
New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process

Session 4.1 - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures

Session 15.1 - Next Steps for the GAC on Subsequent Rounds

Contents

Background	2
Issues	3
GAC Leadership Proposal for GAC Consideration	4
Relevant Developments	6
Timing of the Next Round(s) of Application for New gTLDs (Community Discussion)	6
Status of Policy Development in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG	7
GAC Participation in Ongoing Policy Development	8
Current Positions	8
Key Reference Documents	9
<u>Annex</u> Preliminary GAC Scorecard: Status of Substantive Areas of Interest to the GAC for Subsequent New gTLD Rounds	

Session Objectives

- Assess progress of PDP WG deliberations on issues of importance to the GAC
- Discuss formation and operation of the GAC Focal Group on Subsequent Rounds of gTLDs
- Determine next steps to the GAC

Background

Since its incorporation, ICANN has delivered several expansions of the TLD names space in 2001-2002¹ and 2003² for gTLDs and in 2009 for [IDN ccTLDs](#). The latest and most significant expansion started in 2012, and has seen more than 1000 New gTLDs added to the DNS.

This latest expansion came to be known as the [New gTLD Program](#). In fact it is the product of a multi-year process of policy development, policy implementation and community discussions, in which the GAC continuously participated, with notable contributions such as:

- [The GAC Principles regarding New gTLDs](#) (27 March 2007)
- The [GAC Early Warnings](#) (20 Nov. 2012) and [Safeguard Advice](#) (11 April 2003)
- Continuous [GAC Input](#) and GAC Advice throughout the development, implementation and roll out of the New gTLD Program (2007-2016)

Since 2015, in line with prior commitments by ICANN in the [Affirmation of Commitments](#) (now replaced by [ICANN's New Bylaws](#) stemming from the [IANA Stewardship Transition](#)) and in response to [GAC Advice](#), several ICANN processes have been initiated to review the outcome of the New gTLD Program for possible adjustments of policy.

Substantial analysis work was conducted in this context, including:

- Issue scoping discussions in a [GNSO non-PDP Discussion Group](#) (24 June 2015)
- Reports by the ICANN Organisation: [New gTLD Program Implementation Review](#) (29 Jan. 2016), [Rights Protection Mechanisms Review](#) (11 Sep. 2015), [Issue Report for potential New Policy Development](#) (4 Sep. 2015)
- Studies by independent Third-Parties on the [Trademark Clearing House](#) (23 Feb. 2017), [Root Stability](#) (8 Mar. 2017) and [Safeguards against DNS Abuse](#) (9 Aug. 2017)

Several processes³ that have been supporting deliberations on these findings and wider policy issues related to further expansion of gTLDs have been of interest to the GAC, in particular:

- The [Consumer Trust, Consumer Choice and Competition Review](#) whose [Final Recommendations](#) (8 September 2018) are in the process of being implemented, amid intense debates, per the ICANN Board's [decision](#) (1 March 2018)
- The GNSO's [Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs PDP](#) tasked to assess the effectiveness of instruments such as the UDRP, URS and TMCH and suggest new policy recommendations in these areas
- The GNSO's [New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP](#) (Sub Pro PDP), and within it, the specific [Work Track 5 on Geographic Names at the Top Level](#)

¹ .biz, .info, .name, .pro, .aero, .coop and .museum

² .asia, .cat, .jobs, .mobi, .tel, .travel

³ See timeline at <https://newatlds.icann.org/en/reviews> for an overview of relevant processes and some of their interactions

Since 2016, the New gTLD Sub. Pro. PDP Working Group has been deliberating and soliciting Community input on possible new policy recommendations on several occasions and in numerous areas.

Issues

By current estimates [presented](#) to the GAC in Kobe⁴, final recommendations are expected to be finalized by December 2019 and submitted to the GNSO Council by the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG.

Once this step is reached, the PDP Process will continue with its regular steps as per the PDP Process:

- i. GNSO Council consideration and adoption of the PDP recommendations in the Final Report;
- ii. GNSO Council report to the ICANN Board & Public Comment Proceeding;
- iii. ICANN Board consideration and adoption of the PDP recommendations as adopted by GNSO Council
- iv. ICANN org (as directed by the Board) to begin implementation of the PDP recommendations (which will likely include a revised Applicant Guidebook).

Once these steps are completed, ICANN org should be ready to accept new applications as of 2022, noting the timeline is subject to change throughout the various upcoming steps.

In the meantime, the many interconnected processes involved in shaping policy for future rounds of New gTLDs, and the wide-ranging nature of policy aspects being discussed provides the GAC with an opportunity to ensure a *“comprehensive and measured approach to further releases of new gTLDs”*.

In fact, the GAC has [advised](#) that it should be done in a *“logical, sequential and coordinated way”* that takes into account the results of *“all relevant reviews”*, requirements of *“interoperability, security, stability and resiliency”*, *“independent analysis of costs and benefits”*, and while proposing *“an agreed policy and administrative framework that is supported by all stakeholders”* ([GAC Helsinki Communiqué](#), 30 June 2016, reiterated as part of the [ICANN64 GAC Communiqué](#)).

⁴ Presentation by Jeff Neuman, co-chair of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG (10 March 2019)

GAC Leadership Proposal for GAC Consideration

1. **Launch of GAC Focal Group:** In Kobe the GAC agreed to initiate a focal group geared towards facilitating internal coordination efforts within the GAC, build capacity, expertise, provide regular updates to the GAC and flag issues of interest in order to ensure timely input into the final deliberations of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG. At this stage, the GAC Focal Group on new gTLD Subsequent Procedures is not intended to speak on behalf of the GAC; the group will submit input to the GAC for consideration and discussion. This is a flexible pilot initiative that can be enhanced and changed at anytime if the GAC decides to and its work will be launched at ICANN65
2. **Consideration of ICANN Reviews & Assessments:** Regarding timing and process for initiating a new round of New gTLD applications, the GAC may want to continue to consider the following reviews and assessments:
 - a. Whether [impact assessment](#) of the new gTLD Program is adequate and is taken into account in the policy development.
 - b. Whether [CCT Review recommendations](#) identified as prerequisites to future rounds have been considered in a satisfactory manner in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedure PDP WG and per implementation discussions following the ICANN Board's [decision](#) (1 March 2018).

