Recommendation Number	Recommendation Language	Target of Recommendation	Prerequisite or Priority Level	Does SubPro Currently Address?	How?	What Else Needs To Be Done?
9	The ICANN community should consider whether the costs related to defensive registration for the small number of brands registering a large number of domains can be reduced.	SubPro and RPMs	Prerequisite	No		The recomendation appears to be directed more at the RPMs WG, with the text stating that, "uneven distribution of costs of defensive registrations to a small number of trademark holders may be an unanticipated effect of the current RPM regime..." It is likely beyond the remit of the SubPro PDP to affect that RPM regime, so it is unclear what actions may be needed from the SubPro PDP. The SubPro PDP may want to coordinate with the RPMs PDP to determine if one or both of the PDPs should be responsible for considering this recommendation.
12	Create incentives and/or eliminate current disincentives that encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations regarding (1) the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name; (2) restrictions as to who can register a domain name in certain gTLDs based upon implied messages of trust conveyed by the name of its gTLDs (particularly in sensitive or regulated industries; and (3) the safety and security of users' personal and sensitive information (including health and financial information). These incentives could relate to applicants who choose to make public interest commitments in their applications that relate to these expectations. Ensure that applicants for any subsequent rounds are aware of these public expectations by inserting information about the results of the ICANN surveys in the Applicant Guide Books.	SubPro	Prerequisite	No		The SubPro PDP has not thouroughly considered the findings from the Nielsen surveys, which at a high level indicated that, "the public believes that websites have different extensions to "properly identify the purpose or owner or to give an indication of content or function." As such, the PDP WG has also not considered whether it believes that creating incentives or removing potential barriers (e.g., application fee, annual fees, possible need for RSEP) to operating restricted TLDs is in the best interest of the program.
14	Consider directing ICANN org, in its discussions with registries, to negotiate amendments to existing Registry Agreements, or in consideration of new Registry Agreements associated with subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, to include provisions in the agreements to provide incentives, including financial incentives, for registries, especially open registries, to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures.	ICANN Board, RySG, RrSG, GNSO, SubPro	High	Partially	The PDP WG has not looked specifically at introducing financial incentives for registries to adopt practive anti-abuse measures, but it has considered the prevention of abuse in the context of section 2.3.2 of its Initial Report on the Global Public Interest. There, the PDP WG has preliminarily recommended maintaining the mandatory Public Interest Commitment (PIC) framework, as well as refining the process, scope, and applicability of voluntary PICs.	The SubPro PDP may want to specifically consider whether it supports including, "provisions in the agreements to provide incentives, including financial incentives, for registries, especially open registries, to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures." The PDP WG may want to review the DNS Abuse Review performed on behalf of the CCT-RT. If the PDP WG were to recommend financial incentives, the WG may want to consider the financial impact of doing so and whether it is within the remit of the PDP WG to make such recommendations.
15	ICANN Org should, in its discussions with registrars and registries, negotiate amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreements to include provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars or registries for DNS Security Abuse. With a view to implementing this recommendation as early as possible, and provided this can be done, then this could be brought into effect by a contractual amendment through the bilateral review of the Agreements. In particular, ICANN should establish thresholds of abuse at which compliance inquiries are automatically triggered, with a higher threshold at which registrars and registries are presumed to be in default of their agreements. If the community determines that ICANN org itself is ill-suited or unable to enforce such provisions, a DNS Abuse Dispute Resolution Policy (DADRP) should be considered as an additional means to enforce policies and deter against DNS Security Abuse. Furthermore, defining and identifying DNS Security Abuse is inherently complex and would benefit from analysis by the community, and thus we specifically recommend that the ICANN Board prioritize and support community work in this area to enhance safeguards and trust due to the negative impact of DNS Security Abuse on consumers and other users of the Internet.	ICANN Board, RySG, RrSG, GNSO, SubPro	Prerequisite (provisions to address systemic DNS Security Abuse should be included in the baseline contract for any future new gTLDs)	No		This recommendation appears to target existing registry operators and registrars, whereas recommendation 14 also seeks to amend the base registry agreement for future new gTLD procedures. The PDP WG should consider whether they believe recommendation 15 is relevant to its work. This recommendation may be most appropriately addressed by registries/registrars and ICANN org, utilizing the prescribed contract negotiation processes.
