements be measured? What is the target for a successful implementation?

Consolidation/Updates:

- If only 5 recommendations can be implemented due to community bandwidth and other resource constraints, would this recommendation be one of the top 5? Why or why not?

Current Status of Draft Report Recommendations

Recommendations Addressed to New gTLDs Subsequent Procedures Working Group

[Rec. 10](#)

[Rec. 14](#)

[Rec. 25-30](#)

[Rec. 11, 13, 15, 33](#)

[Rec. 37, 38, 39](#)

[Rec. 43](#)

[Rec. 46](#)

[Rec. 48](#)

[Rec. 49](#)

[Rec. A](#)

[Rec. B](#)

[Rec. C](#)

[Rec. D](#)

[Rec. E](#)

Recommendations Consolidated

Recs 7,8

Recs 11, 13, 15, 33

Recs 17,18

Recs 19, 34, C

Recs 25, 26, 27,28, 29, 30

Recs 37, 38, 39

Recommendations Deleted

Rec. 22

Rec. 35

Rec. 36

Rec. 50

Recommendations Under Review

Rec 14 (*Jordyn*)

Rec. D (*David*)

Rec. E (*Drew*)

Recommendation: Formalize and promote ongoing data collection.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of data has handicapped attempts both internally and externally to evaluate market trends and the success of policy recommendations.

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level : High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: ICANN should establish a formal initiative, perhaps including a dedicated data scientist, to facilitate quantitative analysis, by staff, contractors and the community, of the domain name market and, where possible, the outcomes of policy implementation. This department should be directed and empowered to identify and either collect or acquire datasets relevant to the objectives set out in strategic plans, and analysis and recommendations coming from review teams and working groups.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in continuous improvement of ICANN operations.

Recommendation: Formalize and promote ongoing data collection.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of data has handicapped attempts both internally and externally to evaluate market trends and the success of policy recommendations.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level : High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: In an effort to promote more objective policy development inside ICANN, the ICANN organization should establish a formal initiative, perhaps including a dedicated data scientist, to facilitate quantitative analysis by staff, contractors and the the community, of policy initiatives and review. Specifically, where possible, ICANN staff should proactively collect data needed to validate or invalidate policy initiatives (whether ICANN org or community driven), identify and collect data necessary to measure program success, both incrementally and in retrospect. On a case by case basis, this initiative would help to ascertain the cost/benefit and security requirements for the data in question.

Success Measures: The ability for the community to determine, through review process, if policy initiatives had well defined issue measurement to justify reform and facilitate review.

Recommendation: Collect wholesale pricing for legacy gTLDs.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of wholesale data will continue to frustrate future CCT Review Teams' efforts to analyze competition between new and legacy gTLDs in the domain marketplace.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: ICANN or an outside contractor should acquire wholesale price information from both legacy and new gTLD registries on a regular basis and provide necessary assurances that the data would be treated on a confidential basis. The data could then be used for analytic purposes by the ICANN organization and by others that execute non-disclosure agreements. This may require amendment to the Base Registry Agreement for legacy gTLDs.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect wholesale pricing for legacy gTLDs.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of data from legacy gTLDs and transactional data will continue to hinder future CCT Review Teams' efforts to analyze competition between registries in the domain marketplace. In particular, the review team was unable to determine whether wholesale prices charged by legacy gTLDs had declined as a result of increased competition due to the introduction of new gTLDs.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: TBC

Details: Expanding on the existing model of using an outside contractor to perform existing studies, ICANN should work with an appropriate contractor and registry operators to acquire wholesale price information from both legacy and new gTLD registries on a regular basis, including at least a sample of transactional data. Transactional data is essential to allow analysis of the cost of similar strings across TLDs, and to understand the role of promotional pricing by registries. ADue to the sensitive nature of this data, ICANN and its contractors should provide strong assurances that the data would be treated on a confidential basis, including collecting the data under a nondisclosure agreement. In the event that ICANN and its contractors are unable to establish a voluntary framework for sharing this information, this may require amendment to the Base Registry Agreement for legacy gTLDs.

Success Measures: The ability for a third party economic study to establish a meaningful understanding of (1) wholesale pricing in legacy gTLDs, (2) the role of promotional pricing in the marketplace, and (3) the value of individual second level labels across various TLDs.

Recommendation: Collect transactional pricing for the gTLD marketplace.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of transactional data will continue to frustrate future CCT Review Teams' efforts to analyze competition between registries in the domain marketplace.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: ICANN or an outside contractor should attempt to acquire at least some samples of wholesale price information from registries on a regular basis and provide necessary assurances that the data would be treated on a confidential basis. The data could then be used for analytic purposes by the ICANN organization and by others that execute non-disclosure agreements.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect transactional pricing for the gTLD marketplace.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of transactional data will continue to **hinder** future CCT Review Teams' efforts to analyze competition between registries in the domain marketplace. **Although ICANN was able to obtain base wholesale prices from registries, individual domain transactions are often sold at either a significant discount as part of promotional campaigns, or at a significantly higher price than the baseline price for certain premium domains. For some TLDs, the Review Team believes that a large fraction (even a substantial majority) of domains were been sold at discounted prices. Therefore, any pricing analysis based solely on the base wholesale price is unlikely to correctly capture the competitive dynamics in the marketplace.**

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: TBC

Details: ICANN or an outside contractor should attempt to acquire at least some samples of wholesale price information from registries on a regular basis and provide necessary assurances that the data would be treated on a confidential basis. The data could then be used for analytic purposes by the ICANN organization and by others that execute non-disclosure agreements.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect retail pricing for the domain marketplace.

Rationale/related findings: ICANN does not currently make use of retail price data that can be obtained directly from public sources such as <https://tld-list.com/> and <https://namestat.org>. We recommend that ICANN develop the capability to analyze these data on an ongoing basis. Alternatively, an amendment to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement would ensure the availability of this data with all due diligence to protect competitive information.

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: ICANN does not currently make use of retail price data that can be obtained directly from public sources such as <https://tld-list.com/> and <https://namestat.org>. We recommend that ICANN develop the capability to analyze these data on an ongoing basis. Alternatively, an amendment to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement would ensure the availability of this data with all due diligence to protect competitive information.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect retail pricing for the domain marketplace.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of retail data will continue to **hinder** future CCT Review Teams' efforts to analyze competition between registries and TLDs in the domain marketplace. **One of the anticipated benefits of increased competition from the introduction of new gTLDs would be lower prices for domain names to registrants. Prices charged by registrars to registrants are the best indicator of this potential consumer benefit. In addition, retail prices offered to the public will generally be accessible through registrars' public websites and will not require additional disclosures to ICANN by contracted parties. (Note that some registrars, such as those providing corporate/brand protection services, do not publish their prices and therefore would not be represented in a survey of publicly available prices.)**

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: TBC

Details: ICANN does not currently make use of retail price data that can be obtained directly from public sources such as <https://tld-list.com/> and <https://namestat.org>. We recommend that ICANN develop the capability to analyze these data on an ongoing basis. Alternatively, an amendment to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement would ensure the availability of this data with all due diligence to protect competitive information.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect parking data

Rationale/related findings: The high incidence of parked domains suggests an impact on the competitive landscape, but insufficient data frustrates efforts to analyze this impact.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: ICANN should regularly track the proportion of TLDs that are parked with sufficient granularity to identify trends on a regional and global basis.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect domain usage data to better understand the implications of parked domains

Rationale/related findings: The high incidence of parked domains suggests an impact on the competitive landscape, but insufficient data **hinders** efforts to analyze this impact.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: We use the term “domain usage” rather than “parking” in the recommendation because the term “parking” is associated with a wide variety of behaviors, and different members of the community may define “parking” differently. It is also likely that different type of “parking” behaviors reflect different intentions by registrants and will have different implications on the competitive dynamics in the marketplace. ICANN should regularly track the proportion of domains in gTLDs that are parked with sufficient granularity to identify trends on a regional and global basis. Ideally, data would allow analysis to occur on a per-domain basis rather than being aggregated on a TLD level. Future reviews should conduct further analyses of whether there is a correlation between parked domains and renewal rates or other factors that may affect competition. Further analysis should be performed on the relationship between parking and DNS abuse. The community may also wish to take this issue up for further study outside of the periodic CCT Review process, as the phenomenon is also prevalent within legacy gTLDs and there does not seem to be significant study of the topic with ICANN.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect secondary market data

Rationale/related findings: The presence of price caps in certain TLDs frustrates efforts to comprehensively analysis competitive effects. The true market price may very well be above the caps. Accordingly, the secondary market is the best place to see price movement.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: ICANN should engage with the secondary market community to better understand pricing trends.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect secondary market data

Rationale/related findings: The presence of price caps in certain TLDs **hinders** efforts to comprehensively analysis competitive effects. The true market price may very well be above the caps. Accordingly, the secondary market is the best place to see price movement.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: ICANN should engage with the secondary market community to better understand pricing trends. **Ideally, ICANN would be able to be able to obtain long-term transactional data that would allow it to evaluate whether the price of similar domain names was increase or decreasing over time, and whether there was any relationship to the introduction of new gTLDs. Given that it may be difficult to obtain such data, aggregated data that show per-TLD trends or overall trends in market pricing that take into consideration the introduction of new gTLDs would still be an improvement over the current limited insights into pricing dynamics in legacy gTLDs.**

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Collect TLD sales at a country-by-country level.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of country-level data will continue to frustrate future CCT Review Teams' efforts to analyze competition between registries and TLDs in the domain marketplace. In particular, the lack of country-specific data frustrates efforts to understand the competition between gTLDs and ccTLDs.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: Some of this data is collected by third parties such as CENTR, so it is possible that ICANN can arrange to acquire the data.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Create, support and/or partner with mechanisms and entities involved with the collection of TLD sales data at the country-by country level.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of country-level data will continue to frustrate future CCT Review Teams' efforts to analyze competition between registries and TLDs in the domain marketplace. ccTLD data, which is useful in understanding the overall TLD marketplace, is particularly hard to come by.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: Some regional organizations such as CENTR, AFTLD and APTLD are already engaged in data collection and statistical research initiatives. ICANN should strive to partner with these organizations and explore ways in which it can enhance the capacities of these organizations so that their output is geared to ICANN's data requirements. ICANN should also seek to promote the ability of these disparate organizations to coordinate their efforts in areas such as standardization of research and methodology, so that their data is comparable. The regional initiatives that ICANN has already undertaken, such as the LAC and MEA DNS Marketplace studies, should be undertaken at regular periods, as they too provide invaluable country-level and regional data.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Partner with mechanisms and entities involved with the collection of TLD data. As feasible, collect TLD registration number data per TLD and registrar at a country-by-country level in order to perform analysis based on the same methods used in the LAC study (1).

Rationale/related findings: The lack of country-level data will continue to frustrate future CCT Review Teams' efforts to analyze competition between registries and TLDs in the domain marketplace. In particular, the lack of country-specific data frustrates efforts to understand the competition between gTLDs and ccTLDs. ccTLD data, which is useful in understanding the overall TLD marketplace, is particularly hard to come by.

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: Some of this data is collected by third parties such as CENTR, so it is possible that ICANN can arrange to acquire the data.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Conduct periodic surveys of registrants.

Rationale/related findings: The inability to determine registrant motivations and behavior frustrates efforts to study competition and choice in the TLD marketplace.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The survey should be designed and continuously improved to collect registrant trends. Some initial thoughts on potential questions is in Appendix F: Possible Questions for a Future Consumer Survey.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: Conduct periodic surveys of registrants.

Rationale/related findings: Although Nielsen conducted two surveys of registrants in conjunction with the CCT review, the set of questions posed did not allow for a full analysis of consumer motivations or to understand how valuable they found the expanded choice offered by the new gTLDs. At the same time, as we observe additional registrations and more familiarity with new gTLDs, it is likely that consumer attitudes will change over time as well. A periodic survey will allow the community to observe those changes.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: TBC

Details: Because the survey supports further analysis of both consumer choice and consumer trust, it must pose questions relating to both topics. In both cases it is important to know which TLDs consumers are familiar with and which they actually visit.