In preparation for the GAC/ICANN Board meeting during ICANN64 in Kobe, the GAC Leadership requested whether the ICANN Board could *“share its current consideration or perspective on the extent to which the various criteria established in the Helsinki GAC Advice (accepted by the Board) will be addressed prior to initiation of any new rounds of applications?”*.

Some elements of response may be found in a recent ICANN Board Chairman [blog](#) (20 February 2019) as well as in the [ICANN Board's response to the ICANN64 Kobe Communique](#).

3. **Review the Preliminary GAC Scorecard (in Annex) to Prioritize & Guide the Work of the Focal Group:** The preliminary GAC scorecard was created as a follow-up action item from Kobe, to help prioritize and guide the work of the GAC Focal Group. It is an evergreen DRAFT document that still needs to be reviewed by the GAC. It includes a section that attempts to cross-check previous GAC input vis-a-vis the current discussions of the PDP Working Group to get a general sense of how aligned they are with GAC views. The Preliminary GAC scorecard attempts to **highlight previous GAC contributions and policy concerns** that the GAC should engage further in ongoing deliberations of the Sub Pro PDP WG, in particular in relation to specific issues, including:
 - a. How to achieve flexibility for **responding to public policy issues emerging during applications** evaluation while maintaining a level of predictability for applicants;
 - b. Whether improvements can be made around **GAC Early Warnings**, as suggested by the GAC, without affecting its ability to address emerging public policy concerns in future rounds;

- c. How **Public Interest Commitments** can be made more consistent with the GAC's original intent, in line with [CCT Review recommendations](#) which called for several improvements as prerequisites to future rounds (Recommendation 25);
- d. To what extent options being considered for **Closed Generic TLDs** would ensure that they serve a public interest goal (consistent with previous GAC Advice) and possible what criteria the GAC could propose for evaluating this objective;
- e. How the [CCT Review recommendations](#) related to **GAC Safeguards** (regulated sectors, registration restrictions, DNS Abuse) will be considered for future rounds;
- f. What **new security-related requirements** should be introduced for applicants as well as for service providers for which an accreditation program is contemplated;
- g. Whether procedures and objectives of **Community Based Applications** have been thoroughly reviewed (identified as prerequisite to new rounds by the CCT Review) and appropriate conclusions drawn for future rounds;
- h. How to improve the **Applicant Support Program** to benefit Underserved Regions and meet the needs of prospective applicants in these regions; and
- i. What specific process rules and application criteria should be considered for each of the **Categories of TLDs** likely to be recognized⁵ in future rounds.

⁵ According to the [report of Public Comments](#) on the Sub Pro PDP WG's Initial Report, there is currently "board support to recognize the categories from the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, both explicitly and implicitly utilized, on a going forward basis. These categories include standard, community-based TLDs, TLDs with a governmental entity as the registry operator, geographic TLDs, and Specification 13 Brand TLDs"

Relevant Developments

Timing of the Next Round(s) of Application for New gTLDs (Community Discussion)

During the two Public Forums of the ICANN63 meeting in Barcelona ([22 October](#) and [25 October 2018](#)), members of the ICANN Board responded to emerging calls from parts of the Community for accepting applications for new gTLD as soon as possible.

Interest groups, service providers and advisors to prospective applicants argued that:

- The 2012 round of new gTLDs was generally quite successful, consistent with recent industry showcases⁶, with many TLD providing “trusted and authenticated spaces” (in particular Brand TLDs⁷)
- There is significant interest among prospective brand and geographic applicants, whose applications could be accepted first, as part of “smaller distinct application rounds”, before considering generic and community TLDs.
- It has already been 6 years since the closure of the previous round of applications, despite ICANN’s past commitment to launching subsequent rounds within 1 year⁸

In response, the ICANN Board Chairman and other ICANN Board members indicated:

- The Board would be ready to “*react and respond very quickly*” when the “*GNSO completes its PDP*” while restating that the ICANN Board “*is not a top-down decision-maker*”
- The Board is involved in preparation work, including with the ICANN Org, regarding “*software and investments*” and more generally “*trying to get as much of the groundwork prepared as possible*”
- Thus far, the GNSO WG has not recommended a fast-track application round.

In a [blog](#) (20 February 2019), the ICANN Board Chairman recalled that the Board “*has made it clear that no new date for a next round of new gTLDs will be set until the community has completed the various reviews related to the previous round*”. He further indicated that “*The reviews are expected to come to an end within the next 12 months*”.

⁶ See the ICANN61 Cross Community Session [A Walk in the Shoes of a New gTLD Registry Operator](#) (12 March 2018), ICANN63 High Interest Topic Session on [Innovation in Top-Level Domains](#) (25 October 2018) and ICANN63 [GeoTLDs CITIES Conference](#) (24 October 2018)

⁷ See in particular the [Brand Registry Group's letter to the ICANN Board on 15 May 2018](#)

⁸ In fact, on 7 February 2012 the ICANN Board [resolved](#) that “ICANN is committed to opening a second application window for the New gTLD Program as expeditiously as possible”.

Status of Policy Development in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG

The GNSO's New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP was [initiated](#) on 17 December 2015 to determine “whether changes or adjustments to the existing policy recommendations [...] are needed” in relation to original policies that the Working Group [charter](#) recognizes as “designed to produce a systemized and ongoing mechanisms for applicants to propose new top-level domains”.

Deliberations of the Working Group so far have produced;

- a [first round of community consultations](#) on overarching issues (Summer 2016)
- a [second round of community consultations](#) on a wide range of more specific topics (March-May 2017). It received 25 [submissions](#).
- an [Initial Report](#) (3 July 2018) documenting the Working Group's deliberations, preliminary recommendations, potential options, as well as specific questions to the ICANN Community. It received 72 [submissions](#) in a period of 3 months.
- a [Supplemental Initial Report](#) (30 October 2018) addressed a more limited set of additional issues including Auctions, Application Comments, Changes to Applications and proposal to improve Registrar support of New gTLDs. It received 14 [submissions](#).
- a [Supplemental Initial Report of its Work Track 5](#) (5 December 2018) dedicated to address the use of Geographic Names at the Top Level⁹.

