#	Recommendation	To	Prerequisite or Priority Level*
9	Continue to carry out the periodic survey of registrants in a timely and cost-effective manner, to be 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.	ICANN staff	Prerequisite

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. 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. 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 information are used..	Next CCT Review and ICANN staff	Low

Deleted: organization

Deleted: .

Deleted: .

Deleted: .

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 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.	Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, GAC, ICANN staff	Prerequisite
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. 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

49	The Subsequent Procedures PDP should fully review the process carried out during the first new gTLD round 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). 2) 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 disputes by ensuring that all similar cases of plural versus singular strings are examined by the same expert panelist 4) Introducing a post dispute resolution panel review mechanism	Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group	Prerequisite
50	A thorough review of the results of dispute resolutions on all objections should be carried out prior to the next CCT review	Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group	Low