Anticipated Outcomes:

- The PDP WG expects to consider findings from the CCT-RT, especially as it relates to cost-benefit analyses.

- The WG believes that the ICANN Board should be informed about the Anticipated Outcomes for taking action to implement the findings.

Subject 1: Additional New gTLDs in the Future

- Additional new gTLDs in the Future
- Categorization or Differentiation of gTLDs (for example, brand, geographical, or supported/community) in ongoing new gTLD mechanisms. The WG supports the continued categorization of gTLDs as outlined in the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook and the inclusion of benefits in any ongoing mechanisms.
- 2007 GNSO Final Report on the Introduction of New gTLDs
- New gTLD rounds proposed in rounds 2 and 3.
- The WG thanks the ICANN Board for their continued support.

---

Subject 2: New gTLD Applicants' Guides

- New gTLD Applicants' Guides
- Applicant Guidebook: New gTLD
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the Applicant Guidebook.

---

Subject 3: Impact of New gTLDs on Existing Business Models

- Impact of New gTLDs on Existing Business Models
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing business models.

---

Subject 4: New gTLDs and Competition

- New gTLDs and Competition
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on competition.

---

Subject 5: GAC's Role in the New gTLD Process

- GAC's Role in the New gTLD Process
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the role of the GAC in the new gTLD process.

---

Subject 6: Proposed New gTLD Policy Changes

- Proposed New gTLD Policy Changes
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the proposed new gTLD policy changes.

---

Subject 7: New gTLD Applicant Guidebook

- New gTLD Applicant Guidebook
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the new gTLD applicant guidebook.

---

Subject 8: New gTLDs and Existing Markets

- New gTLDs and Existing Markets
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing markets.

---

Subject 9: New gTLDs and Existing Industry

- New gTLDs and Existing Industry
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing industry.

---

Subject 10: New gTLDs and Existing Regulations

- New gTLDs and Existing Regulations
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing regulations.

---

Subject 11: New gTLDs and Existing Policies

- New gTLDs and Existing Policies
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing policies.

---

Subject 12: New gTLDs and Existing Infrastructure

- New gTLDs and Existing Infrastructure
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing infrastructure.

---

Subject 13: New gTLDs and Existing Standards

- New gTLDs and Existing Standards
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing standards.

---

Subject 14: New gTLDs and Existing Interoperability

- New gTLDs and Existing Interoperability
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing interoperability.

---

Subject 15: New gTLDs and Existing Security

- New gTLDs and Existing Security
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing security.

---

Subject 16: New gTLDs and Existing Privacy

- New gTLDs and Existing Privacy
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing privacy.

---

Subject 17: New gTLDs and Existing Intellectual Property

- New gTLDs and Existing Intellectual Property
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing intellectual property.

---

Subject 18: New gTLDs and Existing Consumer Protection

- New gTLDs and Existing Consumer Protection
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing consumer protection.

---

Subject 19: New gTLDs and Existing Consumer Trust

- New gTLDs and Existing Consumer Trust
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing consumer trust.

---

Subject 20: New gTLDs and Existing Market Integrity

- New gTLDs and Existing Market Integrity
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing market integrity.

---

Subject 21: New gTLDs and Existing Business Practices

- New gTLDs and Existing Business Practices
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing business practices.

---

Subject 22: New gTLDs and Existing Business Models

- New gTLDs and Existing Business Models
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing business models.

---

Subject 23: New gTLDs and Existing Business Opportunities

- New gTLDs and Existing Business Opportunities
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing business opportunities.

---

Subject 24: New gTLDs and Existing Business Risks

- New gTLDs and Existing Business Risks
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing business risks.

---

Subject 25: New gTLDs and Existing Business Strategies

- New gTLDs and Existing Business Strategies
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing business strategies.

---

Subject 26: New gTLDs and Existing Business Challenges

- New gTLDs and Existing Business Challenges
- The WG thanks the ccNSO for its comments on the impact of new gTLDs on existing business challenges.
2.5.2. Yes. The current uncertainty regarding whether and when a future application process will be opened creates a closed market for the future operation of gTLDs. Unpredictability regarding application processes, or long gaps between application windows, may have similar unpredictable effects on competition by limiting the number of new entrants to the market. New entrants could improve competition by creating-market displacement or by introducing new and innovative product offerings.