After the publication of its Initial Report, the Working Group [restructured its work](#), moving from its original 4 Work Tracks (1 to 4), to 3 Sub Groups (A to C), in order to triage the public comments it received for eventual deliberation in Full working Group setting. In the meantime, due to its specific cross-community structure and purpose, the Work Track 5 was retained to continue deliberation on the specific issue of Geographic Names as TLDs.

Currently the Working Group expects to deliver a Final Report during the second semester of 2019 (per latest [work plan](#)).

The coordination between the respective outputs of this PDP, that of the ICANN Board [consideration](#) of the CCT Review Recommendations, as well as the product of the other related processes (such as the GNSO's [Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs PDP](#)), remains to be clarified.

It is also unclear at this stage how the Working Group will address policy areas for which consensus cannot be reached, in particular when defaulting to existing policy from the 2012 application round is not agreeable either.

⁹ Policy development in the area of geographic names is handled separately in the GAC, who formed a internal Working Group for this purpose. Please refer to appropriate resources on the GAC Website for the GAC's Geographic Names Working Group and its [activities related to Work Track 5 of the GNSO Subsequent Procedures PDP](#).

GAC Participation in Ongoing Policy Development

Currently, [membership](#) of the GNSO Sub. Pro. PDP WG includes 8 GAC-affiliated participants registered as members and 5 as observers, together representing 13 GAC Members¹⁰. In contrast, the membership of Work Track 5 (tasked with the specific consideration of geographic names), includes 56 GAC-affiliated participants (including members and observers).

Current Positions

Please refer to the summary table in Annex: Preliminary GAC Scorecard of the Status of Substantive Areas of Interest to the GAC for a detailed overview of GAC input provided on matters pertaining to possible subsequent rounds of new gTLDs to date, specifically through the following submissions:

- [GAC Response](#) to Sub. Pro. PDP Community Consultation 1 (29 July 2016)
- [GAC Comment](#) on the CCT Review Team Draft Report (19 May 2017)
- [GAC Response](#) to Sub. Pro. PDP Community Consultation 2 (22 May 2017)
- [GAC Comment](#) on the Initial Report of the Sub. Pro. PDP (8 October 2018)
- [GAC Comment](#) on CCT Review Team Final Report (11 December 2018)
- [GAC Comment](#) on the Supplemental Initial Report of the GNSO Sub. Pro. PDP (19 December 2018)

The Preliminary GAC Scorecard (in Annex) also incorporates information on the status of deliberations on these matters. It also highlights areas for potential further GAC engagement.

For additional substantive and historical perspective, GAC Members may wish to review:

- [Contributions and correspondence](#) the GAC provided to the ICANN Board, ICANN Organization and Community in the course of the New gTLD Program (2007-2015)
- GAC Advice provided to the ICANN Board in relation to New gTLD Policy and Future Rounds of New gTLDs:
 - [GAC Principles Regarding New gTLDs](#) (28 March 2007)
 - GAC [Nairobi Communiqué](#) on New gTLDs (10 March 2010)
 - GAC [Toronto Communiqué](#) on Early Warnings and Applicant Commitment (17 October 2012)
 - GAC [Beijing Communiqué](#) (11 April 2013)
 - GAC [Los Angeles Communiqué](#) Advice on [Reviews of First Round of New gTLDs and Preparation for Subsequent Rounds](#) (15 October 2014)
 - GAC [Singapore Communiqué](#) Advice on [Safeguards Advice Applicable to all new gTLDs and Category 1 and Category 2 strings](#) (11 February 2015)
 - GAC [Buenos Aires Communiqué](#) Advice on [gTLD Safeguards](#) (24 June 2015)

¹⁰ Argentina, Canada, Cambodia, Dominican Republic, India, Pakistan, Switzerland, and United States

- GAC [Dublin Communiqué](#) Advice on [Future gTLD Rounds](#) (21 October 2015)
- GAC [Marrakech Communiqué](#) Advice on [Future gTLDs Rounds Public Policy Issues](#) (9 March 2016)
- GAC [Helsinki Communiqué](#) Advice on [Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures](#) (30 June 2016)
- GAC [Hyderabad Communiqué](#) Advice reiterating Helsinki Advice (8 November 2016)
- GAC [Kobe Communiqué](#) Follow-up on Previous Advice in the GAC Helsinki Communiqué (14 March 2019)

Key Reference Documents

- Preliminary GAC Scorecard: Status of Substantive Areas of Interest to the GAC for Subsequent New gTLD Rounds (23 May 2019) in Annex to this briefing.
- GAC Scorecard of Board Action on CCT Review Final Recommendations (6 June 2019) annexed to the Briefing on the CCT Review for [Session 11.1 on ICANN Reviews Update](#)
- ICANN Board [resolution](#) and [scorecard](#) of Board Action on the CCT Review Final Recommendations (1 March 2019)
- [CCT Review Final Recommendations](#) (8 September 2018)
- GAC [Helsinki Communiqué](#) Advice on [Future gTLDs Policies and Procedures](#) (30 June 2016)

Further Information

[ICANN65 GAC Session 11.1 on ICANN Reviews Update](#) incl. CCT Review Recommendations

ICANN Organization Resources:

<https://newgtlds.icann.org/>

<https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/reviews>

Resources for Relevant Processes:

[New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP May 2019 Newsletter](#)

<https://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/active/new-gtld-subsequent-procedures>

<https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/specific-reviews/cct>

Document Administration

Meeting	ICANN65 Marrakech, 24-27 June 2019
Title	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process
Distribution	GAC Members and Public (after meeting)
Distribution Date	Version 1: 6 June 2019

New gTLDs Policy - Subsequent Rounds

Annex: Preliminary GAC Scorecard: Status of Substantive Areas of Interest to the GAC

(as of 23 May 2019)

Contents

Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs: Reviews, Policy Development and Prerequisites	3
Policy Development Process	3
Future Releases of New gTLDs (Timing and Prerequisites)	4
New gTLD Applications Process	5
Clarity and Predictability of Application Process	5
Application Procedures	6
Freedom of Expression	7
TLD Categories (or Types)	8
Community Based Applications	9
Community Engagement	10
Applicant Support and Participation of Underserved Regions	11
New gTLD Applications Requirements	12
Applicant Evaluation and Accreditation Programs	12
Closed Generic TLDs	12
Reserved Names	13
New gTLD Applications Requirements - Safeguards and Public Interest Commitments	14
Safeguards (Highly regulated sectors, Registration Restrictions, DNS Abuse)	14
Public Interest Commitments (PICs)	16
Global Public Interest	17
New gTLD Applications Evaluation, Objections and String Contention	18
GAC Early Warnings	18
String Similarity	18
Auctions Procedures	19

