

---

# GAC Scorecard on New gTLD Subsequent Rounds: Status of Substantive Areas of Interest to the GAC

---

## Contents

<b>GAC Priority Topics Identified at ICANN66</b>	<b>3</b>
Applicant Support and Participation of Underserved Regions	3
Closed Generic TLDs	4
Public Interest Commitments (PICs)	5
Global Public Interest	6
GAC Early Warnings and GAC Advice	7
<b>Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs: Reviews, Policy Development and Prerequisites</b>	<b>8</b>
Policy Development Process	8
Future Releases of New gTLDs (Timing and Prerequisites)	9
<b>New gTLD Applications Process</b>	<b>10</b>
Clarity and Predictability of Application Process	10
Application Procedures	11
Freedom of Expression	12
TLD Categories (or Types)	13
Community Based Applications	14
Community Engagement	15
<b>New gTLD Applications Requirements</b>	<b>16</b>
Applicant Evaluation and Accreditation Programs	16
Reserved Names	17
<b>New gTLD Applications Requirements - Safeguards and Public Interest Commitments</b>	<b>18</b>
Safeguards (Highly regulated sectors, Registration Restrictions, DNS Abuse)	18
<b>New gTLD Applications Evaluation, Objections and String Contention</b>	<b>20</b>
String Similarity	20
Auctions Procedures	21

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><b>Status Still To be determined</b> Lack of information on status of PDP WG deliberations prevent accurate evaluation at this stage.</p>	<p><b>General Alignment / Low Priority</b> 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><b>Less Alignment / Medium Priority</b> 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><b>Possibility of No Alignment / High Priority</b> 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>
--	---	--	--

- [PDP Working Group working draft for draft final recommendations:](#)

## 1. GAC Priority Topics Identified at ICANN66

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<p><b>Applicant Support and Participation of Underserved Regions</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Draft Report</a> (19 May 2017):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish <b>clear measurable goals and indicators</b> 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)</li> <li><b>Expand and update work on outreach</b> to Global South, starting with response to challenges identified to date (Draft Rec. 44, Final Rec. 30)</li> <li>ICANN to <b>coordinate pro bono assistance</b> (Draft Rec. 45, Final Rec. 30)</li> <li><b>Revisit Application Support Program:</b> reduction of fees, additional support, access to simple information in relevant language (Draft Rec. 46, Final Rec. 32)</li> <li>Not only should the <b>application fee be reduced for all applicants</b> but members from <b>underserved regions should be offered additional support</b> due to external issues [...] which should not prevent entities in those regions from applying</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please see submission on CCT-RT Draft Report</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PDP Should consider the CCT Review recommendations in this area</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Final Report</a> (11 December 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reiterated comments on Draft Report</li> <li>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)</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Board Response/Action</a> to CCT Review Recommendations (1 March 2019)</p>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support   High Level Agreements &amp; Ongoing Discussion in PDP Last discussed 8 August 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Per 25 July call and <a href="#">high level agreements</a> reached: “Application submission communication period should begin at least 6 months prior to the window opening” .</li> <li>Applicant support and the “middle applicant” was discussed on August 8th, 2019 by PDP WG, and per <a href="#">high-level agreement</a> reached: not only target the Global South, but also consider the “middle applicant” which are struggling regions that are further along in their development compared to underserved or underdeveloped regions”.</li> <li><b>The Working Group is converging on a set of high-level agreements on this topic. Please note that work is still in progress and the recommendations may change. Consensus calls have not yet been held.</b></li> <li>The current high-level agreements from the PDP WG within the <a href="#">Application Processing Summary Document</a> include not only targeting the Global South but also: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>openness to applicants regardless of their location if they meet other program criteria;</li> <li>employing longer lead times to create awareness drawing on regional experts and leveraging tools and expertise to evaluate applicant business cases;</li> <li>including financial support beyond the application fee (such as including application writing fees, attorney fees, etc);</li> <li>considering the number of successful applicants to the program as a measure of success.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Two items were submitted for further discussion on the PDP mailing list: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether to allow an application that fails to meet the criteria for applicant support to switch their application to the regular application process.</li> <li>Seek additional input on mailing list regarding how to prioritize applicant support applications if there are more qualified applicants than resources available.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	<p><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p>	
	<p>The GAC may wish to follow and contribute upcoming deliberations towards the drafting of final recommendations in this area as to ensure outcomes compatible with GAC expectations and actual needs of prospective applicants in these regions.</p>	