2.5.3. Review GNSO’s “natural control” over entry into the new gTLD marketplace, we believe that strains to maintain as ongoing mechanisms the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track for this round.

2.5.4. We believe that the current landscape is not able to provide the impact of additional new gTLDs on competition and the overall market for gTLDs. While it may be too early to evaluate the full range of benefits and challenges, there is currently no indication that policy around ongoing mechanisms needs to be changed.

2.5.5. No existing policy recommendations exist in regards to categories of gTLDs. The 2012 round of the new gTLD Program procedure real world examples of possible categories.

2.5.6. The WP39 comments are on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.

2.5.7. The WP39 comments are on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.

3.2.1. This question requires further clarification of what “sufficient diversity” means in this context. We refer to the list of possible categories of gTLDs, including: .brand; .geo; .co; .net. No existing policy recommendations exist in regards to categories of gTLDs. The 2012 round of the new gTLD Program procedure real world examples of possible categories.

3.2.2. The WP39 comments are on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.

3.2.3. The WP39 comments are on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.

3.2.4. No comments at this time.

3.2.5. We believe that an accreditation process for backend providers would greatly streamline the application process as well as the auction processes.

3.2.6. The WP39 comments are on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.

Subject 2. Categorization or differentiation of gTLDs (for example brand, gTLD, or community/meaningful names) in ongoing new gTLDs.

Indication of information: 
- Subject 2: Categorization or differentiation of gTLDs (for example brand, gTLD, or community/meaningful names) in ongoing new gTLDs.
- The WP39 comments are on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.

Note: Several possible categories have been suggested by PDP WG members, including: Open-Geographic; Geographic; Brand; Specification 2.2.2; Inter-governmental Organization; Community. Additional categories with qualification criteria that must be met: .brand (e.g. registered .brand). Does not apply to .gTLDs. High-Priority Usage Requirements (requirements that apply to .brand registrations & .co by others). TLD with self-identified restrictions and enforcement via Trademark Dispute Resolution Policy.


We refer to comments on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.

We refer to comments on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.

We refer to comments on the topic not being an ongoing mechanism may have anti-competitive effects. There is no evidence that it should create, in the overarching issues process, the set of candidate categories to discuss in the Work Track and policy development process.
The GAC advised it is Communicating from the Noticeable meeting (March 2018) to follow:

Finally, the GAC recognizes the importance of fully exploring the potential benefits of additional categories (i.e., broad differentiation) that are sufficient to other add-complexity to the management of the new TLD program and that will help to accelerate the early GTS program. In particular, the GAC believes that:

- This could create greater flexibility in the application procedures to address the needs of a diversity of categories or types of string-including common names, famous and geographical strings-which may likely make application processes more predictable and make greater efficiency for ICANN, both in its TLD and GC processes.

- Taking into account that applicants for use of new TLDs of a high public interest for a specific community, such as city TLDs or country region and other geographical TLDs, may require the legal framework of the territory in which the community is located to be familiar with the TLD/GACs framework to achieve legal and investor transparency and broader consumer choice. Likewise, successive segmentation of the application period will offset the progress of the working group by encouraging separate policy analysis for each class of registry operator or applicant.

- In the event that the next round does result in 10,000 applications, or 15,000 as some have suggested, categories will result in added burdens for evaluators to decide what goes where. Contentions resolution becomes even more complicated if a single string can fit into a number of categories. The administration of the registry agreement also becomes challenging. It is clear that any claimed benefits of new categories will outweigh the potential costs.

- As mentioned above, we see some benefit in a structured process for .brand (Open Bursts) applications, thus brands provide a natural case for consumers and do not need any of the options of open TLDs. We also believe that GAC/GDs should consider a more substantial approach to subclassing applications from underserved jurisdictions, which would be highly appropriate for the auction process, which ICANN is currently looking beyond the 2012 round.

There are several different views among the GPs about whether additional categories of TLDs should be defined themselves in this proposal for working groups that are interested in this area. As a follow-up, the GPs noted that:

- The WG will take into account feedback received in CC1 responses as it examines the potential scope and impact of possible categories.