Key to color-coding:

General Alignment / Low Priority

Less Alignment / Medium Priority

Possibility of No Alignment / High Priority

Color-coding of General Status/Alignment for Each Policy Area of previous GAC input vis-à-vis the PDP Working Group Deliberations to Prioritize GAC Work:

<p>Status Still To be determined Lack of information on status of PDP WG deliberations prevent accurate evaluation at this stage.</p>	<p>General Alignment / Low Priority GAC positions are generally aligned or are adequate enough to be incorporated by the PDP at this stage. Proactive participation and input may still be appropriate to ensure ultimate alignment of GNSO policy recommendations with GAC objectives</p>	<p>Less Alignment / Medium Priority GAC members may need to monitor deliberations and plan to provide further input to PDP WG as there is a possibility that the group may not address some GAC concerns or may diverge on some policy objectives</p>	<p>Possibility of No Alignment / High Priority GAC action is needed on this item. There is a possibility that the group may not address some GAC input. Action to either engage with the Sub Pro PDP WG (to clarify GAC positions, collaborate, review implementation, etc.) or revise GAC positions (to reflect the latest developments and proposals being considered in the PDP)</p>
--	---	--	--

1. Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs: Reviews, Policy Development and Prerequisites

Policy Area	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Policy Development Process	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC1 (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GAC Notes range of ongoing interconnected reviews and policy development processes relevant to new gTLDs ○ Take a comprehensive and measured approach to new gTLD policy in a sequential and coordinated way rather than through too many parallel and overlapping efforts ○ Cross-community working environment essential to the development of workable policies that maximise benefits to all relevant stakeholders ○ GNSO process to be complemented by the input from other SOs/ACs, and ICANN Board when not appropriately reflected in the outcome ○ Experience suggests conclusion of a PDP on such a wide-ranging set of issues unlikely to be end-point agreed by all stakeholders. GAC will make every effort to participate in agreed post-PDP policy processes. ○ Consider metrics to support both policy development and ongoing implementation as a specific stream of work <p>Comment on CCT Review Team Final Report (11 December 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Increased data collection on consumer trust, DNS abuse, domain wholesale and retail pricing, reseller information, WHOIS accuracy [...] will allow for more informed decision and policy [...] particularly with regard to future standard registry and registrar contract provisions and any subsequent rounds of gTLDs (Final Rec. 1, 8, 11, 13, 17, 18) 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● According to the GNSO Review of the GAC Kobe Communiqué (18 April 2019), all CCT Review recommendations directed at the PDP either by the Review Team (in the course of its work) or by the ICANN Board resolution (1 March 2019) are being considered in the course of the PDP WG's deliberations ● The PDP WG's working document on the matter indicates that most of these have not been addressed specifically or addressed only partially by the PDP, and are still being considered as part of deliberations on public comment received ● Of the CCT Review recommendations identified in previous GAC Input as allowing for more informed policy making (Rec. 1, 8, 11, 13, 17, 18) only recommendation 17 (collection and publication of the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations) is part of recommendations under consideration <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Update, clarify or set specific expectations in terms of policy outcomes stemming from relevant interconnected reviews and PDPs ● Seek clarifications on amount of data and metrics leveraged in by Sub Pro PDP WG deliberations. ● Follow GAC deliberations on the consideration of the CCT Review Recommendations which are not addressed in the Sub Pro PDP WG

Policy Area	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Future Releases of New gTLDs (Timing and Prerequisites)	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC.1 (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reiterated GAC Helsinki Communiqué Advice on this matter ○ Lack of clarity on realization of the expected benefits of new gTLDs (per pre-2012 economic analysis) ○ Development and collection of metrics far from complete ○ ICANN, registries and registrars should commit to gathering appropriate data on security and consumer safety issues in a transparent manner ○ Preventing or restricting further release of new gTLDs could be seen as a windfall gain for existing gTLD owners. However, competition is only one factor in terms of assessment of costs and benefits. <p>Comment on CCT Review Team Draft Report (19 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CCT-RT's contribution is critical in evaluating the overall impact of the new gTLD Program and identifying corrective measures and enhancements <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reiterates GAC Helsinki & Hyderabad Communiqué and previous input that costs and benefits of new gTLDs should be reviewed before any further rounds, noting it does not seem addressed directly by PDP ○ Further expansion should take into account the CCT Review recommendations identified as prerequisites <p>Comment on CCT Review Team Final Report (11 December 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the GAC endorses recommendations in the final report that encourage the collection of data to better inform policy making before increasing the number of new gTLDs (Need for data) 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Sub Pro PDP WG has not conducted cost/benefit analysis of further releases of new gTLDs. This is based on the fact that <i>"It is the policy of ICANN that there be subsequent application rounds, and that a systemized manner of applying for gTLDs be developed in the long term"</i> (New gTLD Applicant Guidebook, section 1.1.6). The PDP WG Co-Chair (J. Neuman) signaled during an ICANN64 GAC plenary session that Policy recommendation on this matter may be at odds with GAC Advice. ● Of the CCT Review recommendations which have been identified by the PDP WG as directed to it and prerequisites to New Rounds of New gTLDs, most have not yet been addressed, or only partially, in PDP deliberations (see PDP WG schedule of deliberations). ● In terms of data collection, the Sub Pro PDP WG deliberations point to the need for assessing gaps in the Global Consumer Survey (29 May 2015) and Assessment of Competitive Effects (11 Oct. 2016) that were conducted in connection with the CCT Review. ● In its response (15 May 2019) to the GAC Kobe Communiqué Follow-up (14 March 2019) on the Helsinki Advice (30 June 2016), the ICANN Board responded: <i>"As noted in the Helsinki Scorecard, the Board accepted the advice and monitored the work of the community [...]. All of the Bylaws- and Board-committed reviews related to the 2012 round of new gTLDs have been completed. [...] The Board will consider the policy recommendations when the community completes its work [...]"</i>. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Determine whether the current status of work in the Sub Pro PDP is consistent with or requires revisiting the GAC's expectations, in particular as formulated in the GAC Helsinki Communiqué Advice that <i>"An objective and independent analysis of costs and benefits should be conducted"</i> or whether such Advice needs to be revisited. ● Evaluate data and conclusions of the Global Consumer Survey and Assessment of Competitive Effects to assess their relevance and consideration in policy outcomes ● Seek clarification as to how expected prerequisites are being incorporated into PDP policy recommendations, and whether some of these may require follow-up at later stages of the process.

