

A dark blue background with a network diagram of white nodes and lines. The nodes are arranged in a roughly horizontal band across the top and bottom of the slide, with lines connecting them to form a complex web. The central text is white and bold.

**New gTLD Subsequent Procedures  
Policy Development Process (PDP)  
Working Group (WG)-  
Public Comment**

# HIGH LEVEL FEEDBACK

- Clarify how strictly CCTRT expects the PDP WG to interpret and adhere to the language of the recommendations
- Incorporate detail into the report about procedural elements, such as ICANN Board consideration of these recommendations and expectations for implementation steps
- Clear definitions for terminology used in the document
- Where recommendations have more than one target, **Clarify target audience**
- **Priority levels may be reconsidered:** May not be feasible from a timing perspective for the ICANN organization to complete data collection and share with the WG for analysis and action before the WG concludes.

# CONSUMER CHOICE

**Rec. 10** Consider if defensive registrations can be reduced for brands registering a large number of domains

**To:** New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG and/or Rights Protection Mechanisms PDP WG

- Deliberating on appropriate target for recommendation
- Clarify “costs related to defensive registration”: What costs specifically are included in this term and for whom?
- Why this recommendation specifically refers to a “small number of brands registering a large number of domains.”

# CONSUMER TRUST

## Rec.14 Create Incentives to encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations re:

- Relationship of name to content
- Implied messages of trust conveyed by name
- Safety & security of sensitive information (incl. health and \$ info)

To: New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

- Define “user expectations”
- Additional details required about the rationale for encouraging “content” to match the TLD’s understood purpose
- Clarify how the reference to “relationship of content of a gTLD to its name” is consistent with Section 1.1 of the ICANN Bylaws.

# SAFEGUARDS

**Rec. 33** Consider if defensive registrations can be reduced for brands registering a large number of domains

**To:** ICANN organization, PDP WG, and future CCT Review Teams

- Clarify target audience
- Provide a more targeted definition of trustworthiness

# SAFEGUARDS

**Rec. 34** Repeat and refine 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 TLDs.

**To:**

ICANN organization, PDP WG, and future CCT Review Teams

- Clarify target audience

# SAFEGUARDS

**Rec. 35** 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).

**To:** ICANN organization, PDP WG, and future CCT Review Teams

- Clarify target audience

# SAFEGUARDS

**Rec. 36** Gather public comments on the impact of new gTLD registration restrictions on competition to include whether restrictions have created undue preferences.

**To:** ICANN organization, PDP WG, and future CCT Review Teams

- Clarify how it fits within the scope of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure PDP WG
- Clarify when the PDP WG will gather public comments
- Clarity “undue preferences” and how these impact competition



# SAFEGUARDS

**Rec. 38** Future gTLD applicants should state the goals of each of their voluntary PICs. The intended purpose is not discernible for many voluntary PICs, making it difficult to evaluate effectiveness.

**To:** ICANN organization and New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

- Recommendation understood and appropriately assigned
- To the extent PICS are part of subsequent procedures, will incorporate into relevant discussions

# SAFEGUARDS

**Rec. 39** 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.

**To:** New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

- Appropriately assigned
- Concept of PICs and their applicability for subsequent procedures being consideration
- More information needed on whether this would prevent the inclusion of voluntary PICs after application submission
- Suggestion to reword it as “All voluntary commitments made by an applicant should 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’.
- WG considering whether commitments can be modified at the time of applications or as a result of GAC advice. How would this fit with the CCTRT recommendations?

# APPLICATION & EVALUATION

**Rec. 43** Set objectives for applications from the Global South. 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.”

**To:** New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

- Appropriately assigned and underway within Track 1
- Clarify how rigidly this recommendation should be interpreted: Focus exclusively on goals for number of applications and number of delegated strings or could objectives for the Global South extend to other measures, as well?
- Define “Global South”

# APPLICATION & EVALUATION

**Rec. 46** Revisit the Applicant Financial Support Program. 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.

**To:** New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

- Appropriately assigned to the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG - underway within Work Track 1
- Clarification needed: “underserved communities” and “Global South”. Interchangeable or distinct terms?
- Recommendation pertains only to: 1) costs of applying for a new gTLD, 2) additional post application fees such as objection-related fees, 3) or also applies to operating costs.

# APPLICATION & EVALUATION

**Rec. 47** 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 specific TLDs.

**To:** New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, GAC, ICANN organization

- Appropriately assigned
- Clarify scope

# APPLICATION & EVALUATION

**Rec. 48** 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.

**To:** New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

- Appropriately assigned and considered within Track 3

# APPLICATION & EVALUATION

**Rec. 49** 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.

**To:** New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

- Appropriately assigned and considered within Track 3

# APPLICATION & EVALUATION

**Rec. 50** A thorough review of the results of dispute resolutions on all objections should be carried out prior to the next CCT review.

**To:** New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

- Priority to be reconsidered: SubPro may have completed its work by the time this recommendation should be implemented. May be redirected to another party?
- Clarify intended timeframe