To better understand issues of consumer trust it is also important to understand why they choose to register in some TLDs but not others and whether the TLD's registration policies and perception of trustworthiness influence the choice of whether or not to register.

For consumer choice, the survey should allow a relative weighting of the potential contributions to consumer choice with respect to geographic name gTLDs, specific sector gTLDs and Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) gTLDs should help determine whether there is a clear preference by registrants for different types of gTLDs and whether there are regional differences or similarities in their preferences. It will be also be important to gather further data on the geographic distribution of gTLD registrants and the services provided to them by registrars, particularly in different regions, including languages offered for service interactions and locations beyond the primary offices.

The survey should be designed to repeat portions of previous surveys while continuously improving to collect registrant trends. Some initial thoughts on potential questions is in the previous draft report - Appendix F: Possible Questions for a Future Consumer Survey. The survey should allow an analysis of (1) what factors matter most to users in determining which gTLDs to visit; (2) whether perceived trustworthiness of TLDs influences registration behavior; (3) comparing the perception of new gTLDs with restrictions on registration, to new gTLDs with few or no restrictions; and (4) whether registrants view the expanded name space as beneficial or confusing.

Success Measures: The availability of relevant data for use by the ICANN organization, contractors and the ICANN

community for its work in evaluating competition in the DNS space.

Recommendation: The ICANN community should consider whether the costs related to defensive registration for the small number of brands registering a large number of domains can be reduced.

Rationale/related findings: We found that while most trademarks were either not registered in new gTLDs or in only a handful of new gTLDs, a small number of trademarks were responsible for a large number of registrations across many new gTLDs and were likely bearing most of the cost of registrations. This bimodal distribution suggests that RPMs tailored to certain of these trademarks may be appropriate.

To: Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group and/or Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM)PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: The ICANN community should consider whether the costs related to defensive registration for the small number of brands registering a large number of domains can be reduced.

Rationale/related findings: We found that while most trademarks were either not registered in new gTLDs or in only a handful of new gTLDs, a small number of trademarks were responsible for a large number of registrations across many new gTLDs and were likely bearing most of the cost of registrations. This bimodal distribution suggests that RPMs tailored to certain of these trademarks may be appropriate.

To: Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group and/or Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM)PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The review team does not suggest a specific mechanism. However, we believe the uneven distribution of costs of defensive registrations to a small number of trademark holders may be an unanticipated effect of the current RPM regime and that the relevant PDP(s) should therefore consider whether those costs can be lowered without impacting the benefits of the new gTLD program, therefore improving the overall cost/benefit ratio of the overall program.

Success Measures: A reduction in the number of overall number of defensive registrations overall, and in particular a reduction in the number of defensive registrations per trademark by the registrants with the most defensive registrations without causing an increase in the number of UDRP and URS cases.

Recommendation: The next consumer end-user and registrant surveys to be carried out should include questions to solicit additional information on the benefits of the expanded number, availability and specificity of new gTLDs.

In particular, for any future consumer end-user surveys, a relative weighting of the positive contributions to consumer choice with respect to geographic name gTLDs, specific sector gTLDs and Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) gTLDs should help determine whether there is a clear preference by consumers for different types of gTLDs and whether there are regional differences or similarities in their preferences.

The next consumer end-user survey should also include further questions about whether confusion has been created for consumers in expanding the number and type of gTLDs, how they navigate to websites and if the nature and manner of search has an impact on confusion (positive, negative or indifferent).

For registrants, it will be important to gather further data on the geographic distribution of gTLD registrants and the services provided to them by registrars, particularly in different regions, including languages offered for service interactions and locations beyond the primary offices.

The next CCT review would then be able to assess in more detail these aspects, by which time there should be more data and a longer history of experience with the new gTLDs, and in particular with those in languages other than English and those using non-Latin scripts.

Rationale/related findings: The absence of data related to consumer confusion means that it is difficult to determine whether consumer confusion arises as a result of the sheer number and variety of TLDs available or whether the benefits of increased consumer choice may have been offset by any possible increase in confusion. The next CCT Review should have this data available before the start of the review to ensure that nothing has been missed and that if any possible constraints or confusions exist, they can be addressed in the future.

To: Next CCT Review and ICANN organization

Details: (none)

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Success Measures: (none)

Consensus within team: TB

Recommendation: Collection and processing personal data should be more strictly regulated within rules which are mandatory for all gTLD registries. Registries should not be allowed to share personal data with third parties without consent of that person or under circumstances defined by applicable law. Also, it is necessary to be aware of new European personal data regulation – the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) – especially on issues such as the possible applicability of the regulation and “right to be forgotten.”

Rationale/related findings: As mentioned above, the policies of the top 30 new gTLDs have rules regarding sharing of personal data of its registrants with third parties. Furthermore, some of those policies have very clear statements that registries have the right to share or sell personal data.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: The GNSO should initiate a new Policy Development Process to create a consistent privacy baseline across all registries, including to explicitly cover cases of privacy infringements such as sharing or selling personal data without a lawful basis, such as the consent of that person. The GNSO PDP should consider limiting the collection and processing of personal data within rules which are mandatory for all gTLD registries. It should also consider not allowing registries to share personal data with third parties without a lawful basis, such as the consent of that person or under circumstances defined by applicable law (e.g. upon requests of government agencies, IP lawyers, etc.). Also, it is necessary to be aware of emerging, applicable regulations related to the processing of the personal data. For clarification, this recommendation does not relate to issues involving WHOIS or registration directory services data.

Rationale/related findings: As mentioned above, the policies of the top 30 new gTLDs have rules regarding sharing of personal data of its registrants with third parties. Furthermore, some of those policies have very clear statements that registries have the right to share or sell personal data.

To: Generic Names Supporting Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: Despite the fact that the base Registry Agreement has references to privacy laws and policies, some of the registries are explicit that they have right to share personal data with third parties without consent of that person or under circumstances defined by applicable law.

Success Measures: The development of relevant policy and update of the base Registry Agreement.

Recommendation: Conduct a study to identify (1) which new gTLDs have been visited most; (2) the reasons users identify to explain why visited certain new gTLDs more than others; (3) what factors matter most to users in determining which gTLDs to visit and (4) how users' behaviors indicate to what extent they trust new gTLDs

Rationale/related findings: The Nielsen studies indicate the relationship between trust of a gTLD and several other factors, including familiarity, reputation and security. However, further information is needed on why and to what extent the public trusts new gTLDs. In particular, in addition to repeating surveys that gather the respondents' subjective views about trustworthiness, ICANN, relevant stakeholders and future Review Teams should assess what objective information can be gathered and measured that relates to trustworthiness. A further study could provide useful information for future gTLD applicants.

To: ICANN organization and future CCT

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Face-to-Face Meeting Action Item: Consolidate **recommendations 13, 15, 33** into a single end-user survey: Laureen to consider whether it will be a part of the earlier larger recommendation on conducting a single end-user survey. **Jordyn to consolidate registrant survey recommendations** and Laureen to address end-user survey recommendations for possible consolidation.

Recommendation: Create incentives to encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations regarding: (1) the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name; (2) restrictions as to who can register a domain name in certain gTLDs based upon implied messages of trust conveyed by the name of its gTLDs (particularly in sensitive or regulated industries) and (3) the safety and security of users' personal and sensitive information (including health and financial information).

Rationale/related findings: The Nielsen surveys indicate that the public expects restrictions on who can purchase domain names, expects that such restrictions will be enforced and is concerned about the security of their personal and sensitive information.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite (incentives could be implemented as part of application process)

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Create incentives to encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations regarding (1) the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name; (2) restrictions as to who can register a domain name in certain gTLDs based upon implied messages of trust conveyed by the name of its gTLDs (particularly in sensitive or regulated industries; and (3) the safety and security of users' personal and sensitive information (including health and financial information). **These incentives could relate to applicants who choose to make public interest commitments in their applications that relate to these expectations. Ensure that applicants for any subsequent rounds are aware of these public expectations by inserting information about the results of the ICANN surveys in the Applicant Guide Books.**

Rationale/related findings: The Nielsen surveys indicate certain expectations on behalf of the public. The surveys indicated the public believes that websites have different extensions to “properly identify the purpose or owner or to give an indication of content or function.” The majority of those surveyed expect both 1) a connection between the name of a gTLD and the websites associated with that gTLD and 2) a consistency between the meaning of the domain name and its actual use. The Nielsen surveys also indicate that the public expects restrictions on who can purchase domain names, expects that such restrictions will be enforced and is concerned about the security of their personal and sensitive information. Hence, the Nielsen surveys indicated a positive relationship between registration restrictions and trustworthiness of a domain.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite (incentives could be implemented as part of application process)

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: In addition to benefits, registration restrictions may also impact competition. Therefore, consideration should be given to both the potential benefits and drawbacks of registration restrictions.

Success Measures: Measures of success for these recommendations would include improved public trust and visitation of new gTLDs and reduced fears regarding the misuse of user's personal and sensitive information. They would also include an assessment of whether registration restrictions have had a negative impact on competition.

Face-to-Face Meeting Action Item: Rewriting it to include removal of barriers to diversity (i.e. more niche TLDs or other business models?) to incentivize it rather than encouraging a particular business model.

Some of rationale from **recs 35 and 36** should be included in **rec 14** or elsewhere in the text. i.e. Observations about risks and costs and benefits in the text.

Recommendation: ICANN should repeat selected parts of global surveys (for consumer end-user and registrant surveys, in addition to necessary baseline and questions – repeat 700, 800, 900, and 1100 series survey questions and questions 775, 1000, 1036, 1050, 155 and 1060) to look for an increase in familiarity with new gTLDs, visitation of new gTLDs and perceived trustworthiness of new gTLDs.

Rationale/related findings: Future review teams can compare these results to prior data to assess whether there has been an increase in familiarity with and trust of new gTLDs.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Face-to-Face Meeting Action Item: Consolidate **recommendations 13, 15, 33** into a single end-user survey: Laureen to consider whether it will be a part of the earlier larger recommendation on conducting a single end-user survey. Jordyn to consolidate registrant survey recommendations and Laureen to address end-user survey recommendations for possible consolidation.

Recommendation: ICANN should commission a study to collect data on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains within certain new gTLDs (registration restrictions) to (1) compare consumer trust levels between new gTLDs with varying degrees of registration restrictions; (2) determine whether there are correlations between DNS abuse and the presence or absence of registration restrictions; (3) assess the costs and benefits of registration restrictions and (4) determine whether and how such registration restrictions are enforced.

Rationale/related findings: Future PDPs and review teams can use this data to inform future policy decisions regarding new gTLDs, especially as it relates to the issue of whether restrictions should be encouraged or included within the standard provisions included in ICANN new gTLD contracts.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: ICANN should collect data in conjunction with its related data collection activities on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains within certain new gTLDs (registration restrictions)¹ to help regularly determine and report:

- (1) whether consumers and registrants are aware that certain new gTLDs have registration restrictions;
- (2) compare consumer trust levels between new gTLDs with varying degrees of registration restrictions;
- (3) determine whether the lower abuse rates associated with gTLDs that impose stricter registration policies identified in the Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in gTLDs continue to be present within new gTLDs that impose registration restrictions as compared with new gTLDs that do not;
- (4) assess the costs and benefits of registration restrictions to contracted parties and the public (to include impacts on competition and consumer choice) and
- (5) determine whether and how such registration restrictions are enforced or challenged.

Rationale/related findings: The ICANN Consumer Research and Registrant surveys indicate that the public expects certain restrictions about who can purchase domain names and trusts that these restrictions will be enforced. The survey results also indicated that the presence of such restrictions contributed to consumer trust. However, it would be useful for future review teams and those developing future policy to have more data on how aware the public is of registration restrictions and the impact of registration restrictions on consumer trust. In addition, the Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in gTLDs indicated that DNS abuse counts correlate with strict registration policies with bad actors preferring to register domains with no registration restrictions.² It is also important to obtain information on the costs of registration restrictions on the relevant parties so that benefits (in terms of increased trust and decreased DNS abuse) can be weighed against costs (including increased resources needed to implement such restrictions and financial costs) and any restrictions on competition. Future PDPs and review teams can use this data to inform future policy decisions regarding new gTLDs, especially as it relates to the issue of whether restrictions should be encouraged or included within the standard provisions included in ICANN new gTLD contracts.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: ICANN should explore how to incorporate this data collection as part of its existing data collection initiatives, including but not limited to the Domain Abuse Activity Reporting System and the Marketplace Health Initiative, as well as future ICANN initiatives related to measuring DNS abuse, and the health of the DNS and the DNS marketplace.