16	Further study the relationship between specific registry operators, registrars and technical DNS abuse by commissioning ongoing data collection, including but not limited to, ICANN Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) initiatives. For transparency purposes, this information should be regularly published, ideally quarterly and no less than annually, in order to be able to identify registries and registrars that need to come under greater scrutiny, investigation, and potential enforcement action by ICANN org. Upon identifying abuse phenomena, ICANN should put in place an action plan to respond to such studies, remediate problems identified, and define future ongoing data collection.	ICANN Board, RySG, RrSG, GNSO, SubPro, SSR2-RT	High	No		This recommendation appears to primarily focus on continuing to commision studies around specific registry operators, registrars, and technical DNS abuse. If the PDP WG is in agreement that this exercise should take place, could develop similar recommentation(s). In connection to recommendation 14, the PDP WG may want to consider data by the CCT-RT related to this subject to determine if any additional measures, including financial incentives, should be recommended.

#	Recommendation	Responsible	Priority	Adopted	WT Discussion	WG Notes
17	ICANN should collect data about and publicize the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations.	ICANN Board, EPDP, RySG, RrSG, GNSO, SubPro, SSAC	High	No		This recommendation appears to be focused primarily on the Registrar data, especially as it concerns potential reseller relationships, within the Whois information. Recommending changes to the information collected and displayed within Whois is likely beyond the remit of this PDP WG, but the WG should affirm that this is the case.
23	ICANN should gather data on new gTLDs operating in highly regulated sectors to include the following elements: a) a survey to determine 1) the steps registry operators are taking to establish working relationships with relevant government or industry bodies; 2) the volume of complaints received by registrants from government and regulatory bodies and their standard practices to respond to those complaints; b) a review of a sample of domain websites within the highly regulated sector category to assess whether contact information to file complaints is sufficiently easy to find; c) an inquiry to ICANN Contractual Compliance and registrars/resellers of highly regulated domains seeking sufficiently detailed information to determine the volume and the subject matter of complaints regarding domains in highly regulated industries; d) an inquiry to registry operators to obtain data to compare rates of abuse between those highly regulated gTLDs that have voluntarily agreed to verify and validate credentials to those highly regulated gTLDs that have not; and e) an audit to assess whether restrictions regarding possessing necessary credentials are being enforced by auditing registrars and resellers offering the highly regulated TLDs (i.e., can an individual or entity without the proper credentials buy a highly regulated domain?). To the extent that current ICANN data collection initiatives and compliance audits could contribute to these efforts, we recommend that ICANN assess the most efficient way to proceed to avoid duplication of effort and leverage current work.	ICANN org, SubPro	High	Partially	Highly sensitive strings and strings in highly regulated industires were discussed in section 2.3.2 of the Initial Report, on the Global Public Interest. At present, the PDP WG is not preliminarily recommending any additional measures, but is asking a question during the public comment period about whether certain strings should be operated as a verified TLD.	The recommendation is primarily focused on additional data gathering in the future and if the PDP WG is in agreement that this exercise should take place, could develop similar recommentation(s). To the extent that the CCT-RT has already collected data related to areas identified in the recommendation, the PDP WG could consider whether those findings might impact ongoing policy development work.
25	To the extent voluntary commitments are permitted in future gTLD application processes, all such commitments made by a gTLD applicant must state their intended goal and 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. Furthermore, such requirements should apply to the extent that voluntary commitments may be made after delegation. Such voluntary commitments, including existing voluntary PICs, should be made accessible in an organized, searchable online database to enhance data driven policy development, community transparency, ICANN compliance, and the awareness of variables relevant to DNS abuse trends.	ICANN org, SubPro	Prerequisite	Partially	PICs have been discussed by WT2 under the topic Global Public Interest (see section 2.3.2. of the Initial Report). There appears to be general consistency between the first part of the CCT-RT recommendation and SubPro recommendations 2.3.2.c.2 and 2.3.2.c.3.	If the WG supports the CCT-RT recommendation, the WG may want to further discuss whether preliminary recommendations should affirm the recommendation that PICs should state their intended goal. The WG may also want to discuss whether SubPro recommendations should more explicitly align with language: "[PICs must] 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." The WG may also want to consider if any additional recommendations are needed regarding publication and accessibility of voluntary PICs. The WG may want to consider if preliminary recommendation 2.3.2.c.4 on modification of PICs is consistent with this CCT-RT recommendation.