2. New gTLD Applications Process

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
<p>Clarity and Predictability of Application Process</p>	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC1 (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ “Continuous delegation” could provide long-term certainty, reduce opportunities for gaming the system and enable more efficient allocation of resources by ICANN, the community and applicants. ○ Need for process flexibility to respond to emerging issues ○ Need mechanism to alert, allow application by and giving a say to parties interested in name applied for ○ GAC Appreciates importance of predictability at the pre-application, application and ongoing post-application stages, However, this should not be the prime or only consideration ○ The GAC needs a degree of flexibility to respond to emerging issues at the global level, as dealt with in ICANN processes, since national laws may not be sufficient to address them. The need for such flexibility continues after the conclusion of a GNSO PDP <p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GAC supports any reasonable measures that streamline application procedures (thereby reducing compliance costs) but that also enable due consideration of public policy issues raised by GAC ○ Reiterates response to Sub Pro PDP CC1 regarding flexibility to respond to emerging issues, including after conclusion of PDP <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reiterates response to Sub Pro PDP CC1 on need for flexibility to respond to emerging issues 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Given the Sub Pro PDP WG preliminary recommendation (2.2.2.c.1) for subjecting the future New gTLD Program, once launched, to a new Predictability Framework, to address new issues that may arise, and in light of comments received on this matter, there seems to be an understanding in the WG that such a Framework will be part of Final policy recommendations. ● Further details of this Predictability Framework (p.16) are being developed through the work of a new dedicated Sub Team of the PDP WG. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In the short term, consider taking part actively in the definition of the Predictability Framework to ensure that it provides for and does not restrict the ability of the GAC to respond to emerging issues of global public policy importance ● In the longer term, consider how the GAC would approach and prepare for both the policy implementation phase (once policy development is complete and before the new round of application is launched) and for the operational phase of a next round (administration of the Program) with the envisioned Predictability Framework.

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Application Procedures	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Critical assessment should be made on whether Applicant Guidebook or single place on ICANN's website should be preferred in future ○ If Applicant Guidebook is retained, partitioning in different audience-driven sections or by type of application has merit <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Supplemental Initial Report (19 Dec. 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Concur that better guidance provided by ICANN would be helpful regarding possible changes in applications once submitted and their consequences in terms of publication and evaluation.. ○ Care is required so as not to allow changes that could undermine the role of Application comments ○ A change to the likely operator of the new gTLD would constitute a material change and require notification (AGB 1.2.7) and possibly re-evaluation as a well as public comments for competition and other concerns. 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Applicant Guidebook is expected to be retained ● The PDP WG Recommendation for ICANN org to provide better guidance to Applicant is not expected to evolve at this point. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Consider providing specific guidance to ICANN once policy development is complete and ICANN begin implementation work, including editing the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook ● Pursue the definition of categories (see other section in this scorecard)

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Freedom of Expression	<p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No clear evidence of infringement of an applicant's freedom of expression rights in the recent gTLD round ○ Freedom of expression, especially from commercial players, is important but not absolute. ○ As in any fundamental rights analysis all affected rights have to be considered, including, inter alia, intellectual property rights, applicable national laws on protection of certain terms etc. ○ Procedures have to be inclusive of all parties whose interests and rights are affected by a specific string application, and all need to be given a fair say in the process 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Deliberations on public comments received on this topic are still pending. They are currently planned in early June (per PDP WG schedule of deliberations, subject to change) ● Public comments indicate there appears to be support for the respect of freedom of expression in balance with that of other rights. If there is additional guidance to be developed for evaluators in this area, it is expected to be developed prior to launch. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Monitor WG deliberations and potential policy recommendation outcomes

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
TLD Categories (or Types)	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC1 (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterates GAC Nairobi Communiqué Advice calling for further exploration of categories Limited geographic and category diversity of 2012 application should inform discussions GAC 2007 Principles and Durban Communiqué suggest certain types of TLDs which may deserve a differential treatment, including sensitive strings and highly regulated sectors Differential treatment may require different tracks for application and different procedures, rules and criteria. To be confirmed with data gathering. <p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterates GAC Nairobi Communiqué Advice in relation to possible variable fee structure per type of application <p>Comment on the Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in New gTLDs (19 September 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is still significant scope for the development and enhancement of current mitigation measures and safeguards, taking into account the specific risk levels associated with different categories of New gTLD (Standard or generic gTLD, Community gTLD, Geographic gTLD and Brand gTLD) Risk levels also varies depending on the strictness of the registration policy (bad actors prefer to register domains in standard new gTLDs, which are generally open for public registration, rather than in community new gTLDs, where registries may impose restrictions on who can register domain names) <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reiterates GAC Nairobi Communiqué Advice calling for further exploration of categories and addressing fees 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deliberations based on public comments received are still pending. It is unclear whether the fee component of GAC Advice is addressed in current deliberations, which are scheduled to resume in early June (per PDP WG schedule of deliberations, subject to change) The summary of Public Comments indicates support from most commenters for maintaining the existing de facto categories of the 2012 round: standard; community-based; governmental entity operated; geographic; and brand TLD; and not creating additional categories A number of new ideas remain to be discussed. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GAC may wish to assess whether new categories should be considered, and if so, highlight specifically what those categories are and why they should be given a different treatment. Allowing for a variable fee structure may need to be pursued specifically

