

Refer to Laureen's Model Issue Paper -

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1rswTUNmvB_Lkt2RDwU2OuNx13pptdP_TpgCZ3V77UBk/edit?usp=sharing

**CCT-RT DISCUSSION PAPER WORKSHEET (LAUREEN'S TEMPLATE ADOPTED ON PLENARY
DRAFT #17)**

Scroll down for prior work

HIGH LEVEL QUESTION: *[These are the discussion paper topics]*

OWNER: *[primary drafter]*

SUB-QUESTIONS: *[what foundation questions need to be answered to fully address the high-level question; these should be as specific as possible]*

FINDINGS: *[a list of relevant findings and supporting data; the presentation of the findings needs to correspond to the numbered subquestions]*

CAUSES:

PRIORITY TO ADDRESS: *[ex. Prior to Subsequent Procedures, Mid-term, Long-term
This is an important area for community input]*

RECOMMENDATIONS: *[recommendations to ICANN. For each, specify: 1. Target of recommendation (i.e. Staff, Board, SubProc PDP); 2. Nature of recommendation; 3. Implementation details, exceptional costs, etc.]*

REVIEW: *[how the effectiveness of these recommendations will be reviewed; e.g. data source recommended for review and recommended timeframe for review]*

HIGH LEVEL QUESTION: Did the use of PICs help prevent DNS abuse?

OWNER: Drew (lead), Carlos, Gao, Fabro

SUB-QUESTIONS:

1. Which types of PICs were incorporated into the new gTLD program?
2. What restrictions were imposed by the PICs?
 - a. registrant restrictions
 - b. use restrictions
3. What were the DNS abuse rates of new gTLDs that employed the various types of PICs compared to new gTLDs that did not use PICs?
 - a. registrant restrictions
 - b. use restrictions

FINDINGS: [a list of relevant findings and supporting data; the presentation of the findings needs to correspond to the numbered subquestions]

1. Which types of PICs were incorporated into the new gTLD program?
 - a. Community
 - b. Regulated
2. What restrictions were imposed by the PICs?
 - a. registrant restrictions
 - b. use restrictions
3. What were the DNS abuse rates of new gTLDs that employed the various types of PICs compared to new gTLDs that did not use PICs?
 - c. registrant restrictions
 - d. use restrictions

CAUSES:

**PRIORITY TO ADDRESS: [ex. Prior to Subsequent Procedures, Mid-term, Long-term
This is an important area for community input]**

RECOMMENDATIONS: [recommendations to ICANN. For each, specify: 1. Target of recommendation (i.e. Staff, Board, SubProc PDP); 2. Nature of recommendation; 3. Implementation details, exceptional costs, etc.]

REVIEW: [how the effectiveness of these recommendations will be reviewed; e.g. data source recommended for review and recommended timeframe for review]

#6. Did the use of PICs (out of Specification 11) help prevent DNS abuse?

CCT-RT HYPOTHESIS WORKSHEET

HYPOTHESIS:

Compliance aspects of PIC-contractual provisions???

Specification 11 is divided in two Hypothesis: the first one is a the Registries operator level on contract implementation, the second one here, at the user levels: about the impact of the PICs on the prevention of DNS abuse. As a follow up from the previous hypothesis, here the CCT RT is to discuss about the effectiveness and compliance aspects of those provisions, established under the overarching concept of the “public interest” by GAC advice.

OWNER:

Drew (lead), Carlos, Gao, Fabro

HIGH LEVEL QUESTION:

Do we have here a clear relationship (balance) between ICANN policies and national laws in terms of the PICs established? Who is responsible for the compliance function in specific cases?

FINDINGS:

Specification 11 is the direct result of advice from the Governmental Advisory Committee of ICANN (GAC), which identified

- strings that reflected highly regulated or restricted industries (Category 1) and
- strings made up of generic terms where the applicant intended to operate an exclusive access registry (Category 2).

Each category presented different implementation and policy concerns. The GAC offered safeguard advice to protect public interests in these strings. That advice manifested as the Public Interest Commitments, which ICANN eventually adopted and implemented through Specification 11 into the registry agreement for all registry operators.

CAUSES:

(refer to relevant hypothesis worksheets on causes)

1. *Outreach program was begun too late in the process
see Outreach too late worksheet*
2. *Outreach program used the wrong media
see Outreach media worksheet*

PRIORITY TO ADDRESS:

(ex. Prior to Subsequent Procedures, Mid-term, Long-term)

This is an important area for community input)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(recommendations to ICANN. For each, specify:

- 1. Target of recommendation (ie Staff, Board, SubProc PDP)*
- 2. Nature of recommendation*
- 3. Implementation details, exceptional costs, etc.)*

(ex:

- 1. Begin Outreach 6 months prior to accepting applications*
 - a. Staff recommendation*
 - b. Likely 20% increase in outreach cost*
- 2. Use more radio advertising for outreach*
 - a. Staff recommendation*
 - b. Likely 30% increase in outreach cost)*

REVIEW:

(how the effectiveness of these recommendations will be reviewed)

- 1. Data source recommended for review*
- 2. Recommended timeframe for review)*

(ex:

- 1. Repeat applicant cohort survey, look for 40% increase in awareness*
- 2. Review in one year to make changes if an increase is not observed.)*

Research Analysis Workseet
(intended to feed into the hypothesis worksheet)

TITLE

OWNER

DESCRIPTION

(short description of the product, article, survey, economic analysis, including the underlying methodology)

TOP LEVEL QUESTIONS ADDRESSED

(a list of high level questions addressed by the research. If none, drop it ie:

1. *Did the new Gtld program enhance competition among registries?*
2. *Did the safeguards help to prevent DNS abuse*
3. *Did the application process serve the developing world*

HYPOTHESES ADDRESSED

(for each hypothesis, include the description of the hypothesis and the findings of the research ie

1. The new gTLD outreach program used the wrong vehicles for outreach
 - a. Support
 - b. The program used online advertising
 - c. The developing world still primarily uses radio for news