A list appears to be a good basis for further analysis of this concept. The 2007 GAIC Principles on new TLDs already include a series of specific types or characteristics of TLDs (firms with national, cultural, and territorial significance; country, territory, or place names and acronyms; city TLDs; brands; and geographical strings). The WG will also consider new categories or types of string (generic, geographic names, community based, sensitive strings, highly regulated sectors), which may well deserve a differentiated treatment.

The list appears to be a good basis for further analysis of this concept. The 2007 GAIC Principles on new TLDs already include a series of specific types or characteristics of TLDs (firms with national, cultural, and territorial significance; country, territory, or place names and acronyms; city TLDs; brands; and geographical strings). The WG will also consider new categories or types of string (generic, geographic names, community based, sensitive strings, highly regulated sectors), which may well deserve a differentiated treatment.

The list appears to be a good basis for further analysis of this concept. The 2007 GAIC Principles on new TLDs already include a series of specific types or characteristics of TLDs (firms with national, cultural, and territorial significance; country, territory, or place names and acronyms; city TLDs; brands; and geographical strings). The WG will also consider new categories or types of string (generic, geographic names, community based, sensitive strings, highly regulated sectors), which may well deserve a differentiated treatment.

- The WG will take into account feedback received in CC1 responses as it examines the potential scope and impact of possible categories.

There is a preliminary agreement within the Working Group that categories currently listed in the Applicant Guidebook should continue to be used. Different perspectives have been raised within the working group regarding additional categories. There is a preliminary agreement as to whether additional additional categories should be included.

The list appears to be a good basis for further analysis of this concept. The 2007 GAIC Principles on new TLDs already include a series of specific types or characteristics of TLDs (firms with national, cultural, and territorial significance; country, territory, or place names and acronyms; city TLDs; brands; and geographical strings). The WG will also consider new categories or types of string (generic, geographic names, community based, sensitive strings, highly regulated sectors), which may well deserve a differentiated treatment.

The list appears to be a good basis for further analysis of this concept. The 2007 GAIC Principles on new TLDs already include a series of specific types or characteristics of TLDs (firms with national, cultural, and territorial significance; country, territory, or place names and acronyms; city TLDs; brands; and geographical strings). The WG will also consider new categories or types of string (generic, geographic names, community based, sensitive strings, highly regulated sectors), which may well deserve a differentiated treatment.

The list appears to be a good basis for further analysis of this concept. The 2007 GAIC Principles on new TLDs already include a series of specific types or characteristics of TLDs (firms with national, cultural, and territorial significance; country, territory, or place names and acronyms; city TLDs; brands; and geographical strings). The WG will also consider new categories or types of string (generic, geographic names, community based, sensitive strings, highly regulated sectors), which may well deserve a differentiated treatment.

The list appears to be a good basis for further analysis of this concept. The 2007 GAIC Principles on new TLDs already include a series of specific types or characteristics of TLDs (firms with national, cultural, and territorial significance; country, territory, or place names and acronyms; city TLDs; brands; and geographical strings). The WG will also consider new categories or types of string (generic, geographic names, community based, sensitive strings, highly regulated sectors), which may well deserve a differentiated treatment.

There is a preliminary agreement within the Working Group that categories currently listed in the Applicant Guidebook should continue to be used. Different perspectives have been raised within the working group regarding additional categories. There is a preliminary agreement as to whether additional additional categories should be included.

The list appears to be a good basis for further analysis of this concept. The 2007 GAIC Principles on new TLDs already include a series of specific types or characteristics of TLDs (firms with national, cultural, and territorial significance; country, territory, or place names and acronyms; city TLDs; brands; and geographical strings). The WG will also consider new categories or types of string (generic, geographic names, community based, sensitive strings, highly regulated sectors), which may well deserve a differentiated treatment.

There is a preliminary agreement within the Working Group that categories currently listed in the Applicant Guidebook should continue to be used. Different perspectives have been raised within the working group regarding additional categories. There is a preliminary agreement as to whether additional additional categories should be included.
In initial discussions, the WG agreed that there should be an ongoing process that is clearly defined, with the understanding that there may be one or two rounds. The WG agreed that following these preliminary rounds the process will go to a steady state of first come, first served. Continued conversation on this topic will take into account feedback received in CC1 responses as well as the potential scope and impact of possible categories.