Moreover, ICANN may also explore how to incorporate this data collection through the activities and reporting of ICANN Compliance, including but not limited to its audit functions. Collecting this data would inform future review teams about the impact of registration restrictions and whether and how they can best be utilized for gTLDs, particularly those gTLDs that fall within sensitive or highly regulated market sectors.

Success Measures: This recommendation will be considered successful if it generates data that provides guidance for future review teams and policy development processes on the topic of registration restrictions, particular if the data indicates under what circumstances the benefits of registration restrictions to the public (which may include decreased levels of DNS abuse) outweigh possible costs to contracted parties or possible impacts on competition.

Recommendation: Consider directing ICANN org, in its discussions with registries, to negotiate amendments to existing Registry Agreements, or in negotiations of new Registry Agreements associated with subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, to include provisions in the agreements to provide incentives, including financial incentives, to registries, especially open registries, to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures.

Rationale/related findings: The new gTLD safeguards alone do not prevent technical abuse in the DNS. Abuse rates are correlated to registration restrictions imposed on registrants and registration prices may influence rates too. Some registries are inherently designed to have strict registration policies and/or high prices. However, a free, open, and accessible Internet will invariably include registries with open registration policies and low prices that must adopt other measures to prevent technical DNS abuse. Registries that do not impose registration eligibility restrictions can reduce technical DNS abuse through proactive means such as identifying repeat offenders, monitoring suspicious registrations, and actively detecting abuse instead of merely waiting for complaints to be filed. Therefore, ICANN should incentivize and reward the implementation of proactive anti-abuse measures by such registry operators to reduce technical DNS abuse in open gTLDs.

To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Details: The ICANN Board should consider urging ICANN org to negotiate with registries to include in the registry agreements fee discounts available to registry operators with open registration policies that implement proactive measures to prevent technical DNS abuse in their zone.

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Consider directing ICANN org to negotiate amendments to existing Registry Agreements, or in [consideration](#) of new Registry Agreements associated with subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, to include provisions in the agreements to provide incentives, including financial incentives, [for](#) registries, especially open registries, to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures⁷⁶.

Rationale/related findings: [ICANN is committed to maintaining “the operational stability, reliability, security, global interoperability, resilience, and openness of the DNS and the Internet.”](#) ⁷⁷ The new gTLD safeguards alone do not prevent technical abuse in the DNS and have consequently failed to meet their intended goal in preventing the abuse phenomenon from spreading to new gTLDs. The CCT Review Team’s analysis and the DNS Abuse Study indicate that abuse rates are correlated to registration restrictions imposed on registrants and registration prices ([i.e., abuse rates tend to go down with increased registration restrictions and high domain name prices](#)). Some registries are inherently designed to have strict registration policies and/or high prices. However, a free, open, and accessible Internet will invariably include registries with open registration policies and low prices that must adopt other measures to prevent technical DNS abuse. Registries that do not impose registration eligibility restrictions can [nonetheless](#) reduce technical DNS abuse through proactive means such as identifying repeat offenders, monitoring suspicious registrations, and actively detecting abuse instead of merely waiting for complaints to be filed. Therefore, ICANN org should incentivize and [reward operators that adopt and implement](#) proactive anti-abuse measures [identified by the community as effective](#) for reducing technical DNS abuse. [Operators that have already adopted such measures, prior to the creation of an incentive program, should be rewarded as well.](#)

To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The ICANN Board should consider urging ICANN org to negotiate with [new and legacy gTLD registries](#) to include in the registry agreements fee discounts available to registry operators with open registration policies that implement proactive measures to prevent technical DNS abuse in their zone. [ICANN should verify compliance with incentive programs](#) to ensure bad actors are not receiving incentives despite acting in bad faith. It is not intended that the adoption of proactive anti-abuse measures in exchange for incentives, should form the basis of an argument to shift liability for underlying abuse incidents to the registry operator.

Success Measures: [More registries, even those with open registration policies, will adopt proactive anti-abuse measures such that there is a decrease in the overall rates of technical DNS abuse in their zones.](#)

Recommendation: Consider directing ICANN org, in its discussions with registrars and registries, to negotiate amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreements to include provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse.

Rationale/related findings: Current policies focus on individual abuse complaints. However, registrars and registry operators associated with extremely high rates of technical DNS abuse continue operating and face little incentive to prevent technical DNS abuse. Moreover, there currently exist few enforcement mechanisms to prevent systemic domain name abuse associated with resellers. Systemic use of particular registrars and registries for technical DNS abuse threatens the security and stability of the DNS, the universal acceptance of TLDs, and consumer trust.

To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The ICANN Board should consider directing ICANN org to negotiate amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreement provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse. Such language should impose upon registrars, and their affiliated entities such as resellers, a duty to mitigate technical DNS abuse, whereby ICANN may suspend registrars and registry operators found to be associated with unabated, abnormal and extremely high rates of technical abuse. ICANN must base such findings on multiple verifiable reliable sources and such findings may be rebutted by the registrar upon sufficient proof that the findings were inaccurate. The following factors may be taken into account when making a determination: whether the registrar or registry operator 1) engages in proactive anti-abuse measures to prevent technical DNS abuse, 2) was itself a victim in the relevant instance, 3) has since taken necessary and appropriate actions to stop the abuse and prevent future systemic use of its services for technical DNS abuse.

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Consider directing ICANN org, in its discussions with registrars and registries, to negotiate amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreements to include provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse.

Rationale/related findings: Current policies focus on individual abuse complaints. However, registrars and registry operators associated with extremely high rates of technical DNS abuse [have continued to operate and faced](#) little incentive to prevent technical DNS abuse. Moreover, there currently exist few enforcement mechanisms to prevent systemic domain name abuse associated with resellers. [Published research, cybersecurity analysis, and DNS abuse monitoring tools highlight concentrated, systemic DNS abuse for which there are no adequate, actionable remedies.](#) Systemic use of particular registrars and registries for technical DNS abuse threatens the security and stability of the DNS, the universal acceptance of TLDs, and consumer trust.

To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The ICANN Board should consider directing ICANN org to negotiate amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreement provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse. Such language should impose upon registrars, and, [through down-stream contract requirements](#) their affiliated entities such as resellers, a duty to mitigate technical DNS abuse, whereby ICANN may suspend registrars and registry operators found to be associated with unabated, abnormal and extremely high rates of technical abuse. [It is important for ICANN Org to gather relevant data, conduct analysis, and act on actionable information.](#) Accordingly, [ICANN should initiate an investigation into a contracted party's direct or indirect \(such as through a reseller\) involvement with systemic technical abuse and take whatever remedial actions are warranted if they receive and verify information, whether or not through a formal complaint, indicating unabated, abnormal, and extremely high rates of technical abuse. Upon making a finding and contacting the contracted party, such findings may be rebutted upon sufficient proof that the findings were materially inaccurate. The following factors may be taken into account when making a determination: whether the registrar or registry operator 1\) engages in proactive anti-abuse measures to prevent technical DNS abuse, 2\) was itself a victim in the relevant instance, 3\) has since taken necessary and appropriate actions to stop the abuse and prevent future systemic use of its services for technical DNS abuse.](#)

Success Measures: [Contractual language is adopted which empowers ICANN to investigate and engage in enforcement actions against registries and registrars associated with systemic technical abuse such that there are no contracted parties serving as enablers of systemic technical abuse for which ICANN cannot bring an enforcement action.](#)

Recommendation: Further study the relationship between specific registry operators, registrars and DNS abuse by commissioning ongoing data collection, including but not limited to, ICANN Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) initiatives. For transparency purposes, this information should be regularly published in order to be able to identify registries and registrars that need to come under greater scrutiny and higher priority by ICANN Compliance. Upon identifying abuse phenomena, ICANN should put in place an action plan to respond to such studies, remediate problems identified, and define future ongoing data collection.

Rationale/related findings: The DNS Abuse Study commissioned by the CCT-RT identified extremely high rates of abuse associated with specific registries and registrars as well as registration features, such as mass registrations, which appear to enable abuse. Moreover, the Study concluded that registration restrictions correlate with abuse, which means that there are many factors for which to account in order to extrapolate cross-TLD abuse trends for specific registry operators and registrars. The DNS Abuse Study has highlighted certain behaviors that are diametrically opposed to encouraging consumer trust in the DNS. Certain registries and registrars appear to either positively encourage or at the very least willfully ignore DNS abuse. Such behavior needs to be identified rapidly and action must be taken by ICANN compliance as deemed necessary.

To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, SSR2 Review Team.

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The additional studies need to be of an ongoing nature, collecting relevant data concerning DNS abuse at both the registrar and registry level. The data should be regularly published, thereby enabling the community and ICANN compliance in particular to identify registries and registrars that need to come under greater compliance scrutiny and thereby have such behavior eradicated.

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Further study the relationship between specific registry operators, registrars and DNS abuse by commissioning ongoing data collection, including but not limited to, ICANN Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) initiatives. For transparency purposes, this information should be regularly published, **ideally quarterly and no less than annually**, in order to be able to identify registries and registrars that need to come under greater scrutiny, **investigation**, and **potential enforcement action** by ICANN org. Upon identifying abuse phenomena, ICANN should put in place an action plan to respond to such studies, remediate problems identified, and define future ongoing data collection.

Rationale/related findings: **Comprehensive DNS abuse data collection and analysis is necessary for studying the efficacy of safeguards put in place to protect against malicious abuse issues associated with the expansion of the DNS. Furthermore, progress and trends can be identified by repeating studies over time.** The DNS Abuse Study commissioned by the CCT-RT identified extremely high rates of abuse associated with specific registries and registrars as well as registration features, such as mass registrations, which appear to enable abuse. Moreover, the Study concluded that registration restrictions correlate with abuse, which **indicates** that there are many factors **to consider and analyze** in order to extrapolate cross-TLD abuse trends for specific registry operators and registrars. The DNS Abuse Study has highlighted certain behaviors that are diametrically opposed to encouraging consumer trust in the DNS. Certain registries and registrars appear to either positively encourage or at the very least willfully ignore DNS abuse. Such behavior needs to be identified rapidly and **acted upon quickly** by ICANN org **as determined by the facts and evidence presented. The DNS Abuse Study, which provided a benchmark of technical abuse since the onset of the new gTLD program, should be followed up with regular studies so that the community is provided current, actionable data on a regular basis to inform policy decisions.**

To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, SSR2 Review Team.

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The additional studies need to be of an ongoing nature, collecting relevant data concerning DNS abuse at both the registrar and registry level. The data should be regularly published, thereby enabling the community and ICANN compliance in particular to identify registries and registrars that need to come under greater compliance scrutiny and thereby have such behavior eradicated.

Success Measures: Comprehensive, up-to-date technical DNS abuse data is readily available to the Community so that problems can be identified and data-driven policy initiatives can be measured for efficacy.

Recommendation: A DNS Abuse Dispute Resolution Policy ("DADRP") should be considered by the community to deal with registry operators and registrars that are identified as having excessive levels of abuse (to define, e.g. over 10% of their domain names are blacklisted domain names). Such registry operators or registrars should in the first instance be required to a) explain to ICANN Compliance why this is, b) commit to clean up that abuse within a certain time period, and / or adopt stricter registration policies within a certain time period. Failure to comply will result in a DADRP, should ICANN not take any action themselves.

Rationale/related findings: The DNS Abuse Study commissioned by CCT-RT identified extremely high rates of abuse associated with specific registries. It is important to have a mechanism to deal with this abuse, particularly if it's prevalent in certain registries. Abusive behavior needs to be eradicated from the DNS and this would provide an additional arm to combat that abuse.

