

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
<b>OVERALL QUESTIONS</b>				
<b>Predictability:</b> How can changes to the program introduced after launch (e.g., digital archery/prioritization issues, name collision, registry agreement changes, public interest commitments (PICs), etc.) be avoided?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
<b>Competition, Consumer Choice and Consumer Trust:</b> Did the implementation meet or discourage these goals? – <i>CCT Review Team?</i>	High interest	High interest	High Interest	Overall team objective
<b>Community Engagement:</b> How can participation from the community be better encouraged and integrated during the policy development process, implementation, and execution?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
<b>TLD Differentiation:</b> Does a one-size-fits all approach work? Brands, Geos, Communities?	Low risk			Low interest

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
<b>Application Order:</b> Should there be a Brand round before others?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
<b>Application Submission Limits</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
<b>WORK STREAM 1: PROCESS/SUPPORT/OUTREACH</b>				
<b>Applicant Guidebook (AGB):</b> Is the AGB the right implementation of the GNSO recommendations for all parties (ROs, RSPs, Escrow Providers)?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
<b>Clarity of Application Process:</b> How can the application process avoid developing processes on an as-needed basis (e.g., clarifying question process, change request process, customer support, etc.)	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
<b>Accreditation Programs:</b> As there appears to be a limited set of technical service and Escrow providers, would the program benefit from an accreditation program for third party service	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT Interest

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
providers? If so, would this simplify the application process with a set of pre-qualified providers to choose from?				
<b>Systems:</b> How can the systems used to support the New gTLD Program, such as TAS, Centralized Zone Data Service, Portal, etc. be made more robust, user friendly, and better integrated?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT Interest
<b>Application Fees:</b> Evaluate accuracy of cost estimates and/or review the methodology to develop the cost model, while adhering to the principle of cost recovery. Examine how payment processing can be improved.	Low interest	Low interest	Low interest	Some interest in how fees affect participation
<b>Variable Fees:</b> Should the New gTLD application fee be variable based on type of application (e.g. open or closed), multiple identical applications, or other factors.	Low interest	Low interest	Low interest	Some interest in how fees affect participation

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
<b>Application Submission Period:</b> Is 3 months the proper amount of time?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
<b>Support for Applicants from Developing Countries:</b> Evaluate effectiveness of Applicant Support program to assess if the criteria were properly designed, outreach sufficient, monetary support sufficient, etc.	High interest	High interest	High interest	RT: Was the application and evaluation process effective at... <input type="checkbox"/> Addressing the needs of underserved areas and markets? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Serving the community</li> <li>○ Encouraging participation as providers from within the area</li> <li>○ Providing effective dispute resolutions for developing regions</li> <li>○ Examine barriers to entry for prospective participants for emerging economies</li> <li>○ IDN's</li> <li>○ App support</li> </ul>
<b>WORK STREAM 2:</b> <b>Legal/Regulatory</b>				
<b>Reserved Names List and Mechanism for Release:</b> Review work of original reserved names working group; Review			Low interest	

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
whether geographic names requirements are appropriate.				
<b>Base Registry Agreement/Differentiation:</b> Review base agreement, including how and why it was amended after program launch, whether a single base agreement is appropriate, whether PICs are the right way to protect the public interest.	PIC's – supplementing and augmenting GAC advice	PIC's - impact		High interest in PICs and GAC advice
<b>Registrant Protections:</b> Evaluate protections against failure such as EBERO and the Letter of Credit.		Possible future interest		
<b>Registry/Registrar Separation:</b> Examine vertical integration relaxation and whether current restrictions are appropriate.			High interest	
<b>Registrar Non-Discrimination:</b> Are requirements still necessary?			High interest	
<b>TLD Rollout:</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	No general RT interest but interest in analyzing outreach and awareness