Subject 5: Future new gTLDs assessed in "rounds."

WG Comments

2.22 We believe that the priority dispute mechanisms at the top level set forth in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook were adequate and need to be fixed in advance of the opening of any ongoing application mechanism.

Resources related to specific categories of new gTLDs submitted following WG Request for Advice Relating to the 2012 New gTLD Round:
- ICANN letter on the Meaningful Representations of Country and Territory Names in the gTLD space: goo.gl/dPjT9u
- ALAC Statement on the Use of Country and Territory Names on Top-level Domains: goo.gl/1W8yU
- ALAC Correspondence on the Study Group on Brand New gTLDs: goo.gl/dPjT9u
- ALAC Statement on the Community Expertise in Community Priority Evaluation: goo.gl/whOGy
- ALAC Statement on the Preferential Treatment for Community Applications in String Contention: goo.gl/9ZKw1
- ALAC Statement on the Public Interest Commitments: goo.gl/3GyL and Follow-up Statement on the Public Interest Commitments: goo.gl/9ZKw1
- Proposal for the Use of Mandatory Policy Advisory Boards for Regulated Industry Sector and Consumer-Facing Brand New gTLD strings: goo.gl/CboG

2.23 The WG is unlikely to set the evaluation date of relevant aspects of the first round while the GAC has not yet considered the merits of all options, it should be noted for the sake of discussion that one alternative to "rounds" is a permanent process of GA right to applications for new gTLDs within an agreed policy and operational framework is referred to as "continuous delegation." This could provide long-term certainty, reduce opportunities for gaming the system and enable more efficient allocation of resources by ICANN, the community and applicants. There are several aspects of existing rounds to be considered, including:
- A lack of clarity for the framework to respond to emerging issues, including public policy issues.
- A possible mechanism to ensure that when there is an application for a certain string, community or other stakeholder that has an interest in the same string is the (at least) applicant and it (also) have an opportunity to apply for the string when a specific window, and/or (c) have some say in determining or otherwise managing the string. This must be put in place to be delegated.
- An objective analysis of relevant resources demands on ICANN, the community and applicants.

2.24 The WG recommended that the community and stakeholders engage in conversations on the position that there should be an ongoing process that is clearly defined, with the understanding that there may be one or two rounds. The WG further agreed that following these preliminary rounds the process will go to a steady state of first come, first served. Continuing conversation on this topic will take into account feedback received in CC1 responses as well as the potential scope and impact of possible categories.

2.25 No. Allowing for subsequent procedures that contemplate a rolling first come, first served process period after all applications—new and legacy—are processed. This allows for a more efficient use of resources, particularly where there are well-structured and relevant categories of new gTLDs. A hybrid approach might be considered by the Working Group (e.g., a short window followed by an immediate rolling period).

Resources related to specific categories of new gTLDs submitted following WG Request for Advice Relating to the 2012 New gTLD Round:
- ICANN letter on the Meaningful Representations of Country and Territory Names in the gTLD space: goo.gl/dPjT9u
- ALAC Statement on the Use of Country and Territory Names on Top-level Domains: goo.gl/1W8yU
- ALAC Correspondence on the Study Group on Brand New gTLDs: goo.gl/dPjT9u
- ALAC Statement on the Community Expertise in Community Priority Evaluation: goo.gl/whOGy
- ALAC Statement on the Preferential Treatment for Community Applications in String Contention: goo.gl/9ZKw1
- ALAC Statement on the Public Interest Commitments: goo.gl/3GyL and Follow-up Statement on the Public Interest Commitments: goo.gl/9ZKw1
- Proposal for the Use of Mandatory Policy Advisory Boards for Regulated Industry Sector and Consumer-Facing Brand New gTLD strings: goo.gl/CboG

The WG will take into account feedback received in CC1 responses as well as the potential scope and impact of possible categories, including questions related to process.
to the new gTLD Application process, the disruptive effect to all parties should be minimized.