	<p><a href="#">GAC Response</a> to <a href="#">ICANN Board Clarification Questions</a> on the <a href="#">GAC Montreal Communiqué</a>: GAC agree[s] that expanding and improving outreach should be an ongoing effort. [The GAC] would expect the Board to make a judgment, in good faith, as to whether it considers outreach has been expanded and improved enough to justify proceeding with the new round of gTLDs.</p>	
--	---	--

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<b>Closed Generic TLDs</b>	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Based on principles of promoting competition and consumer protection, <b>exclusive registry access should serve public interest goal</b> (per Beijing GAC Communiqué Cat. 2 Safeguards Advice)</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Re-affirms previous advice (Beijing Communiqué, Cat. 2 Safeguards): for strings representing generic terms, exclusive registry access should serve a public interest goal</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support   No High Level Agreement and Continued Divergence in PDP WG   Last discussed on 22 August 2019 PDP WG call</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● PDP WG Leadership invited the GAC to clarify criteria for what would constitute serving the public interest. Input would still be very timely.</li> <li>● <a href="#">Public Comments</a> to date indicated there appears to be a fair amount of support to allow closed generics in some capacity, but requiring that the closed generic serve the public interest, perhaps requiring a commitment to a code of conduct, and/or introducing an objection process. However, there are some strongly held views against closed generics altogether. The WG remains widely divergent on this topic.</li> <li>● Key challenges in this discussion include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ defining closed generics</li> <li>○ defining the public interest or public interest goals, and</li> <li>○ evaluating whether the public interest may be served or harmed by an application.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
		<b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The GAC may consider clarifying criteria for what would constitute serving the public interest (in response to PDP WG Co-chair request during ICANN64 <a href="#">GAC plenary session</a>)</li> <li>● The GAC may wish to appoint topic lead(s) to engage in discussion with PDP WG Members on a <a href="#">dedicated mailing list</a> created specifically to further discuss closed generics and identify any consensus if at all possible. The list has not seen much activity since August 2019 however,</li> <li>● The GAC may also be interested to review and refine safeguards applicable to closed generics, and assess proposed mechanisms in the PDP WG such as Application Criteria, Code of Conduct or a new Objection mechanism.</li> </ul>

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<b>Public Interest Commitments (PICs)</b>	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Draft Report</a> (19 May 2017): the GAC supports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improvement of <b>definition, accessibility and evaluation</b> of applicant's Public Interest Commitments (Draft Rec. 37-39, Final Rec. 25)</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Actual adoption and implementation of the PICs <b>differed in many respects from GAC advice</b> (Toronto and Beijing Communiqués), most notably on the issue of safeguards applicable to highly regulated gTLDs (Cat. 1).</li> <li>Before making any final recommendations, the PDP should consider the <b>GAC's prior safeguard advice</b> and any recommendations in the <b>CCT final report</b> on these issues should be fully considered in the next stage of the PDP's work</li> <li>PICs should be effectively <b>monitored by ICANN for compliance</b>, with appropriate sanctions when breached</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support   High Level Agreements &amp; Ongoing Discussion   Last discussed 11 July 2019</p> <p><b>The Working Group is converging on a set of high-level agreements on this topic. Please note that work is still in progress and the draft final recommendations may change. Consensus calls have not yet been held.</b> PDP WG high level agreements as per <a href="#">11 July PDP WG Meeting</a>:</p> <p>Mandatory PICs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Codify the current implementation of mandatory PICs as policy recommendations. No additional mandatory PICs are needed.</li> <li>Provide single-registrant TLDs with exemptions and/or waivers to mandatory PICs provisions of the Registry Agreement, Specification 11 3(a) and 11 3(b).</li> </ul> <p>Voluntary commitments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue with the concept of voluntary commitments and allow applicants to make such commitments in response to public comments, GAC Early Warnings, and/or GAC Advice.</li> <li>At the time a voluntary commitment is made, the applicant must set forth whether such commitment is limited in time, duration and/or scope such that the commitment can adequately be reviewed by ICANN, an existing objector (if applicable) and/or the GAC (if the voluntary PIC was in response to a GAC Early Warning or GAC Advice).</li> <li>Voluntary commitments should be reflected in the applicant's Registry Agreement; Voluntary commitments can only be changed after public comment.</li> </ul>
	<b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GAC may wish to monitor closely the upcoming draft final recommendations emerging from SubPro PDP 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.</li> <li>The GAC may wish to also monitor upcoming draft final recommendations on topics not yet addressed in high level agreements, of interest to the GAC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consideration of existing safeguards and related CCT recommendations</li> <li>Implementation of Cat. 1 safeguards vs. GAC Advice</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Effective ICANN compliance monitoring</li> <li>○ Accessibility of PICs</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● GAC and PSWG may want to start considering whether and to what extent, as suggested in the PDP WG <a href="#">Initial Report</a> (section 2.3.2.c.1, p.54): “mandatory PICs should be revisited to reflect the ongoing discussions between the GAC Public Safety Working Group and Registries as appropriate”, which would likely be policy implementation work.</li> </ul>
--	--	---