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
Did ICANN allow enough time in agreement for launch? When should initial fees be due to ICANN.				
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Level RPM's:</b> Reserved for RPM PDPs; anything leftover?		High interest		High interest to Safeguards sub team
<b>Global Public Interest/GAC Advice/Safeguards:</b> Consider issue identified in GAC Advice on safeguards, PICs, etc.		High interest		High interest to Safeguards sub team
<b>IGO/INGO Protections:</b> Any leftover issues from IGO/INGO PDP?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No current RT interest; pending RT discussion/developments
<b>Closed Generics:</b> Restricted in this last round? What should be allowed in the future?		Some interest		Listed in GAC advice; pending future discussion
<b>WORK STREAM 3:</b> <b>STRING CONTENTION/OBJECTIONS &amp; DISUPTES</b>				
<b>New gTLD Applicant Freedom of Expression:</b>	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
Did GAC Advice, community processes and reserved names impact this goal?				
<b>String Similarity Evaluations:</b> Were contention evaluation results consistent and effective in preventing user confusion? (Look at singular v. plural)	High interest			References: Was the application and evaluation process effective at... Preventing the delegation of TLDs that would be confusing or harmful <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Standing in objection process</li> <li>○ String confusion</li> <li>○ Singular plurals</li> <li>○ Inconsistent decisions/appeals (not sure this is in scope)</li> </ul>
<b>Objections:</b> Review rules around standing, fees, consolidation, consistency of outcomes? Appeals? Oversight over Process.	High interest			Reference note on previous item above
<b>Role of Independent Objector:</b> Did he accomplish goal? Should we continue to have?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No current RT interest; pending objections and considerations discussion
<b>Accountability Mechanism:</b> Ombudsman, Reconsideration process and IRPs?	Some interest	N/A	N/A	RT has requested reconsideration data

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
<b>Community Applications and Community Priority Evaluations:</b> Was approach consistent with recommendations and implementation guidance?	High interest			High interest in communities generally; interest effectiveness of the application process in relation to communities
<b>WORK STREAM 4: INTERNATIONALIZED DOMAIN NAMES</b>				
<b>Internationalized Domain Names:</b> Consider how to encourage adoption of gTLDs. Evaluate whether rule around IDNs properly accounted for recommendations from IDN WG. Determine and address policy guidance needed for the implementation of IDN variant TLDs.	Some interest			Some interest in IDNs; not focused on IDN WG recommendations or process.
<b>Universal Acceptance:</b> Are the current efforts enough or does more need to be done to ensure usability of all top level domains, including internationalized domains?		Some interest		Possible interest for consumer choice



## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
<b>WORK STREAM 5: TECHNICAL &amp; OPERATIONS</b>				
<b>Security and Stability:</b>				
*Were the proper questions asked to minimize the risk to the DNS and ensure that applicants will be able to meet their obligations in the registry agreement?		General interest in safeguards		General interest in risk mitigation
*Should there be non-scored questions and if so, how should they be presented?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
*Were the proper criteria established to avoid causing technical instability?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest
*Is the impact to the DNS from new gTLDs fully understood?		Some interest		
<b>Applicant Reviews:</b> Technical/Operational and Financial: Were Financial and Technical criteria designed properly to allow applicants to demonstrate their capabilities while allowing evaluators to validate their capabilities?	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT interest

## PDP TOPICS MAPPING

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP	Application Process	Safeguards	Competition	Notes
<p><b>Accreditation Process:</b>            If Workstream 1 decides that there should be an accreditation program from technical service providers, what should that process look like? What questions should be asked? Should accreditation be for all registries or just for certain types of registries? Under what circumstances would there need to be additional technical reviews?</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	No RT Interest
<p><b>Name Collision:</b>            How should name collisions be incorporated into future new gTLD rounds? What measures may be needed to manage risks for 2012-round gTLDs beyond their 2 year anniversary of delegation, or gTLDs delegated prior to the 2012 round?</p>	N/A	N/A	N/A	No general RT interest; possible interest to Safeguards sub team