To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization, the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG and the SSR2 Review Team

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Majority consensus but not unanimity (see Minority Statement in [Appendix 6.1 Minority Statements](#))

Details: ICANN Compliance is one route to dealing with this high level of DNS abuse, enforcing existing and any amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement to prevent systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse as per Recommendation 2. However, in addition, a specific DADRP should be considered as it could also be very helpful in dealing with such DNS abuse, and it could also serve as a significant deterrent and help prevent or minimize such high levels of DNS abuse. Registry operators or registrars that are identified as having excessive levels of abuse (to be defined, for example where a registry operator has over 10% of their domain names blacklisted by one or more heterogeneous blacklists (StopBadware SDP, APWG, Spamhaus, Secure Domain Foundation, SURBL and CleanMX). A DADRP should set out specific penalties. Examples from the DNS Abuse Study of new gTLDs with over 10% of their domain names blacklisted, according to Spamhaus for example are .SCIENCE (51%), .STREAM (47%), .STUDY (33%), .DOWNLOAD (20%), .CLICK (18%), .TOP (17%), .GDN (16%), .TRADE (15%), .REVIEW (13%), and .ACCOUNTANT (12%). Thus, each of these registries should be obliged to review their second level domain names being used for DNS abuse and explain why this is, commit to cleaning these up within a certain timeframe, and adopt stricter registration policies if necessary to ensure that there exist relevant contractual terms to effectively handle such registrations. If the domain names at issue are not cleaned up satisfactorily, and in the event ICANN does not take immediate action, then a DADRP may be brought by an affected party. The process should involve a written complaint to the registry, time allotted for a response from the registry, and an oral hearing. Final decisions should be issued by an expert panel which could recommend one or more enforcement mechanisms to be agreed upon by the community.

For purposes of this recommendation, a registrar acting under the control of a registry operator would be covered by the DADRP so it is important to ensure that “registry operator” shall include entities directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by, or under common control with, a registry operator, whether by ownership or control of voting securities, by contract or otherwise where ‘control’ means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of an entity, whether by ownership or control of voting securities, by contract or otherwise.

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: A DNS Abuse Dispute Resolution Policy ("DADRP") should be considered by the community on an urgent basis to deal with registry operators and registrars that are identified as having excessive levels of Technical DNS abuse which has not been remedied in a timely manner. The need to remedy Technical DNS abuse is incumbent upon ICANN and the ICANN Community as a whole. Whilst many remedial powers should come from the RAA and RA, the CCT-RT is of the view, as set out in Recommendation B, that such powers are presently too weak in their present form to be useful in abating such Technical DNS abuse. The DADRP would operate prior to such amendments of the RAA and RA and would remain after such amendments are in place as a subsequent mechanism to empower the community to take action against ongoing systemic abuse. Defining and identifying Technical DNS abuse is inherently complex and would benefit from analysis by the community and thus we specifically recommend that the ICANN Board prioritize and support community work in this area to enhance safeguards and trust due to the negative impact of Technical DNS Abuse on consumers and innocent users of the Internet.

Rationale/related findings: The DNS Abuse Study commissioned by CCT-RT identified extremely high rates of abuse associated with specific registrars and registries.[1] This can lead to network operators blocking entire TLDs, which therefore runs counter to ICANN's goal of Universal Acceptance of new gTLDs. It is important for the community to have a recourse mechanism in the event ICANN Compliance is unable to address a systemic Technical DNS Abuse issue for whatever reason. Left unabated, this phenomenon undermines consumer safeguards and threatens the security and stability of the DNS. One of the specific areas of concern identified by the community prior to the launch of the New gTLD Program was how to ensure that "bad actors" do not run registries.[2] Accordingly, this Recommendation would provide another fail safe against bad actor registries and registrars that could address significant, concentrated, unabated Technical DNS Abuse as a deterrent and where ICANN Compliance is unable to use the RA and RAA to do so.

To: The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization, the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG and the SSR2 Review Team

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Details: Contract enforcement is one route to dealing with this high level of DNS abuse, by enforcing existing and future provisions of the Registrar Accreditation Agreement to prevent systemic use of specific registrars for technical DNS abuse as per Recommendation 2. However, in addition, a specific DADRP should be considered as it could also help in deal with such DNS abuse, could serve as a significant deterrent, and help prevent or minimize such high levels of DNS abuse. Analogous to the Trademark PDDRP, this tool would empower the community to address systemic technical DNS abuse, which plagues the security and stability of Internet infrastructure and undermines safeguards aimed at ensuring consumer trust. Such a procedure could apply where ICANN Compliance is unable to resolve a complaint related to technical DNS abuse and the registry operators or registrars are identified as having excessive levels of abuse. Excessive levels of abuse could be defined, for example where a registry operator has more than 10% of their domain names blacklisted by one or more heterogeneous blacklists over a significant period of time, such as six months.

Qualified DADRP complainants should include victims of DNS abuse, targets of DNS abuse, or an individual advocating in the public interest, such as in an independent advocate position created for this purpose.[3] A DADRP filing fee should be set to discourage frivolous complaints. Upon first attempting a complaint through the ICANN compliance process, a party would be permitted to use the DADRP if the technical DNS abuse issue remained unresolved (rather than a mere negative decision) and the defendant party was associated with persistently high rates of more than 10% technical abuse for their registrations over the specified time period. In the event of a successful DADRP judgment against a party, then the penalties may include monetary awards or equitable remedies such as prohibiting the acceptance of further registrations until the technical abuse or means to engage in such technical abuse are eliminated.

Details (continued): Examples from the DNS Abuse Study of new gTLDs registrars with over 10% of their domain names blacklisted as well as registries, according to Spamhaus for example are .science (51%), .stream (47%), .study (33%), .download (20%), .click (18%), .top (17%), .gdn (16%), .trade (15%), .review (13%), and .accountant (12%). Thus, each of these registries would be obliged to review their second level domain names being used for DNS abuse and explain the reasons for the excessive DNS abuse, commit to remedying the abuse within a certain timeframe, and adopt stricter registration policies if necessary to ensure that relevant contract terms exist to effectively deal with such registrations. If the domain names at issue are not responded to in a satisfactory and timely manner, and in the event ICANN does not take immediate action, then a DADRP may be brought by an affected party. The process should involve a written complaint to the registry, time allotted for a response from the registry, and an oral hearing. Final decisions should be issued by an expert panel which could recommend one or more enforcement mechanisms to be agreed upon by the community.

For purposes of this recommendation, a registrar acting under the control of a registry operator would also be covered by the DADRP. Hence, it would be important to ensure that “registry operator” shall include entities directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by, or under common control with, a registry operator, whether by ownership or control of voting securities, by contract or otherwise where ‘control’ means the possession, directly or indirectly, of the power to direct or cause the direction of the management and policies of an entity, whether by ownership or control of voting securities, by contract or otherwise. The evolution of ICANN Compliance and the RAA should be considered and if the community is of the view that future revisions to the terms of the RAA give ICANN Compliance the necessary tools to deal with DNS abuse effectively then the DADRP can and should be revisited. In any event, the DADRP should be revisited within 24 months of coming into existence.

Success Measures: This would be a reduction in concentrated levels of technical DNS abuse in gTLDs after implementation of the DADRP. Actual use of the DADRP is not necessary as in itself it is hoped it would act as a deterrent in much the same way as the PDDRP has as we do not see gTLDs with 10% of the domains infringing trade marks.

Recommendation: ICANN should collect data about and publicize the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations.

Rationale/related findings: At present, there is no consistent mechanism for determining all of the ICANN contracted and non-contracted operators associated with a gTLD domain name registration. Whois records often do not distinguish between registrars and resellers. The DNS Abuse Study commissioned by the CCT-RT, for example, was unable to discern resellers from registrars to determine the degree to which technical DNS abuse rates may be driven by specific-resellers may affect levels of technical DNS abuse. This data should be available to enhance data-driven determinations necessary for recommendations proposed the CCT-RT, supplement new gTLD program safeguards, and improve ICANN contractual compliance determinations.

To: The ICANN Board, the GNSO Expedited PDP, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization, the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, SSAC

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team:

Details: Whois information is an important source of data for technical DNS abuse analysis. Safeguards, such as the Thick Whois requirements, do not mandate that resellers are listed in Whois records. Consequently, the full chain of parties to a registration transaction is not readily discernable. Without such information, it is difficult to determine the extent to which technical abuse is correlated to individual resellers, rather than registrars. For example, with such data hidden, it would be possible for a reseller associated with extremely high levels of abuse to remain in operation under a registrar with relatively normal levels of technical abuse. This would, in effect, permit systemic technical abuse by a non-contracted party. *Although the reseller is theoretically bound by flow down contract requirements, in practice this systemic DNS abuse often remain difficult to attribute and tends to goes unabated.* Whereas, collecting and publicizing such information would enable end users to readily determine the registry, registrar, and reseller associated with a domain name registration to remove the mask of parties responsible for mitigating technical DNS abuse. This would allow for more granular DNS abuse analysis and transparency for Internet users, thereby enhancing community accountability efforts, and contractual compliance enforcement.

Success Measures: *It is possible to readily determine the reseller associated with any gTLD registration.*

Recommendation: ICANN should gather data to assess whether a significant percentage of WHOIS-related complaints applicable to new gTLDs relate to the accuracy of the identity of the registrant, and whether there are differences in behavior between new and legacy gTLDs. This data should include analysis of WHOIS accuracy complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance to identify the subject matter of the complaints (e.g., complaints about syntax, operability or identity) and compare the number of complaints about WHOIS syntax, operability or identity between legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs. ICANN should also identify other potential data sources of WHOIS complaints (registrars, registries, ISPs, etc.) and attempt to obtain anonymized data from these sources.

Rationale/related findings: WHOIS-related complaints are the largest category of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance for registrars. However, it is unclear what aspect of WHOIS accuracy forms the basis of these complaints, or if the introduction of new gTLDs has had any effect on the accuracy of WHOIS data. Phase 1 of ICANN's ARS project analyzes the syntactic accuracy of WHOIS contact information and Phase 2 assesses the operability of the contact data in the WHOIS record. But there is currently no plan to proceed with Phase 3 of the ARS project, identity validation (is the contacted individual responsible for the domain?).

To: ICANN organization to gather required data, and to provide data to relevant review teams to consider the results and if warranted, to assess feasibility and desirability of moving to identity validation phase of WHOIS ARS project.

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Details: (none)

Consensus within team: Yes

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Once gathered (see Recommendation 17), this data regarding WHOIS accuracy should be considered by the upcoming WHOIS Review Team to determine whether additional steps are needed to improve WHOIS accuracy, particularly whether to proceed with the identity phase of the Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) project. Future CCT Reviews may also consider making use of this data if a differential in behavior is identified between legacy and new gTLDs.

Rationale/related findings: WHOIS-related complaints are the largest category of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance for registrars. However, it is unclear what aspect of WHOIS accuracy forms the basis of these complaints, or if the introduction of new gTLDs has had any effect on the accuracy of WHOIS data. Phase 1 of ICANN's ARS project analyzes the syntactic accuracy of WHOIS contact information and Phase 2 assesses the operability of the contact data in the WHOIS record. But there is currently no plan to proceed with Phase 3 of the ARS project, identity validation (is the contacted individual responsible for the domain?).

To: ICANN organization to gather required data, and to provide data to relevant review teams to consider the results and if warranted, to assess feasibility and desirability of moving to identity validation phase of WHOIS ARS project.

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Details: (none)

Consensus within team: Yes

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: In order for the upcoming WHOIS Review Team to determine whether additional steps are needed to improve WHOIS accuracy, and whether to proceed with the identity phase of the Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) project, ICANN should gather data to assess whether a significant percentage of WHOIS-related complaints applicable to new gTLDs relate to the accuracy of the identity of the registrant. This should include analysis of WHOIS accuracy complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance to identify the subject matter of the complaints (e.g., complaints about syntax, operability or identity). The volume of these complaints between legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs should also be compared. ICANN should **also** identify other potential data sources of WHOIS complaints **beyond those that are contractually required (including but not limited to complaints received directly by registrars, registries, ISPs, etc.)** and attempt to obtain anonymized data from these sources. Future CCT Reviews may **then also use these data**.