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Community Based Applications	<p>Comment on CCT Review Team Draft Report (19 May 2017):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Conduct a thorough review of procedures and objectives for Community-based applications (Draft Rec. 48, Final Rec. 34) <p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Where a community which is impacted by a new gTLD application has expressed a collective and clear opinion, that opinion should be duly taken into account as part of the application. (Beijing Communiqué) o Take better account of community views, regardless of whether those communities have utilised the ICANN formal community process or not (Durban Communiqué 2013) o The GAC proposes the establishment of an appeal mechanism for community applications o The GAC has recently referred to the PDP Working Group for consideration the recommendations of a report on community applications commissioned by the Council of Europe. <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Supports proposal in the Initial Report o The study of this matter by the Council of Europe should be considered <p>Comment on CCT Review Team Final Report (11 December 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o a thorough review of procedures and objectives related Community-Based Applications be conducted prior to the launch of any future round of New gTLD Application (Final Rec. 34) 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deliberations of Sub Pro PDP WG on public comments received, (which include CCT Review Final Rec. 34) are still pending. It should be completed by August 2019 (per PDP WG schedule, subject to change) • The PDP WG Co-Chair (J. Neuman) indicated during an ICANN64 GAC plenary session that there are divergent views on these matters and commended the findings of the Council of Europe study. • ICANN Board and Sub Pro PDP consideration of CCT Review Final Recommendation 34 for a thorough review of this mechanism, identified as a prerequisite to future rounds (and directed at the Sub Pro PDP WG) are still pending. • Public Comments indicate there appears to be support to try and make Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) more transparent and predictable, including developing and sharing guidance earlier in the process. • Open questions remain on the definition of “community” and whether any additional considerations for communities should be introduced beyond CPE. • Regarding the CPE, there remains a lack of clarity on which of the criteria are most problematic. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor outcomes on the consideration of CCT Review Recommendation 34, both by ICANN Board and the Sub Pro PDP WG • Consider providing specific input on expectations in connection with the “thorough review” the GAC has called for, as well as on specific problems to be addressed such as the definition of Communities (as agreed during the ICANN64 GAC plenary session). The GAC may wish to leverage prior documentation of the issues by the UK GAC Representative (16 October 2017) and the report by the Council of Europe (May 2016)

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Community Engagement	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC1 (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Ensure/empower participation from all relevant stakeholders from affected communities (as applicants or to have a fair say when legitimate interests affected by TLD applications) 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliberations of Sub Pro PDP WG based on public comments received in relation to the New gTLD Communications Strategy (2.4.2) are still pending. • For context, the questions included in the first Community Consultation (CC1) focused mostly on the resolution of issues that might arise after the program launch. The preliminary outcome at that time was envisioned to be a “change control framework”, which later became the ‘Predictability Framework’ in the Initial Report (p.16), that is still being developed through the work of a dedicated Sub Team of the PDP WG (see this other section of this scorecard) <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider monitoring and contributing specific input on the New gTLD Communication Strategy as well as other areas of WG deliberations such Comments and Objections on Applications.

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Applicant Support and Participation of Underserved Regions	<p>Comment on CCT Review Team Draft Report (19 May 2017):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Establish clear measurable goals and indicators for applications from the Global South, linked to ICANN strategic objectives. Increase in number of delegated strings from underserved regions should be critical (Draft Rec. 43, Final Rec. 29) o Expand and update work on outreach to Global South, starting with response to challenges identified to date (Draft Rec. 44, Final Rec. 30) o ICANN to coordinate pro bono assistance (Draft Rec. 45, Final Rec. 30) o Revisit Application Support Program: reduction of fees, additional support, access to simple information in relevant language (Draft Rec. 46, Final Rec. 32) o Not only should the application fee be reduced for all applicants but members from underserved regions should be offered additional support due to external issues [...] which should not prevent entities in those regions from applying <p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Please see submission on CCT-RT Draft Report <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o PDP Should consider the CCT Review recommendations in this area <p>Comment on CCT Review Team Final Report (11 December 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reiterated comments on Draft Report o Establishment of “clear, measurable goals for the Global South, including whether or when applications and even number of delegated strings should be objectives” of any New gTLD Application Round (Final Rec. 29) 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliberations on public comments received (not a ‘high volume of input’) are still pending. It is expected to discuss this in mid-June (per current WG Schedule). • ICANN Board, ICANN org and Sub Pro PDP consideration of the CCT Review Final Rec. 29, 30 and 32 - all identified as prerequisites to launching new rounds - is still pending. • Public Comments indicate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – There appear to support for targeting not just the Global South, but the so-called “middle applicant,” or regions that are further along in their development but where struggles to participate remain – There also appears to be support for a number of more operationally related elements, like improving outreach and awareness building, extending support beyond just financial contributions. • There are still open questions on what success looks like and the appropriate metrics to measure. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GAC Underserved Regions WG may wish to follow and contribute to deliberations in this area as to ensure outcomes compatible with GAC expectations and actual needs of prospective applicants in these regions.

3. New gTLD Applications Requirements

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Applicant Evaluation and Accreditation Programs	<p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant evaluation and Registry Service Provider pre-approval process should include consideration of potential security threats Such consideration should include using tools such as ICANN's DAAR to identify any potential security risks (and affiliated data) associated with an application 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As of 16 May 2019, the Sub Pro PDP WG has not addressed this area yet. It is expected to discuss this by end of May 2019 (per the current WG Schedule). Public Comments to date indicate there appears to be support for an optional RSP pre-approval mechanism, understood as following the same technical and operational requirements as the general application process. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GAC and PSWG particularly may wish to follow and contribute to deliberations of Sub Pro PDP WG in this area as to ensure outcomes compatible with GAC expectations and threat landscape, consistent with previous GAC Advice¹
Closed Generic TLDs	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on principles of promoting competition and consumer protection, exclusive registry access should serve public interest goal (per Beijing GAC Communiqué Cat. 2 Safeguards Advice) <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-affirms previous advice (Beijing Communiqué, Cat. 2 Safeguards): for strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further deliberations of the Sub Pro PDP WG, in the context of wide-ranging opinions on a topic recognized as one of the most controversial in the PDP WG are still pending. It is expected the WG would discuss this matter by end of May 2019 (per current WG Schedule) Public Comments to date indicate there appears to be a fair amount of support to allow closed generics in some capacity, perhaps requiring that the closed generic serve the public interest, require commitment to a code of conduct, and/or introduce an objection process. However, there are some strongly held views against closed generics altogether. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The GAC may consider clarifying criteria for what would constitute serving the public interest (per PDP WG Co-chair request during ICANN64 GAC plenary session) The GAC may also be interested to review and refine safeguards applicable to closed generic, and assess proposed mechanisms such as Application Criteria, Code of Conduct or a new Objection mechanism.