29	Set objectives/metrics for applications from the Global South	SubPro / GNSO	Prerequisite	Partially	This issue has been discussed by WT1 in the context of topic Applicant Support (see section 2.5.4 of the Initial Report). Question 2.5.4.e.2 in the Initial Report requests community input on objectives/metrics for the ASP, but none have yet been identified.	Based on input received through public comment, the Working Group may want to develop recommendations on objectives/metrics for the Applicant Support Program, with a focus on the Global South.
32	Revisit the Applicant Financial Support Program.	SubPro	Prerequisite	Yes	This topic has been discussed extensively in WT1 (see section 2.5.4 of the Initial Report). Preliminary recommendations, options, and questions for community input are included in section 2.5.4 of the Initial Report.	Recommendations will be finalized for the Final Report. Note that the CCT-RT recommendation specifically focuses on reducing the costs of the application process and increasing participation in the program. As the WG finalizes recommendations, it may want to revisit the CCT-RT recommendations to ensure that there is alignment. The CCT-RT recommendation also mentions "efforts to reduce the application fee for all applicants." The Working Group may want to consider this element of the CCT-RT recommendation as it finalizes recommendations on Application Fees.

#	Recommendation	Entity	Type	Status	Initial Report Notes	WG Consideration
33	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.	SubPro, GAC, ICANN org	Prerequisite	Partially	The options presented in the Initial Report section on Objections (2.8.1) echo some of the themes in this recommendation, for example that GAC Advice should be clear and should include a rationale and that timelines should be clearly spelled out. The option stating "The applicant should have an opportunity to engage in direct dialogue in response to such warning. . ." appears to be consistent with the details of the CCT-RT recommendation that call for a "means to challenge assertions of fact by GAC members."	As the WG finalizes the recommendations, it may want to consider whether it may want to further harmonize recommendations, for example by recommending establishment of clear process and timelines by which GAC Advice is expected for individual TLDs (currently SubPro draft language only reference timelines for Early Warnings). The Working Group may want to review the details of the CCT-RT recommendation, which state: "While the details should be left to the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, the CCT believe there should be a mechanism created to specifically allow objections by individual members of the GAC and means to challenge assertions of fact by GAC members. Finally, some sort of appeals mechanism is imperative." The WG may want to consider if the preliminary recommendation to establish a substantive appeal mechanism specific to the New gTLD Program addresses part of the CCT-RT recommendation.
34	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.	SubPro	Prerequisite	Yes	The Initial Report discusses work completed so far on this topic (see section 2.9.1). Work Track 3 devoted a significant amount of time to deliberations on procedures and objectives. Several preliminary recommendations focus on improvements to the process.	As the WG refines recommendations on this topic, it may want to consider whether to make additional recommendations regarding objectives. Note that the CCT-RT recommendations consider "a higher rate of success for such applications" to be a measure of success.
35	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	SubPro	Prerequisite	Partially	The SubPro Initial Report includes preliminary recommendations to improve the string similarity review process (see section 2.7.4). The Preliminary Recommendations include a recommendation to establish a substantive appeal mechanism specific to the New gTLD Program (see 2.8.2).	The WG may want to consider if additional recommendations related to the String Confusion Objection are appropriate. Several questions on this topic were put out to the community in the Initial Report. The WG may want to consider if it agrees with the CCT-RT recommendation "2) Avoiding disparities in similar disputes by ensuring that all similar cases of plural versus singular strings are examined by the same expert panelist." The WG may want to consider whether its preliminary recommendation to establish a substantive appeal mechanism specific to the New gTLD Program addresses the CCT-RT recommendation: "3) Introducing a post dispute resolution panel review mechanism."