| # | Recommendation | То | Prerequisite or Priority Level* | 4 | Formatted Table |
|---|--|-------------|------------------------------------|---|-----------------------|
| 9 | Continue to carry out the periodic | ICANN staff | Prerequisite | | Deleted: onduct |
| | survey of registrants in a timely and | | | | Deleted: a |
| | cost-effective manner, to be | | | | Deleted: organization |
| | determined in association with the | | | | |
| | PDP working group on new gTLD | | | | |
| | rounds, the ICANN gTLD Marketplace | | | | |
| | index, and any future CCT review. 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. | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| 11 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. Next CCT Review and Low Deleted: organization In particular, for any future consumer end-user surveys, a relative weighting of the respondents' assessments of the positive contributions to consumer choice with respect to geographic mange [TLDs, 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. Deleted: • • • • Such additional refinements of the questions asked in the end-user and registrant surveys should ge hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and information are used. Deleted: | | | | | _ | |
|---|----|--|---------------------|-----|---|---------------------------|
| 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 <u>respondents'</u> assessments 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. <u>v</u> <u>such additional refinements of the questions asked in the end-user and registrant surveys should go hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and</u> | 11 | The next consumer end-user and | Next CCT Review and | Low | | |
| 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 <u>respondents'</u> assessments 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. <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> | | registrant surveys to be carried out | ICANN <u>staff</u> | | | Deleted: organization |
| of the expanded number, availability and specificity of new gTLDs. In particular, for any future consumer end-user surveys, a relative weighting of the <u>respondents'</u> assessments 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. <u>v</u> | | should include questions to solicit | | | | |
| and specificity of new gTLDs. In particular, for any future consumer end-user surveys, a relative weighting of the respondents' assessments 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. | | additional information on the benefits | | | | |
| In particular, for any future consumer end-user surveys, a relative weighting of the <u>respondents'</u> assessments 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. * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * - * | | of the expanded number, availability | | | | |
| end-user surveys, a relative weighting of the <u>respondents' assessments of the</u> 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. | | and specificity of new gTLDs. | | | | |
| end-user surveys, a relative weighting of the <u>respondents' assessments of the</u> 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. | | | | | | |
| of the <u>respondents' assessments of the</u> 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. <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> <u>v</u> | | In particular, for any future consumer | | | | |
| 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. Such additional refinements of the questions asked in the end-user and registrant surveys should go hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | end-user surveys, a relative weighting | | | | |
| 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. | | of the respondents' assessments of the | | | | |
| 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. | | positive contributions to consumer | | | | |
| 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. | | choice with respect to geographic | | | | |
| 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. | | name gTLDs, specific sector gTLDs and | | | | |
| 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. | | | | | | |
| consumers for different types of gTLDs, and whether there are regional differences or similarities in their preferences. | | | | | | |
| consumers for different types of gTLDs, and whether there are regional differences or similarities in their preferences. | | there is a clear preference by | | | | |
| gTLDs, and whether there are regional differences or similarities in their preferences. | | | | | | |
| differences or similarities in their preferences. | | | | | | |
| Such additional refinements of the questions asked in the end-user and registrant surveys should go hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and Deleted: . | | | | | | |
| V Deleted: . Such additional refinements of the questions asked in the end-user and registrant surveys should go hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | preferences. | | | | |
| Such additional refinements of the questions asked in the end-user and registrant surveys should go hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | | | | | Deleted: |
| Such additional refinements of the questions asked in the end-user and registrant surveys should go hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | | | | | Deleted: |
| questions asked in the end-user and registrant surveys should go hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | | | | | Deleted: |
| registrant surveys should go hand in hand with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | Such additional refinements of the | | | | |
| with efforts carried out in the context of the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | questions asked in the end-user and | | | | |
| the ICANN gTLD Marketplace Index and complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | | | | | |
| complement the work of each to ensure that common sets of indicators and | | | | | | |
| that common sets of indicators and | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | information are used | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | IL | | | | | |

| 47 | As required by the October 2016 Bylaws, GAC consensus advice to the Board regarding gTLDs should also be clearly enunciated, actionable and | Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, GAC, ICANN <u>staff</u> | Prerequisite | Formatted: No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers Deleted: organization |
|----|---|---|--------------|---|
| 48 | 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. In particular a clear process should be developed to identify regulated and safeguard TLDs. Each of the actors identified has an obvious role in the development and application of new procedures and processes. 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. In particular these improvements and clarifications should address transparency of process, clearer criteria for eligibility and objection, and recourse to appeal Revisions or adjustments should be clearly reflected in an updated version of the 2012 AGB. | Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group | Prerequisite | Formatted: No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers |

| 49 | The Subsequent Procedures PDP | Subsequent | Prerequisite | | |
|----|---|----------------|--------------|-------|--|
| | should fully review the process carried | Procedures PDP | | ٠٠٠٠٠ | Formatted: No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space |
| | out during the first new gTLD round | Working Group | | | between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers |
| | and 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) Reviewing and clarifying the criteria for | | | | |
| | each formal objection ground (Legal | | | | |
| | Rights, Community, String Confusion and | | | | |
| | Limited Public Interest). | | | | |
| | <u>2)</u> Determining through the initial | | | | |
| | string similarity review process that | | | | |
| | singular and plural versions of the | | | | |
| | same gTLD string should not be | | | | |
| | delegated | | | | |
| | 3) Avoiding disparities in similar | | | | Deleted: 2 |
| | disputes by ensuring that all similar | | | | |
| | cases of plural versus singular strings | | | | |
| | are examined by the same expert | | | | |
| | panelist | | | | |
| | <u>4</u>) Introducing a post dispute | | | | Deleted: 3 |
| | resolution panel review mechanism | | | | |
| 50 | A thorough review of the results of | Subsequent | Low | | |
| | dispute resolutions on all objections | Procedures PDP | | | |
| | should be carried out prior to the next | Working Group | | | |
| | CCT review | | | | |