¹ In particular Annex 1 of [GAC Hyderabad Communiqué](#), and follow-up exchange with ICANN Board and ICANN Org. For more information: <https://gac.icann.org/activity/dns-abuse-mitigation> (section Ongoing Work > Effectiveness of DNS Abuse Safeguards in Registries and Registrars Contracts)

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Reserved Names	<p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Existing reservations of names at the top level substantially reflect the GAC Principles Regarding New gTLDs. o The GAC would expect that any changes should be consistent with these Principles o The GAC wishes to draw the attention of the PDP to its most recent advice on certain 2-character codes at the second level (GAC Panama Communiqué) 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further deliberations of Sub Pro PDP WG are still pending based on public comments received, amid intense debate around letter-digit and digit-letter two-character domains, including potential DNS Stability, Security and Resiliency concerns. The WG is expected to discuss this by mid July 2019 (per current WG Schedule). • Public Comments to date indicate there appears to be support to maintain the existing reservations at top-level in the AGB, but adding names for the Public Technical Identifiers and Special-Use names agreed upon through IETF RFC 6761. • The WG is contemplating allowing two character letter-number combinations, which would require the lifting of the ban on numerals, though is a fair amount of opposition. • Public Comments to date indicate there also appears to be support for the existing second-level reservations as well, but including the measures for Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels to Avoid Confusion with Corresponding Country Codes adopted by the ICANN Board on 8 Nov 2016

4. New gTLD Applications Requirements - Safeguards and Public Interest Commitments

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
<p>Safeguards (Highly regulated sectors, Registration Restrictions, DNS Abuse)</p>	<p>Comment on CCT Review Team Draft Report (19 May 2017): the GAC supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Incentives for registries to meet user expectations regarding content, registrants in TLD, safety of personal data (Draft Rec. 14, Final Rec. 12) ○ Further gathering of data related to WHOIS Accuracy and related complaints (Draft Rec. 17-18, Final Rec. 18) ○ Regular gathering, analysis by ICANN of data pertaining to abuse rates in new gTLDs (Draft Rec. 19, Final Rec. 16) ○ Review of Registry Security Framework (Draft Rec. 20, Final Rec. 19) ○ Assessing whether mechanisms to report and handle complaints have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse and improving awareness of Registries points of contact to report abuse (Draft Rec. 21-22, Final Rec. 20) ○ Collection of additional information in complaints to assess effectiveness of highly regulated strings Cat. 1 safeguards (Draft Rec. 23-24, Final Rec. 21) ○ More data and information required for an objective assessment of the effectiveness of safeguards for highly regulated strings (Draft Rec. 25-30, Final Rec. 23) ○ Survey registrant and ICANN compliance on enforcement of Safeguards related to New gTLDs with Inherent Governmental Functions and Cyberbullying (Draft. Rec 31-32, Final Rec. 24) ○ Additional collection of data to assess effects of restricted registration policies on TLD trustworthiness, DNS Abuse, competition, and costs of compliance(Draft Rec. 33-36, Final Rec. 13) <p>Comment on the Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in New gTLDs (19 September 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There is still significant scope for the development and enhancement of current mitigation measures and safeguards, taking into account the specific risk levels associated with different categories of New gTLD (Standard or generic gTLD, Community gTLD, Geographic gTLD and Brand gTLD) ○ Fisk levels also varies depending on the strictness of the registration policy (bad actors prefer to register domains in standard new gTLDs, which are generally open for public registration, rather than in 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Sub Pro PDP WG does not track these under a dedicated topic or area of work. This subject has been considered to some extent in the context of TLD Types/Categories or as part of its Global Public Interest discussions. ● There appears to be some support for the concept of a Verified TLD (TLDs implying trust and related to regulated or professional sectors that have implications for consumer safety and well-being) ● As indicated in the Policy Development Process section of this scorecard, the PDP WG considers that all CCT Review recommendations directed at the PDP are being considered in the course of the PDP WG's deliberations ● Per the PDP WG's working document, only 4 of the CCT Review recommendations identified as important by the GAC in the area of safeguards (see Left) are being considered, that is Rec. 12, 14, 16, 23. All of these are identified as requiring more consideration in PDP WG deliberations ● It should be noted that CCT Review Final Recommendations have been considered by the ICANN Board (1 March 2019). The Board's actions are currently subject to further community discussion, as tracked by the GAC in another dedicated scorecard. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <p>Given the importance of this policy area for the GAC, and given the reduced scope of consideration of CCT Review Recommendations in the PDP WG (compared to GAC expectations), the GAC May wish to::</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● proactively engage or contribute position papers for consideration in PDP WG deliberations related to TLD Types/Categories or Global Public Interest. These are currently planned for end of May/early June (per WG Schedule, subject to change) ● actively track developments in relation to the Board consideration of the CCT Review recommendations, and possibly engage via other channels in complement to the PDP WG where appropriate.

community new gTLDs, where registries may impose restrictions on who can register domain names)

[Comment](#) on [Sub Pro PDP Initial Report](#) (8 October 2018)

- o **Verified [TLD]** Consortium and the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy recommendations on applications for strings linked to highly regulated sectors should be supported.

[Comment](#) on [CCT Review Team Final Report](#) (11 December 2018)

- o Considering the conclusion that “The new gTLD safeguards alone do not prevent DNS Security abuse in the DNS”, consider more **proactive measures to identify and combat DNS abuse**, including incentives (contractually and/or financially) by ICANN to encourage contracted parties to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures (Final Rec. 14)
- o Incentivize registries to meet **expectations about who can register domains in sensitive or regulated industries** and gathering data about complaints and rates of abuse in these gTLDs that often convey an implied level of trust (Final Rec. 12, 23)
- o Endorses recommendation for an **audit of highly regulated gTLDs** to assess whether restrictions regarding possessing necessary credentials are being enforced (Final Rec. 23)
- o ICANN Contractual Compliance to publish **more details as to the nature of the complaints** they are receiving and what safeguards they are aligned with, to enhance future policy making and contractual safeguards (Final Rec. 20, 21)