Rationale/related findings: WHOIS-related complaints are the largest category of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance for registrars. However, it is unclear what aspect of WHOIS accuracy forms the basis of these complaints, or if the introduction of new gTLDs has had any effect on the accuracy of WHOIS data. Phase 1 of ICANN's ARS project analyzes the syntactic accuracy of WHOIS contact information and Phase 2 assesses the operability of the contact data in the WHOIS record. But there is currently no plan to proceed with Phase 3 of the ARS project, identity validation (is the contacted individual responsible for the domain?).

To: ICANN organization to gather required data, and to provide data to relevant review teams to consider the results and if warranted, to assess feasibility and desirability of moving to identity validation phase of WHOIS ARS project.

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: TBC

Details: (none)

Success Measures: If analysis of the data allows the breakdown of WHOIS accuracy complaints by subject matter. If the analysis of the data gathered allows comparison between legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs. If the analysis of the data can serve to inform the upcoming WHOIS Review Team.

Recommendation: Repeat data-gathering efforts that compare rates of abuse in domains operating under new Registry Agreement and Registrar Agreements to legacy gTLDs as future review teams deem necessary. Although we recommend a periodic data-gathering exercise, we anticipate that these studies will change over time as a result of input from the community and future review teams.

Rationale/related findings: In order to better measure new gTLDs' ability to mitigate abusive activity, data related to abuse rates in new gTLDs should be gathered and analyzed on a regular basis. The data should be reviewed by both the ICANN organization and be made available to policymaking bodies and future review teams. The CCT Review Team has commissioned a study on this topic to serve as a baseline for future review teams and will report findings based on this study in our final report. This baseline will serve as a basis to compare future rates of abuse using the same methodology, which will work to support future hypothesis formulation and testing on potential causal factors that explain the variation in rates of abuse in TLDs.**To:** ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: The next CCTRT should review the proposed Registry Operator Framework when completed and assess whether the framework is a sufficiently clear and effective mechanism to mitigate abuse by providing for specified actions in response to security threats.

Rationale/related findings: It is not clear whether the intended goal of the security checks safeguard – to enhance efforts to fight DNS abuse – has been met. The community will be better positioned to evaluate the effectiveness of this safeguard once a specific framework has been proposed that specifies how registry operators should respond to security threats.

To: Future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: The next CCTRT should review the "Framework for Registry Operator to Respond to Security Threats" and assess whether the framework is a sufficiently clear and effective mechanism to mitigate abuse by providing for specified actions in response to security threats.

Rationale/related findings: It is not clear whether the intended goal of the security checks safeguard – to enhance efforts to fight DNS abuse – has been met. The community will be better positioned to evaluate the effectiveness of this safeguard once a specific framework has been proposed that specifies how registry operators should respond to security threats.

To: Future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: It is not clear whether the intended goal of the security checks safeguard – to enhance efforts to fight DNS abuse – has been met. The community will be better positioned to evaluate the effectiveness of this safeguard once a specific framework has been proposed that specifies how registry operators should respond to security threats.

Success Measures: An evaluation of the "Framework for Registry Operator to Respond to Security Threats".

Recommendation: Assess whether mechanisms to report and handle complaints have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse by determining (1) the volume of reports of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD that registries receive from governmental and quasi-governmental agencies and the volume of inquiries that registries receive from the public related to malicious conduct in the TLD and (2) what actions registries have taken to respond to complaints of illegal or malicious conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. Such efforts could include surveys, focus groups or community discussions. If these methods proved ineffective, consideration could be given to amending future standard Registry Agreements to require registry operators to provide this information to ICANN. Once this information is gathered, future review teams should consider recommendations for appropriate follow up measures.

Rationale/related findings: (none)

To: ICANN organization and future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Assess whether mechanisms to report and handle complaints have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse by determining (1) the volume of reports of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD that registries receive from governmental and quasi-governmental agencies (2) the volume of inquiries that registries receive from the public related to malicious conduct in the TLD; (3) whether more efforts are needed to publicize contact points to report complaints that involve abuse or illegal behavior within a TLD; (4) what actions registries have taken to respond to complaints of illegal or malicious conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. Such efforts could include surveys, focus groups or community discussions. If these methods proved ineffective, consideration could be given to amending future standard Registry Agreements to require Registries to more prominently disclose their abuse points of contact and provide more granular information to ICANN. Once this information is gathered, future review teams should consider recommendations for appropriate follow up measures.

Rationale/related findings: The Consumer Research and Registrant surveys executed by Nielsen have shown significant consumer concern for abuse as tending to undermine confidence and trust in the DNS. The broad strategic response should be to ensure that there are sufficiently effective mechanisms to report complaints so that we are able to measure and assess them, and hence develop the capacity to manage and mitigate the causes of these complaints.

There is concern from the community that abuse data is not reported consistently to ICANN Registries. Other concerns focus on ICANN's own reporting of the complaints it receives focus as lacking granularity regarding the subject matter of the complaints and lacking information regarding the response to abuse complaints. Generally speaking detailed information regarding the subject matter of complaints and responses to those complaints is sparingly captured and shared, missing or unknown.

In light of these concerns, although the safeguards regarding making and handling complaints have been implemented, it is unclear: (1) whether either law enforcement or the public is sufficiently aware that these complaint mechanisms exist; (2) how frequently these channels are used by the public and law enforcement to notify registries of illegal or abusive behavior and (3) what impact these safeguards have had on their intended goal of mitigating DNS abuse. Hence our recommendations relate to improved data gathering to inform future efforts on combatting abuse within gTLDs.

To: ICANN organization and future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures:

- More information is gathered to assess whether current complaint reporting mechanisms are effective and inform policy efforts involving amendment of standard Registry agreements.
- ICANN Compliance routinely records and makes available information about complaints by categories filed from registry and registrars, including responses to reports of abuse to original reporters.

Recommendation: Assess whether more efforts are needed to publicize contact points where complaints that involve abuse or illegal behavior within a TLD should be directed.

Rationale/related findings: Although the safeguards regarding making and handling complaints have been implemented, it is unclear: (1) whether either law enforcement or the public is sufficiently aware that these complaint mechanisms exist; (2) how frequently these channels are used by the public and law enforcement to notify registries of illegal or abusive behavior and (3) what impact these safeguards have had on their intended goal of mitigating DNS abuse. Hence our recommendations relate to improved data gathering to inform future efforts on combatting abuse within gTLDs.

To: ICANN organization and future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

~~**Recommendation:** Assess whether more efforts are needed to publicize contact points where complaints that involve abuse or illegal behavior within a TLD should be directed.~~

~~**Rationale/related findings:** Although the safeguards regarding making and handling complaints have been implemented, it is unclear: (1) whether either law enforcement or the public is sufficiently aware that these complaint mechanisms exist; (2) how frequently these channels are used by the public and law enforcement to notify registries of illegal or abusive behavior and (3) what impact these safeguards have had on their intended goal of mitigating DNS abuse. Hence our recommendations relate to improved data gathering to inform future efforts on combatting abuse within gTLDs.~~

~~**To:** ICANN organization and future CCT Review Teams~~

~~**Prerequisite or Priority Level:** Medium~~

~~**Consensus within team:** Yes~~

~~**Details:** (none)~~

~~**Success Measures:** (none)~~

Recommendation: Include more detailed information on the subject matter of complaints in ICANN publicly available compliance reports. Specifically, more precise data on the subject matter of complaints, particularly (1) what type of law violation is being complained of and (2) an indication of whether complaints relate to the protection of sensitive health or financial information, would assist future Review Teams in their assessment of these safeguards. Note: A general recommendation for further transparency regarding the subject matter of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance is set forth in Chapter V. Data-Driven Analysis: Recommendations for Additional Data Collection and Analysis.

Rationale/related findings:

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Include more detailed information on the subject matter of complaints in ICANN publicly available compliance reports. Specifically, more precise data on the subject matter of complaints, particularly (1) the class/type of abuse (2) the gTLD that is target of the abuse (3) the safeguard that is at risk (4) an indication of whether complaints relate to the protection of sensitive health or financial information (5) what type of contractual breach is being complained of and (6) resolution status of the complaints, including action details. These details would assist future review teams in their assessment of these safeguards.

Rationale/related findings:

Note: A general recommendation for further transparency regarding the subject matter of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance is set forth in [Chapter V. Data-Driven Analysis: Recommendations for Additional Data Collection and Analysis](#).

The lack of publicly available information about whether ICANN Contractual Compliance has received complaints related to the implemented Category 1 safeguards, and lack of a common framework to define sensitive information and identify what constitutes “reasonable and appropriate security measures” make it difficult to assess what impact this safeguard has had on mitigating risks to the public.

The Consumer Research and Registrant Survey by Nielsen survey results indicate that new gTLDs are not trusted to the same extent as legacy gTLDs and that the public is concerned about potential misuse of their personal information. Domains resolved to interests in highly regulated sectors such as health and finance are likely to collect more personal and sensitive information. So in that sense, trustworthiness of these domains is even more crucial. There is a further concern that complaints about illegal DNS activities may be under reported.

Although ICANN has mandated certain safeguards applicable to all new gTLD domains in general and domains for highly regulated strings in particular, there is scant evidentiary data that the contracted parties have implemented and are complying with these safeguards. We lack the evidence to definitively declare whether the defined and implemented safeguards have been effective in mitigating risks associated with domains in the overall new gTLD market and those in highly regulated markets in particular. Hence it is important to understand whether the existing safeguards mitigate the risks assessed for the new gTLD domains, especially those associated with highly regulated domains and whether there is adequate and effective enforcement. The recommendation therefore proposes that ICANN Compliance collect and report the abuse reported to registry and registrars with a granularity that allows identification of origin, type, form and nature of abuse or alleged illegal use of the DNS reported.

The ICANN organization acknowledges that data on the several safeguards is not currently being collected in either the detail expected or at all. However there are ongoing data collection activities and initiatives that may remedy this situation.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The preceding recommendation is causally related to this one and together they seek to address whether the safeguards imposed on the new gTLD program, the mechanisms developed to implement them, and the outcomes of those implementations allow a reviewer to draw a definitive conclusion on their effectiveness and fitness to purpose.

Success Measures: ICANN Compliance release of a formatted report on abuse reports received and adjudicated with, at minimum, all of the specified labels included.

Recommendation: Initiate discussions with relevant stakeholders to determine what constitutes reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of services that involve the gathering of sensitive health and financial information. Such a discussion could include identifying what falls within the categories of “sensitive health and financial information” and what metrics could be used to measure compliance with this safeguard.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of publicly available information about whether ICANN Contractual Compliance has received complaints related to the implemented Category 1 safeguards, and lack of a common framework to define sensitive information and identify what constitutes “reasonable and appropriate security measures” make it difficult to assess what impact this safeguard has had on mitigating risks to the public.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Initiate **engagement** with relevant stakeholders to determine **what best practices are being implemented to offer** reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of services that involve the gathering of sensitive health and financial information. Such a discussion could include identifying what falls within the categories of “sensitive health and financial information” and what metrics could be used to measure compliance with this safeguard.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of publicly available information about whether ICANN Contractual Compliance has received complaints related to the implemented Category 1 safeguards, and lack of a common framework to define sensitive information makes it difficult to assess what impact this safeguard has had on mitigating risks to the public. **However, protection of sensitive information, particularly sensitive financial and health information is a high priority for Internet users. As a result, this recommendation aims at improving both complaint data regarding these issues and encouraging communications about best practices on how to protect these sensitive categories of information.**

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: This Recommendation would be successful if relevant stakeholders, to include new gTLD registries and stakeholder groups representing the public interest, discuss what constitutes sensitive information and best practices regarding how to protect sensitive information. Such discussions could inform future policy in this area **with a goal of increasing the public’s trust of new gTLDs.**

Recommendation: ICANN should perform a study on highly regulated new gTLDs to include the following elements: steps registry operators are taking to establish working relationships with relevant government or industry bodies;

Rationale/related findings: (none)

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: the volume of complaints received by registrants from regulatory bodies and their standard practices to respond to those complaints;

Rationale/related findings: (none)

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: assessment of a sample of domain websites within the highly regulated sector category to see whether contact information to file complaints is sufficiently easy to find;

Rationale/related findings: (none)

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: assessment of whether restrictions regarding possessing necessary credentials are being enforced by auditing registrars and resellers offering the highly regulated TLDs (e.g., can an individual or entity without the proper credentials buy a highly regulated domain?);

Rationale/related findings: (none)

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: determining the volume and subject matter of complaints regarding domains in highly regulated industries by seeking more detailed information from ICANN Contractual Compliance and registrars/resellers of highly regulated domains; and

Rationale/related findings: (none)

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: comparing rates of abuse between those highly regulated gTLDs that have voluntarily agreed to verify and validate credentials to those highly regulated gTLDs that have not.