3j.R3

3j.R1

3i.R3

3i.R1

3h.R3

3h.R2

3g.R3

3g.R2

3f.R3

3f.R1

3.e Do "rounds" lead to greater predictability for applicants and other interested parties?

We do not have sufficient data to determine this since there has never been an ongoing application mechanism against which to compare. However, posting applications into ordinary groups would happen, at least formally, to lead to better and more consistent results.

3d.R3

3d.R2

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

No.

No comments at this stage.

3f.R1

3.f: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of an application, leading to longer times to market?

Not necessarily. An ongoing process of accepting applications within an agreed framework could presumably treat applicants equally reasonably.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No

Comments at this stage.

3d.R1

3.d: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

Yes.

Having a "window" leads to a scramble to apply for any-and-all potentially lucrative strings or to secure your brand name for fear of delays.

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

No

Comments at this stage.

Yes, moving to a continuous process would dramatically change the way in which resources are used and resources should be devoted to the content.

3f.R1

3.f: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

Yes, moving to a continuous process would dramatically change the way in which resources are used and resources should be devoted to the content.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

Yes, moving to a continuous process would dramatically change the way in which resources are used and resources should be devoted to the content.

3d.R3

3d.R2

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

No

Comments at this stage.

3f.R1

3.f: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.

3d.R3

3d.R2

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

No

Comments at this stage.

3f.R1

3.f: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

Yes.

Having a "window" leads to a scramble to apply for any-and-all potentially lucrative strings or to secure your brand name for fear of being locked out of the market.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

Yes.

More than four years from the closure of the 2012 round, several strings remain in contention and their timeline for launch is unclear.

3d.R3

3d.R2

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

Yes, moving to a continuous process would dramatically change the way in which resources are used and resources should be devoted to the content.

3f.R1

3.f: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

Yes.

More than four years from the closure of the 2012 round, several strings remain in contention and their timeline for launch is unclear.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

Yes.

More than four years from the closure of the 2012 round, several strings remain in contention and their timeline for launch is unclear.

3d.R3

3d.R2

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

Yes

Comments at this stage.

3f.R1

3.f: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.

3d.R3

3d.R2

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

As mentioned above, we are currently under-determined and experience shows that moving to "rounds" may lead to more consistent results, which can lead to better and more consistent treatment of applicants. It may be worth considering "open" filings for rounds, rather than the "black box"-like approach taken in the current round.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.

3d.R3

3d.R2

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

As mentioned above, we are currently under-determined and experience shows that moving to "rounds" may lead to more consistent results, which can lead to better and more consistent treatment of applicants. It may be worth considering "open" filings for rounds, rather than the "black box"-like approach taken in the current round.

3f.R1

3.f: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.

3d.R3

3d.R2

3c.R3

3b.R1

3a.R3

As mentioned above, we are currently under-determined and experience shows that moving to "rounds" may lead to more consistent results, which can lead to better and more consistent treatment of applicants. It may be worth considering "open" filings for rounds, rather than the "black box"-like approach taken in the current round.

3f.R1

3.f: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.

3e.R2

3.e: Do "rounds" add latency to the evaluation and approval of applications, leading to longer times to market?

No.

Comments at this stage.
Predictability is an important factor of the New gTLD Program, as outlined in the Principles of the GNSO's 2007 Final Report. The GNSO acknowledges that there are a number of factors that have been considered and included, to help promote predictability and simultaneously, mitigate disruption from issues that were unforeseen or not be covered in the implementation phase. However, predictability should not be the only criterion.

- **Outcomes:**
  - **Predictability** should be a key factor in policy development, though substantive work remains to be done. The WG continues to refine this approach.
  - Some elements of the framework could determine what factors should be predictable (e.g., outcomes, timelines, input from the community, etc.).

**Example:**

If the Board is faced with questions that cannot be addressed by the policy recommendations they were sent, must the Board bring the issue back to the GNSO for further consideration?

**Anticipated Outcomes:**
- The Board may review all the new policy recommendations and determine if any need to be brought back to the GNSO.
- If so, the GNSO could consider a range of options, including seeking additional input from the community.

**Policy Issues:**
- Policy recommendations that were not reflected in the applicable GNSO and PDP processes appears to be one of a range of options the Board could consider.