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Public Interest Commitments (PICs)	<p>Comment on CCT Review Team Draft Report (19 May 2017): the GAC supports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Improvement of definition, accessibility and evaluation of applicant's Public Interest Commitments (Draft Rec. 37-39, Final Rec. 25) <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Actual adoption and implementation of the PICs differed in many respects from GAC advice (Toronto and Beijing Communiqués), most notably on the issue of safeguards applicable to highly regulated gTLDs (Cat. 1). o Before making any final recommendations, the PDP should consider the GAC's prior safeguard advice and any recommendations in the CCT final report on these issues should be fully considered in the next stage of the PDP's work o PICs should be effectively monitored by ICANN for compliance, with appropriate sanctions when breached 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As of 16 May 2019, the Sub Pro PDP WG has not addressed this area yet (see WG public comments analysis spreadsheet on Global Public Interest). It is expected to discuss this by June 2019 (per current WG Schedule, subject to change). • Sub Pro PDP WG consideration of CCT Review Final Recommendation 25, identified as prerequisite to subsequent rounds, is still pending. • Public Comments to date indicate there appears to be support to codify the concept of mandatory Public Interest Commitments (PICs) as policy. There also appears to be support for voluntary PICs, with the ability for applicants to agree to additional PICs in response to public comments, GAC Early Warnings, and GAC Advice. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GAC may wish to monitor closely and possibly engage in these deliberations on "Global Public Interest" matters as they have gathered significant interest and their outcomes are likely to affect the GAC's ability to handle public policy concerns in future rounds (see also discussion of predictability of application process above). • GAC and PSWG may want to start considering whether and to what extent, as suggested in the PDP WG Initial Report (section 2.3.2.c.1, p.54): "<i>mandatory PICs should be revisited to reflect the ongoing discussions between the GAC Public Safety Working Group and Registries as appropriate</i>", which would likely be policy implementation work.

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
Global Public Interest	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <p>Regarding mechanisms to be employed to serve the public interest, in addition to Public Interest Commitments, the GAC referred GAC Advice it believed were still current:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Beijing Communiqué on Cat. 1 Safeguards Advice (Closed Generics) ○ Los Angeles Communiqué Advice on PICDRP to ensure that non compliance with Public Interest Commitments is effectively and promptly addressed, and for Cat. 2 TLDs (restricted registration) to provide registrants an avenue to seek redress for discriminatory policies ○ Singapore Communiqué (2015) Advice to reconsider the PICDRP and develop a 'fast track' process for regulatory authorities, government agencies and law enforcement to work with ICANN contract compliance to effectively respond to issues involving serious risks of harm to the public ○ Singapore Communiqué (2015) Advice to recognise voluntary adoption of GAC advice on verification and validation of credentials as best practice. 	See discussion of Safeguards and Public Interest Commitments above.

5. New gTLD Applications Evaluation, Objections and String Contention

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Potential Next Steps for GAC Review/Consideration
GAC Early Warnings	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o GAC Early Warning provided earliest possible notice of potential public policy concern and served the interests of both applicants and the GAC o GAC Advised for commitments in response to Early Warning to be made contractually binding (Toronto) o The GAC is interested in participating in any discussions to improve the Early Warning arrangements so that the legitimate concerns of governments, applicants and the wider community are met. <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o GAC Early Warning and GAC Advice were useful instruments to identify applications that raise public policy concerns and should be an integral part of any future rounds. o GAC is Open to increasing transparency and fairness of these, including giving applicants an opportunity for direct dialogue with the GAC. o However, the GAC does not consider that the PDP should make recommendations on GAC activities which are carried out in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws and the GAC's internal procedures 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sub Pro PDP WG has not addressed this area yet beyond its consideration in the Initial Report (see section 2.3.2 p.53). It is expected to discuss public comments received on the Global Public Interest by early June (per current WG Schedule, subject to change) • Public Comments indicate there appears to be support to continue the practice of GAC Early Warnings (EW), but introducing a requirement that rationale/basis and specific action requested of applicant must be included. There should be an opportunity for dialogue to respond to GAC EW by the applicant either amending the application or including a Public Interest Commitment (PIC). <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GAC may wish to engage in these deliberations as there is significant interest in the role of the GAC and support to impose requirements on GAC actions in future rounds,
String Similarity	<p>Response to Sub Pro PDP CC2 (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reference to the GAC Hyderabad Communiqué Advice regarding the proposed guidelines on the second IDN ccTLD string similarity review process o Reference to GAC Prague Communiqué advice "to create a mechanism of appeal that will allow challenging the decisions on confusability" in relations to applied-for IDN ccTLDs <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Reaffirms previous advice (GAC Beijing and Singapore Communiqué) that singular and plural versions of the same string as a TLD could lead to consumer harm 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Sub Pro PDP WG has not addressed this area yet beyond its consideration in the Initial Report (see section 2.7.4, p. 127). It is expected to discuss public comments received in late July (per current WG Schedule) • Public Comments indicate there appears to be support to prohibit plurals and singulars of the same word within the same language/script (utilizing a dictionary), in order to reduce the risk of consumer confusion. These singular/plural combinations would be put in contention sets. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While convergence seems likely on the issue of singular and plural versions of the same string, the GAC may be interested in monitoring possible discussion of review and appeals mechanisms

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input to relevant processes and consultations (please refer to full text when in need of precise language)	Status & Possible Next Steps
Auctions Procedures	<p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Initial Report (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Auctions of last resort should not be used in contentions between commercial and non-commercial applications ○ Private auctions should be strongly disincentivised <p>Comment on Sub Pro PDP Supplemental Initial Report (19 Dec. 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reiterates comments made on the Initial Report 	<p>Status:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Sub Pro PDP WG has not addressed this area yet beyond its consideration in the Initial Report (see section 2.7.4, p. 127) and the Supplemental Initial Report. It is expected to discuss public comments received on the Initial Report and comments received on the Supplemental Report in late August (per current WG Schedule) ● Public Comments indicate there appears to be support to continue the practice of last resort auctions, but with mechanisms to reduce their necessity (e.g., allow joint ventures, string change in limited instances). ● For private resolutions, it is unclear which direction the WG may go. The WG has not agreed to a practical mechanism that would deter or prevent the activity and in fact some believe that private resolution is a valid way to resolve contention should be allowed. <p>Possible Next Steps for the GAC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Prepare to engage the WG to press on and bolster existing support by some members of the WG (section 2.1.d.2.1) for specific consideration of non-commercial applications in auctions, or alternatives thereof. ● Consider refining expectations and making proposals in terms of incentives for the avoidance of private auctions.