Rationale/related findings: Although ICANN has implemented certain safeguards applicable to domains for highly regulated strings, it is unclear whether and how contracted parties are complying with these safeguards. It is also not clear whether these safeguards have been effective in mitigating risks associated with domains in highly regulated markets.

To: ICANN Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: ICANN should gather data on new gTLDs operating in highly regulated sectors to include the following elements:

- a) a survey to determine 1) the steps registry operators are taking to establish working relationships with relevant government or industry bodies; 2) the volume of complaints received by registrants from government and regulatory bodies and their standard practices to respond to those complaints;
- b) a review of a sample of domain websites within the highly regulated sector category to assess whether contact information to file complaints is sufficiently easy to find;
- c) an inquiry to ICANN Contractual Compliance and registrars/resellers of highly regulated domains seeking sufficiently detailed information to determine the volume and the subject matter of complaints regarding domains in highly regulated industries;
- d) an inquiry to registry operators to obtain data to compare rates of abuse between those highly regulated gTLDs that have voluntarily agreed to verify and validate credentials to those highly regulated gTLDs that have not; and
- e) an audit to assess whether restrictions regarding possessing necessary credentials are being enforced by auditing registrars and resellers offering the highly regulated TLDs (i.e., can an individual or entity without the proper credentials buy a highly regulated domain?).

To the extent that current ICANN data collection initiatives and compliance audits could contribute to these efforts, we recommend that ICANN assess the most efficient way to proceed to avoid duplication of effort and leverage current work.

Rationale/related findings: Although ICANN has implemented certain safeguards applicable to domains **operating in highly regulated sectors**, it is unclear whether and how contracted parties are complying with these safeguards. It is also not clear whether these safeguards have been effective in mitigating risks associated with domains in highly regulated markets. **The consumer end-user survey results indicate that new gTLDs are not trusted to the same extent as legacy gTLDs and that the public is concerned about potential misuse of their sensitive information. Domains working in highly regulated sectors such as health and finance may be more apt to collect this sensitive information and hence the trustworthiness of these domains is even more crucial. Accordingly, it is important to understand whether the safeguards put into place to mitigate the risks associated with highly regulated domains are being enforced and whether they are effective.**

To: ICANN Organization, **New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group**

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: **Yes**

Details: ICANN is embarking on several data gathering initiatives that may shed light on some of these issues, including the Data Abuse Activity Reporting Project, the Marketplace Health Index, and the Identifier Technology Health Indicators project. Moreover, ICANN Compliance is expanding its audit functions to include additional examination of compliance with certain safeguards. Hence, consideration should be given to assessing whether ICANN's ongoing data collection and compliance initiatives could be leveraged to implement parts of this recommendation.

Success Measures: This recommendation will be successful if additional data is generated to inform ongoing policy development processes regarding the effectiveness of ICANN contract provisions intended to safeguard the public particularly as it relates to new gTLDs operating in highly regulated sectors and whether the current contractual safeguards sufficiently protect the public against the higher risks associated with these domains. In particular, it is vital to determine whether the current safeguard requiring that registrants possess appropriate credentials for gTLDs operating in highly regulated sectors is operating as intended. Success in this regard would be to generate an assessment of complaints relating to this safeguard, information on this how this safeguard is enforced, among other factors, in order to determine its effectiveness.

Face-to-Face Meeting Action Item: ICANN org to reach out to Subsequent Procedures leadership and ask where they are in their highly regulated strings discussion. As it will influence priority level for the recommendation -- does it need to be completed in time for Subsequent Procedures PDP WG to address in its work?

Recommendation: Determine whether ICANN Contractual Compliance has received complaints for a registry operator's failure to comply with either the safeguard related to gTLDs with inherent governmental functions or the safeguard related to cyberbullying.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of information about whether ICANN Contractual Compliance or registries have received complaints related to these safeguards and lack of consequences for failure to comply with these safeguards make it difficult to assess their effectiveness in mitigating the risks they were intended to address, Note: A general recommendation for further transparency regarding the subject matter of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance is set forth in Chapter V. Data-Driven Analysis: Recommendations for Additional Data Collection and Analysis.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: ICANN Contractual Compliance **should report on a quarterly basis whether it** has received complaints for a registry operator's failure to comply with either the safeguard related to gTLDs with inherent governmental functions or the safeguard related to cyberbullying.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of information about whether ICANN Contractual Compliance or registries have received complaints related to these safeguards and lack of consequences for failure to comply with these safeguards make it difficult to assess their effectiveness in mitigating the risks they were intended to address, Note: A general recommendation for further transparency regarding the subject matter of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance is set forth in Chapter V. Data-Driven Analysis: Recommendations for Additional Data Collection and Analysis.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: **These recommendations will be successful if they generate data that indicates the magnitude of complaints regarding cyberbullying and misrepresenting governmental affiliations and provide information regarding how Registries enforce these safeguards.**

Recommendation: Survey registries to determine how they enforce these safeguards.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of information about whether ICANN Contractual Compliance or registries have received complaints related to these safeguards and lack of consequences for failure to comply with these safeguards make it difficult to assess their effectiveness in mitigating the risks they were intended to address, Note: A general recommendation for further transparency regarding the subject matter of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance is set forth in Chapter V. Data-Driven Analysis: Recommendations for Additional Data Collection and Analysis.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Survey Registries to determine 1) whether they receive complaints related to cyberbullying and misrepresenting a governmental affiliation and 2) how they enforce these safeguards.

Rationale/related findings: The lack of information about whether ICANN Contractual Compliance or registries have received complaints related to these safeguards and lack of consequences for failure to comply with these safeguards make it difficult to assess their effectiveness in mitigating the risks they were intended to address, Note: A general recommendation for further transparency regarding the subject matter of complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance is set forth in Chapter V. Data-Driven Analysis: Recommendations for Additional Data Collection and Analysis.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: These recommendations will be successful if they generate data that indicates the magnitude of complaints regarding cyberbullying and misrepresenting governmental affiliations and provide information regarding how Registries enforce these safeguards.

Recommendation: Collect data comparing subjective and objective trustworthiness of new gTLDs with restrictions on registration, to new gTLDs with few or no restrictions.

Rationale/related findings: (none)

To: ICANN organization, PDP Working Group, and future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Face-to-Face Meeting Action Item: Consolidate **recommendations 13, 15, 33** into a single end-user survey: Laureen to consider whether it will be a part of the earlier larger recommendation on conducting a single end-user survey. Jordyn to consolidate registrant survey recommendations and Laureen to address end-user survey recommendations for possible consolidation.

Recommendation: Conduct a survey that focuses on consumer trust of new gTLDs to include identifying :

- (1) which new gTLDs have been visited most;
- (2) the reasons users give to explain why they visited certain new gTLDs more than others;
- (3) what factors matter most to users in determining which gTLDs to visit
- (4) how users' behaviors indicate to what extent they trust new gTLDs, and comparing the trustworthiness of new gTLDs with restrictions on registration, to new gTLDs with few or no restrictions.

This survey should also repeat applicable parts of the global surveys for consumer end-users and registrants to determine whether there has been an increase in 1) familiarity with new gTLDs, 2) visitation of new gTLDs, and 3) perceived trustworthiness of new gTLDs.

Rationale/Related findings: The Nielsen surveys indicate the relationship between trust of a gTLD and several other factors, including familiarity, reputation and security.

The Nielsen surveys also indicated a positive relationship between registration restrictions and trustworthiness of a domain. However, further information is needed on why and to what extent the public trusts new gTLDs. In particular, in addition to repeating surveys that gather the respondents' subjective views about trustworthiness, ICANN, relevant stakeholders and future Review Teams should assess what objective information can be gathered and measured that relates to trustworthiness. A further survey could provide useful information for future gTLD applicants.

To the extent this survey repeats questions posed in the 2015-2016 Global Surveys, future review teams can compare these results to prior data to assess whether there has been an increase in familiarity with and trust of new gTLDs.

To: ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, and future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: TBC

Details: Regarding repeating applicable parts of the Global Surveys, in addition to necessary baseline questions – repeat 700, 800, 900, and 1100 series survey questions and questions 1000, 1036, 1050, 1055 and 1060.

Success Measures:

This recommendation would be considered successful if it produces data that enables future Review Teams and the ICANN organisation to see how the levels of trustworthiness correlate with the number of visitations to new gTLDs, and what factors may contribute to the levels of trustworthiness. These factors may be related to such things as registration restrictions for example. This information could inform future policy making on the terms and conditions that should apply for all new gTLD applicants. Another success measure would be information for new gTLD applicants in regards to what factors may lead to increased visitation and trustworthiness for new gTLDs. The last success measure would be data that informs ICANN policy on registration restrictions especially if the data indicates that certain basic restrictions enhance trustworthiness in the gTLD space, alongside other variables driving gTLD model design and diversity. Those applicants choosing to apply for gTLDs with restrictions would then have a better basis for the decision to do so.

Recommendation: Repeat and refine the DNS Abuse Study to determine whether the presence of additional registration restrictions correlate to a decrease in abuse in new gTLDs, and as compared to new gTLDs that lack registration restrictions, and as compared to legacy gTLDs.

Rationale/related findings: The Nielsen surveys indicated a positive relationship between registration restrictions and trustworthiness of a domain. However, in addition to benefits, registration restrictions may also impact competition. More information is needed to assess whether this safeguard has met its intended goal in a manner that balances the benefits to the public in terms of trustworthiness and competition.

To: ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, and future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Collect data on costs and benefits of implementing various registration restrictions, including the impact on compliance costs and costs for registries, registrars and registrants. One source of this data might be existing gTLDs (for example, for verification and validation restrictions, we could look to those new gTLDs that have voluntarily included verification and validation requirements to get a sense of the costs involved).

Rationale/related findings: The Nielsen surveys indicated a positive relationship between registration restrictions and trustworthiness of a domain. However, in addition to benefits, registration restrictions may also impact competition. More information is needed to assess whether this safeguard has met its intended goal in a manner that balances the benefits to the public in terms of trustworthiness and competition.

To: ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, and future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures:

~~**Recommendation:** To the extent possible and as necessary and helpful for the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group to complete its work, collect data on costs and benefits of implementing various registration restrictions, including the impact on compliance costs and costs for registries, registrars and registrants. Collection of this data is contingent on the voluntary cooperation of the contracted parties and registrants. One source of this data might be existing gTLDs (for example, for verification and validation restrictions, we could look to those new gTLDs that have voluntarily included verification and validation requirements to get a sense of the costs involved).~~

~~**Rationale/related findings:** The Nielsen surveys indicated a positive relationship between registration restrictions and trustworthiness of a domain. However, in addition to benefits, registration restrictions may also impact competition. More information is needed to assess whether this safeguard has met its intended goal in a manner that balances the benefits to the public in terms of trustworthiness and competition.~~

~~**To:** ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, and future CCT Review Teams~~

~~**Prerequisite or Priority Level:** High~~

~~**Consensus within team:** Yes~~

~~**Details:** (none)~~

~~**Success Measures:** (none)~~

Face-to-Face action item: remove recommendation, pending Jamie's review. Delete **rec 36**. Some of rationale from **recs 35 and 36** should be included in **rec 14** or elsewhere in the text. i.e. Observations about risks and costs and benefits in the text.

Recommendation: Gather public comments on the impact of new gTLD registration restrictions on competition to include whether restrictions have created undue preferences.