**Outcomes:**
- The Board has determined that it may be beneficial to establish a change control framework that can help mitigate the detrimental effect from unforeseen policy changes.

**Process:**
- The Board will review all policy recommendations that were not reflected in the applicable GNSO and PDP processes and determine if any need to be brought back to the GNSO.

**Outcomes:**
- The Board may review all the new policy recommendations and determine if any need to be brought back to the GNSO.
- If so, the GNSO could consider a range of options, including seeking additional input from the community.

**Subject:** Community engagement in new gTLD application processes.

**Outcomes:**
- Community engagement is an important factor in the predictability of the New gTLD Program.
- There are new community engagement mechanisms to place that were not in existence or well defined during the development of the GNSO's 2007 Final Report, such as the new Policy Development Process (PDP) and the GAC's (Global Administrative Council) PDP processes.

**Process:**
- The Board will review all policy recommendations that were not reflected in the applicable GNSO and PDP processes.

**Outcomes:**
- The Board may review all the new policy recommendations and determine if any need to be brought back to the GNSO.
- If so, the GNSO could consider a range of options, including seeking additional input from the community.

**Additional Considerations:**
- We will ensure that the guidance is clear and consistent.
- We will also ensure that the guidance is easy to understand.
- We will also ensure that the guidance is easy to use.

**Revised Policy Development Process (PDP) Proposal:**
- The Board will review all policy recommendations that were not reflected in the applicable GNSO and PDP processes.
- The Board may review all the new policy recommendations and determine if any need to be brought back to the GNSO.

**Outcomes:**
- The Board may review all the new policy recommendations and determine if any need to be brought back to the GNSO.
- If so, the GNSO could consider a range of options, including seeking additional input from the community.

**Additional Considerations:**
- We will ensure that the guidance is clear and consistent.
- We will also ensure that the guidance is easy to understand.
- We will also ensure that the guidance is easy to use.
Subject 6. Limiting applications in total and/or per entity during an application window.

Initial Findings/Conclusions:

5d. Limiting applications be set to establish this limit?

- Preliminarily, the WG has agreed that the establishing application limits are seemingly anti-competitive and possibly contrary to the original principles of competition. In addition, enforcing any of that has been unambiguously established.

5f. No comments at this stage.

- How would a limit on the total number of applications for an application window and/or from a single entity impact fees?

- If a limit for the total number of applications for an application window and/or from a single entity is established, what mechanism(s) could be used to enforce it?

5g. No comments at this stage.

- What would be the total number of applications for an application window and/or from a single entity remain to be considered anti-competition? Please explain.

- How would a limit on the total number of applications for an application window and/or from a single entity favor “insiders”?

- Any other issues related to this overarching subject?

Open Questions (to be further researching issues or considerations that should be discussed in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WGs)

- The 2012 New gTLD Round has further tightened the number of applications that can be submitted from a single entity.

- In addition to the number of applications that can be submitted, other issues to be considered during the process of application submissions.

- There is no rational basis for such a limit.

- Regardless of the number of applications, ICANN’s standard is to look at the financial stability of the company, including all applied for and non-applied for domains.

- Comment on the number of applications that can be submitted from a single entity.

- Should additional steps be proposed to further enable community engagement in this, but may do so as the process progresses.

Additional Resources

- ICANN should send initial letters to all entity owners.

- ICANN should be more forthcoming in terms of community outreach.

- Comments on the稳妥 of the initial outreach.

- Comments on the need for additional language to propose to better enable community engagement at this phase, but may do so as the process progresses.

- Comments on the need for additional language to propose to better enable community engagement at this phase, but may do so as the process progresses.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.

- No comments at this stage.
A full historical record of GAC advice and statements on this topic is available at https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/New+gTLDs.

GAC Response to the Request for Advice Relating to the 2012 New gTLD Round

A full historical record of ALAC statements on new gTLDs is available at https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1BoDtmXT5GYpeuk5UoSKCQ3MVWldSbh4X86mbCMR4JhA/edit#gid=305222389. Topics include IDNs, PICs, objection procedures, geographic names and other subjects that may be addressed in the PDP but were not the focus of specific questions in CC1.
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