Rationale/related findings: The Nielsen surveys indicated a positive relationship between registration restrictions and trustworthiness of a domain. However, in addition to benefits, registration restrictions may also impact competition. More information is needed to assess whether this safeguard has met its intended goal in a manner that balances the benefits to the public in terms of trustworthiness and competition.

To: ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, and future CCT Review Teams

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

~~**Recommendation:** Gather public comments on the proposed classification of the source of restrictions as per Recommendation #16 (policy based vs. conditional restrictions for purposes of application evaluation and/or gTLD delegation), as well as the impact of new gTLD registration restrictions on competition, to gain insight if there is a perception whether certain restrictions have created undue preferences. Focus of the evaluation of the public comments should elucidate if restrictions should have a stronger (policy based) rationale, or if it is only a matter of enforcement.~~

~~**Rationale/related findings:** The Nielsen surveys indicated a positive relationship between registration restrictions and trustworthiness of a domain. However, in addition to benefits, registration restrictions may also impact competition. More information is needed to assess whether this safeguard has met its intended goal in a manner that balances the benefits to the public in terms of trustworthiness and competition.~~

~~**To:** ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, and future CCT Review Teams~~

~~**Prerequisite or Priority Level:** High~~

~~**Consensus within team:** Yes~~

~~**Details:** (none)~~

~~**Success Measures:** (none)~~

~~**Face-to-Face action item:** Delete rec 36. Some of rationale from recs 35 and 36 should be included in rec 14 or elsewhere in the text. i.e. Observations about risks and costs and benefits in the text.~~

Recommendation: The ICANN organization should improve the accessibility of voluntary public interest commitments by maintaining a publicly accessible database of these commitments, as extracted from the registry agreements.

Rationale/related findings: The current process of analyzing individual voluntary PICs, comparing PICs amongst TLDs, and understanding their impact is currently cumbersome for end users and the community. Unlike many other aspects of registry agreements, voluntary PICs vary greatly from one TLD to another. Therefore, a publicly accessible database of these commitments would enhance visibility and accountability.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Medium

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Future gTLD applicants should state the goals of each of their voluntary PICs.

Rationale/related findings: The intended purpose is not discernable for many voluntary PICs, making it difficult to evaluate effectiveness.

To: ICANN organization and New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: Future gTLD applicants should state the goals of each of their voluntary PICs.

Rationale/related findings: The intended purpose is not discernable for many voluntary PICs, making it difficult to evaluate effectiveness.

To: ICANN organization and New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: All voluntary PICs should be submitted during the application process such that there is sufficient opportunity for Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) review and time to meet the deadlines for community and Limited Public Interest objections.

Rationale/related findings: At present, there is no mechanism in place to ensure that voluntary public interest commitments do not negatively impact the public interest prior to going into effect. Therefore, it is important for voluntary PICs to be made available to the community during the public comment period of the application process.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: To the extent voluntary commitments are permitted in future gTLD application processes, all such commitments made by a gTLD applicant must state their intended goal and be submitted during the application process such that there is sufficient opportunity for community review and time to meet the deadlines for community and limited public interest objections. Furthermore, such requirements should apply to the extent that voluntary commitments may be made after delegation. Such voluntary commitments, including existing voluntary PICs, should be made accessible in an organized, searchable online database to enhance data driven policy development, community transparency, ICANN compliance, and the awareness of variables relevant to DNS abuse trends.

Rationale/related findings: The intended purpose of many existing voluntary commitments, through the form of voluntary PICs, is not readily discernable. This ambiguity stifles the community's ability to evaluate effectiveness. Moreover, upon submission in a gTLD application, there is no mechanism in place for the community to ensure that such commitments do not negatively impact public interest and other aspects of the DNS. Consequently, it is important to the multi-stakeholder process that such voluntary commitment proposals be made available to the community with adequate time for assessment and potential objections. Furthermore, once adopted, the current process for analyzing voluntary commitments, drawing comparisons amongst TLDs, measuring effectiveness, and building data points for analysis, is too cumbersome because such commitments are only available in individualized contractual documents embedded on the ICANN website and not available in a categorized, searchable form. Unlike many other aspects of registry agreements, voluntary PICs vary greatly from one TLD to another. Therefore, a publicly accessible, categorized, searchable database of these commitments would enhance data driven policy development, community transparency, ICANN compliance, and the awareness of variables relevant to DNS abuse trends, and the overall ability of future review teams to measure their effectiveness.

To: ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: The implementation of this recommendation will be successful if the purpose of any voluntary commitment proposed by a registry operator is clearly stated to describe its intended goal, all parties in the multistakeholder community are given ample time to provide input before such a commitment is adopted into a contract, and any adopted measures are available and easily accessible on the ICANN website in an organized way to empower community awareness and accountability.

Recommendation: This Full Impact Study to ascertain the impact of the New gTLD Program on the cost and effort required to protect trademarks in the DNS should be repeated at regular intervals to see the evolution over time as the New gTLD Program continues to evolve and new gTLD registrations increase. We would specifically recommend that the next Impact Survey be completed within 18 months after issuance of the CCTRT final report, and that subsequent studies be repeated every 18 to 24 months.

Rationale/related findings: Costs will likely vary considerably over time as new gTLDs are delegated and registration levels evolve. Repeating the Impact Study would enable a comparison over time.

To: RPM PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The evolution over time will provide a more precise picture of costs as they evolve and track the effectiveness of RPMs generally in the Domain Name System.

Success Measures: The results of such Impact Studies would provide significantly more data to the relevant working groups currently looking into RPMs and the TMCH as well as future ones, thereby benefitting the community as a whole. Recommendations would then also be able to evolve appropriately in future CCT Review Teams.

Recommendation: A Study to ascertain the impact of the New gTLD Program on the costs required to protect trademarks in the expanded DNS space should be repeated at regular intervals to see the evolution over time of those costs. The CCT recommends that the next Study be completed within 18 months after issuance of the CCT final report, and that subsequent studies be repeated every 18 to 24 months.

The CCT acknowledges that the Nielsen survey of INTA members in 2017 intended to provide such guidance yielded a lower response rate than anticipated. We recommend a more user friendly and perhaps shorter survey to help ensure a higher and more statistically significant response rate.

Rationale/related findings: Costs will likely vary considerably over time as new gTLDs are delegated and registration levels evolve. Repeating the Impact Study would enable a comparison over time.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: High

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The evolution over time will provide a more precise picture of costs as they evolve and track the effectiveness of RPMs generally in the Domain Name System.

Success Measures: The results of such Impact Studies would provide significantly more data to the relevant working groups currently looking into RPMs and the TMCH as well as future ones, thereby benefitting the community as a whole. Recommendations would then also be able to evolve appropriately in future CCT Review Teams.

Recommendation 41: A full review of the URS should be carried out and consideration be given to how it should interoperate with the UDRP. However, given the PDP Review of All RPMs in All gTLDs, which is currently ongoing, such a review needs to take on board that report when published and indeed may not be necessary if that report is substantial in its findings and if the report fully considers potential modifications.

Rationale/related findings: The uptake in use of the URS appears to be below expectations, so it would be useful to understand the reasons for this and whether the URS is considered an effective mechanism to prevent abuse. It is also important for all gTLDs to have a level playing field. The PDP Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs is due to consider the URS during spring or early summer 2017 with a final report scheduled for January 2018. It would seem to be diluting resources to create a separate review of the URS without the clarity of the PDP Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs.

To: RPM PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: A review of the URS consider inter alia (1) whether there should be a transfer option with the URS rather than only suspension; (2) whether two full systems should continue to operate (namely UDPR and URS in parallel) considering their relative merits, (3) the potential applicability of the URS to all gTLDs and (4) whether the availability of different mechanisms applicable in different gTLDs may be a source of confusion to consumers and rights holders.

Success Measures: Based on the findings, a clear overview of the suitability of the URS and whether it is functioning effectively in the way originally intended.

Recommendation 41: Since our initial draft recommendation, the PDP Review of All RPMs in All gTLDs has started reviewing the URS in detail and this is currently ongoing. Given this ongoing review, the CCT recommends that the RPM WG continues its review of the URS and also looks into the interoperability of the URS with the UDRP. Given the current timeline it would appear that the appropriate time to do so will be when the UDRP review is carried out by the PDP WG and at this time consideration be given to how it should interoperate with the UDRP.

The CCT Review has encountered a lack of data for complete analysis in many respects. The PDP Review of All RPMs appears to also be encountering this issue and this may well prevent it drawing firm conclusions. If modifications are not easily identified, then the CCT recommends continued monitoring until more data is collected and made available for a review at a later date.

Rationale/related findings: It is important for all gTLDs to have a level playing field so the applicability of the URS should be considered to all gTLDs.

To: Generic Names Supporting Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: A review of the URS consider inter alia (1) whether there should be a transfer option with the URS rather than only suspension; (2) whether two full systems should continue to operate (namely UDPR and URS in parallel) considering their relative merits, (3) the potential applicability of the URS to all gTLDs and (4) whether the availability of different mechanisms applicable in different gTLDs may be a source of confusion to consumers and rights holders.

Success Measures: Based on the findings, a clear overview of the suitability of the URS and whether it is functioning effectively in the way originally intended.

Recommendation: A review of the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) and its scope should be carried out to provides us with sufficient data to make recommendations and allow an effective policy review.

Rationale/related findings: It seems likely that a full review of the TMCH is necessary including a cost-benefit analyses. The effectiveness of the TMCH appears to be in question. The Independent Review of Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) Services Revised Report has not been able to make definitive conclusions due to data limitations and indeed specifically noted that it was unable to perform a cost-benefit analysis of extending the Claims Service or expanding the matching criteria. Indeed, the PDP Review of All RPMs in All gTLDs, which is running in parallel to this CCT Review Team, will contribute to this consideration with its report due January 2018. That Working Group’s report needs to be considered to set the scope of any review and potential modifications.

To: RPM PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: There appears to be considerable discussion and comment on whether the TMCH should be expanded beyond applying to only identical matches and if it should be extended to include “mark+keyword” or common typographical errors of the mark in question. If an extension is considered valuable, then the basis of such extension needs to be clear.

Success Measures: The availability of adequate data to make recommendations and allow an effective policy review of the TMC.

Recommendation 42: A cost-benefit analysis and review of the TMCH and its scope should be carried out to provide quantifiable information on the costs and benefits associated with the present state of the TMCH services and thus to allow for an effective policy review. Since our initial draft recommendation, the PDP Review of All RPMs in All gTLDs has started reviewing the TMCH in detail and ICANN has appointed Analysis Group, Inc. to develop and conduct the survey(s) to assess the use and effectiveness of the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs. Provided that this PDP Review of All RPMs has sufficient data from this survey or other surveys and is able to draw firm conclusions the CCT does not consider that an additional review is necessary. However, the CCT reiterates its recommendation for a cost-benefit analysis to be carried out if such analysis can enable objective conclusions to be drawn. Such cost-benefit analysis should include but not necessarily be limited to looking at cost to brand owners, cost to registries and cost to registrars of operating with the TMCH now and going forward and look at the interplay with premium pricing.

Rationale/related findings: The Independent Review of Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) Services Revised Report has not been able to make definitive conclusions due to data limitations and indeed specifically noted that it was unable to perform a cost-benefit analysis of extending the Claims Service or expanding the matching criteria.

To: Generic Names Supporting Organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: There appears to be considerable discussion and comment on whether the TMCH should be expanded beyond applying to only identical matches and if it should be extended to include “mark+keyword” or common typographical errors of the mark in question. If an extension is considered valuable, then the basis of such extension needs to be clear.

Success Measures: The availability of adequate data to make recommendations and allow an effective policy review of the TMCH.

Recommendation: Set objectives for applications from the Global South

Rationale/related findings: Applications were few, but there was no concerted effort to encourage them.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite – objectives must be set

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The Subsequent Procedures Working Group needs to establish clear measurable goals for the Global South in terms of number of applications and even number of delegated strings. This effort should include a definition of the “Global South.”

Success Measures: Increased participation by the Global South as demonstrated by increased applications and delegations

Recommendation: Set objectives/**metrics** for applications from the Global South

Rationale/related findings: Applications were few, but there was no concerted effort to encourage them.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group / **Generic Supporting Names Organization**

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite – objectives must be set

Consensus within team: **Yes**

Details: The Subsequent Procedures Working Group needs to establish clear measurable goals for the Global South **including whether or when applications and even number of delegated strings should be objectives. It is possible that Short term objectives should be around second level participation.**

Success Measures: Increased participation by the Global South as demonstrated by increased applications and delegations

Recommendation: Expand and improve outreach into the Global South

Rationale/related findings: Low understanding of New gTLD Program in the Global South

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: Outreach to the Global South requires a more comprehensive program of conference participation, thought leader engagement and traditional media. This outreach should include cost projections and, potential business models. Furthermore, it is recommended that the outreach program begin significantly earlier to facilitate internal decision-making by potential applicants. The outreach team should compile a list of likely candidates, starting with the work of AMGlobal, and ensure these candidates are part of the outreach effort.

Success Measures: Ideally, success would be measured in appreciable growth in applications from the Global South. In the absence of such growth, ICANN should survey entities in the Global South again to determine the sources of the difficulties that continue to be faced by potential applicants.

Recommendation: Expand and improve outreach into the Global South

Rationale/related findings: Low understanding of New gTLD Program in the Global South

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: Outreach to the Global South requires a more comprehensive program of conference participation, thought leader engagement and traditional media. **The work of AMGlobal should be built upon to identify targets, outlets and venues for better outreach.** This outreach should include cost projections and, potential business models, **and resources for further information.** Furthermore, it is recommended that the outreach program begin significantly earlier **so as** to facilitate internal decision-making by potential applicants.

Success Measures: Ideally, success would be measured in appreciable growth in applications from the Global South. In the absence of such growth, ICANN should survey entities in the Global South again to determine the sources of the difficulties that continue to be faced by potential applicants.

Recommendation: Coordinate the pro bono assistance program.

Rationale/related findings: Despite the registration of both volunteers and applicants, there is no evidence of interaction.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: Ideally, the pro bono assistance program would be coordinated by the ICANN organization to ensure that communication is successful between volunteers and applicants.

Success Measures: Both volunteers and applicants should be surveyed by the ICANN organization on the success of the interaction between them so that future reforms can be based on better information.

Recommendation: ICANN org to “coordinate” the pro bono assistance program.

Rationale/related findings: Despite the registration of both volunteers and applicants, there is no evidence of interaction.

To: ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: Ideally, the pro bono assistance program would be coordinated by the ICANN organization to ensure that communication is successful between volunteers and applicants.

Success Measures: Both volunteers and applicants should be surveyed by the ICANN organization on the success of the interaction between them so that future reforms can be based on better information.

Recommendation: Revisit the Applicant Financial Support Program.

Rationale/related findings: Only three applicants applied for support.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The total cost of applying for a new gTLD string far exceeds the \$185K application fee. Beyond efforts to reduce the application fee for all applicants, efforts should be made to further reduce the overall cost of application, including additional subsidies and dedicated support for underserved communities.

Success Measures: Greater participation in the applicant support program.

Recommendation: Revisit the Applicant Financial Support Program.

Rationale/related findings: Only three applicants applied for support.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: The total cost of **getting** a new gTLD string far exceeds the \$185K application fee. Beyond efforts to reduce the application fee for all applicants, efforts should be made to further reduce the overall cost of application, **evaluation and conflict resolution, including additional subsidies and dedicated support for applicants from the Global South.**

Success Measures: Greater participation in the applicant support program.

Recommendation: As required by the October 2016 Bylaws, GAC consensus advice to the Board regarding gTLDs should also be clearly enunciated, actionable and accompanied by a rationale, permitting the Board to determine how to apply that advice. ICANN should provide a template to the GAC for advice related to specific TLDs, in order to provide a structure that includes all of these elements. In addition to providing a template, the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) should clarify the process and timelines by which GAC advice is expected for individual TLDs.

Rationale/related findings: The early warnings provided by GAC members helped applicants to improve delegated gTLDs by ensuring that public policy or public interest concerns were addressed, and should continue to be an element of any future expansion of the gTLD space. Applicants could withdraw their applications if they determined that the response or action required to respond to GAC early warning advice was either too costly or too complex and to do so in a timely manner that would permit them to recover 80% of the application cost. Where general GAC advice was provided by means of communiqués to the ICANN Board, it was sometimes not as easy to apply to the direct cases. Applying for a gTLD is a complex and time-consuming process and the initial AGB was amended even after the call for applications had closed. Given the recommendations to attempt to increase representation from applicants from the Global South, it would be appropriate to ensure that the clearest possible information and results from the last round were made available.

To: Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, GAC, ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Success Measures: (none)

Recommendation: As required by the October 2016 Bylaws, GAC consensus advice to the Board regarding gTLDs should also be clearly enunciated, actionable and accompanied by a rationale, permitting the Board to determine how to apply that advice. ICANN should provide a template to the GAC for advice related to specific TLDs, in order to provide a structure that includes all of these elements. In addition to providing a template, the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) should clarify the process and timelines by which GAC advice is expected for individual TLDs.

Rationale/related findings: The early warnings provided by GAC members helped applicants to improve delegated gTLDs by ensuring that public policy or public interest concerns were addressed, and should continue to be an element of any future expansion of the gTLD space. Applicants could withdraw their applications if they determined that the response or action required to respond to GAC early warning advice was either too costly or too complex and to do so in a timely manner that would permit them to recover 80% of the application cost. Where general GAC advice was provided by means of communiqués to the ICANN Board, it was sometimes not as easy to apply to the direct cases. Applying for a gTLD is a complex and time-consuming process and the initial AGB was amended even after the call for applications had closed. Given the recommendations to attempt to increase representation from applicants from the Global South, it would be appropriate to ensure that the clearest possible information and results from the last round were made available.

To: Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, GAC, ICANN organization

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Details: While the details should be left to the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, the CCT believe there should be a mechanism created to specifically allow objections by individual members of the GAC and means to challenge assertions of fact by GAC members. Finally, some sort of appeals mechanism is imperative.

Consensus within team: Yes

Success Measures: This recommendation stems from a more qualitative assessment by the CCTRT and anecdotal feedback from applicants. Consequently, the measures for success will be similarly qualitative as the next CCRT evaluates the process of gTLD application moving forward. That said, the proof will lie in the implementation of the recommendation. With a structured process and template for the submission of GAC advice and a process for objection and appeal, the most frequently voiced concerns of applicants, regarding such advice, will be addressed.

Recommendation: A thorough review of the procedures and objectives for community based applications should be carried out and improvements made to address and correct the concerns raised before a new gTLD application process is launched. Revisions or adjustments should be clearly reflected in an updated version of the 2012 AGB.

Rationale/related findings: Given the assessment carried out by the Ombudsman's Own Motion Report, the results of community-based objections, the Council of Europe report on the human rights perspective of those applications, and the interest raised by the ICANN community regarding the relative lack of success of community-based applications (an area where the ICANN community had intended to provide a special entry for communities to gTLDs of particular interest and use for them), it could be expected that there would be a higher rate of success for community-based applications.

To: Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: Should the Subsequent Procedures Working Group deem it beneficial to proceed with the notion of community based applications, a metric for success would simply be a higher rate of success for such application.

Recommendation: A thorough review of the procedures and objectives for community based applications should be carried out and improvements made to address and correct the concerns raised before a new gTLD application process is launched. Revisions or adjustments should be clearly reflected in an updated version of the 2012 AGB.

Rationale/related findings: Given the assessment carried out by the Ombudsman's Own Motion Report, the results of community-based objections, the Council of Europe report on the human rights perspective of those applications, and the interest raised by the ICANN community regarding the relative lack of success of community-based applications (an area where the ICANN community had intended to provide a special entry for communities to gTLDs of particular interest and use for them), it could be expected that there would be a higher rate of success for community-based applications.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: TBC

Details: (none)

Success Measures: Should the Subsequent Procedures Working Group deem it beneficial to proceed with the notion of community based applications, a metric for success would simply be a higher rate of success for such application.

Recommendation: The Subsequent Procedures PDP should consider adopting new policies to avoid the potential for inconsistent results in string confusion objections. In particular, the PDP should consider the following possibilities:

- 1) Determining through the initial string similarity review process that singular and plural versions of the same gTLD string should not be delegated
- 2) Avoiding disparities in similar disputes by ensuring that all similar cases of plural versus singular strings are examined by the same expert panelist
- 3) Introducing a post dispute resolution panel review mechanism

Rationale/related findings: From a review of the outcome of singular and plural cases, it would appear that discrepancies in outcomes arose because the Dispute Resolution Service Provider (DRSP) process allowed for different expert panelists to examine individual cases, although they were based on similar situations. This meant that different expert panelists could come to different conclusions in cases that otherwise might have been considered to have similar characteristics.

ICANN Program Implementation Review 2016 found that there was no recourse after the decision taken by an expert panel. Given that there appear to be inconsistencies in the outcomes of different dispute resolution panels, it would be useful to ensure a review mechanism.

There appear to be inconsistencies in the outcomes of different dispute resolution panels regarding singular and plural versions of the same word, which a priori (and according to the GAC advice of 2013) should be avoided in order to avoid confusing consumers.

To: Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: No string confusion objections are filed for cases of singular and plural versions of the same string. Or, should singular and plural versions be allowed, objection panels evaluate all such cases with a consistent approach such that all single or plural disputes are resolved in the same manner.

Recommendation: The Subsequent Procedures PDP should consider adopting new policies to avoid the potential for inconsistent results in string confusion objections. In particular, the PDP should consider the following possibilities:

- 1) Determining through the initial string similarity review process that singular and plural versions of the same gTLD string should not be delegated
- 2) Avoiding disparities in similar disputes by ensuring that all similar cases of plural versus singular strings are examined by the same expert panelist
- 3) Introducing a post dispute resolution panel review mechanism

Rationale/related findings: From a review of the outcome of singular and plural cases, it would appear that discrepancies in outcomes arose because the Dispute Resolution Service Provider (DRSP) process allowed for different expert panelists to examine individual cases, although they were based on similar situations. This meant that different expert panelists could come to different conclusions in cases that otherwise might have been considered to have similar characteristics.

ICANN Program Implementation Review 2016 found that there was no recourse after the decision taken by an expert panel. Given that there appear to be inconsistencies in the outcomes of different dispute resolution panels, it would be useful to ensure a review mechanism.

There appear to be inconsistencies in the outcomes of different dispute resolution panels regarding singular and plural versions of the same word, which a priori (and according to the GAC advice of 2013) should be avoided in order to avoid confusing consumers.

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Prerequisite

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: While the details should be left to the subproc working group, the CCT believe there should be a mechanism created to specifically allow objections by individual members of the GAC and means to challenge assertions of fact by GAC members. Finally, some sort of appeals mechanism is imperative.

Success Measures: No string confusion objections are filed for cases of singular and plural versions of the same string. Or, should singular and plural versions be allowed, objection panels evaluate all such cases with a consistent approach such that all single or plural disputes are resolved in the same manner.

Recommendation: A thorough review of the results of dispute resolutions on all objections should be carried out prior to the next CCT review.

Rationale/related findings: Given inconsistencies of outcome of some similar cases, the fact that three different tribunals reviewed four different kinds of objections, that there was no right of appeal following the outcome of those findings and the particular case of community objections, it is important that a full, analytical review be carried out of the overall process.

To: Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group

Prerequisite or Priority Level: Low

Consensus within team: Yes

Details: (none)

Success Measures: (none)

~~**Recommendation:** A thorough review of the results of dispute resolutions on all objections should be carried out prior to the next CCT review.~~

~~**Rationale/related findings:** Given inconsistencies of outcome of some similar cases, the fact that three different tribunals reviewed four different kinds of objections, that there was no right of appeal following the outcome of those findings and the particular case of community objections, it is important that a full, analytical review be carried out of the overall process.~~

~~**To:** Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group~~

~~**Prerequisite or Priority Level:** Low~~

~~**Consensus within team:** TBC~~

~~**Details:** (none)~~

~~**Success Measures:** (none)~~