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
Global Public Interest	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017) Regarding mechanisms to be employed to serve the public interest, in addition to Public Interest Commitments, the GAC referred <b>GAC Advice</b> it believed were <b>still current</b>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Beijing Communiqué on Cat. 1 Safeguards Advice (<b>Closed Generics</b>)</li> <li>○ 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</li> <li>○ 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</li> <li>○ Singapore Communiqué (2015) Advice to recognise voluntary adoption of GAC advice on verification and validation of credentials as best practice.</li> </ul>	Confirmed w/ GNSO Support
		See discussion of <a href="#">Safeguards</a> and <a href="#">Public Interest Commitments</a> above.
		Possible Next Steps for the GAC
		See above.

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<b>GAC Early Warnings and GAC Advice</b>	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o GAC Early Warning provided <b>earliest possible notice of potential public policy concern</b> and served the interests of both applicants and the GAC</li> <li>o GAC Advised for <b>commitments</b> in response to Early Warning to be made <b>contractually binding</b> (Toronto)</li> <li>o The GAC is interested in participating in any <b>discussions to improve</b> the Early Warning arrangements so that the legitimate concerns of governments, applicants and the wider community are met.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o GAC Early Warning and GAC Advice were <b>useful instruments</b> to identify applications that raise public policy concerns and should be an integral part of any future rounds.</li> <li>o GAC is Open to <b>increasing transparency and fairness</b> of these, including giving applicants an opportunity for direct dialogue with the GAC.</li> <li>o However, the <b>GAC does not consider that the PDP should make recommendations on GAC activities</b> which are carried out in accordance with the ICANN Bylaws and the GAC's internal procedures</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed with GNSO Support   Ongoing Discussion   Last discussed: 23 September 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Working Group is converging on a set of high-level agreements on this topic. Please note that work is still in progress and the recommendations may change. Consensus calls have not yet been held. Policy discussions in preparation for high level agreements within <a href="#">Sub Pro WG Call of 23 September 2019</a> contrast <a href="#">GAC input from October 2018</a> since the PDP WG is considering a recommendation to omit in future editions of the Applicant Guidebook language included in the 2012 AGB section 3.1 that GAC Advice “will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.” Some WG rationale for considering this change can be found in the bullets below.</li> <li>• The WG believes that this language hampers opportunities for applicants and the GAC to work together to agree on mitigation of concerns, which could allow an application to proceed upon resolution of concerns.</li> <li>• The WG believes that “GAC Advice must include clearly articulated rationale, including the national or international law upon which it is based”.</li> <li>• The WG believes that “future GAC Advice, and Board action thereupon, for categories of gTLDs should be issued prior to the finalization of the next Applicant Guidebook. Any GAC Advice issued after the application period has begun must apply to individual strings only, based on the merits and details of the application, not on groups or classes of applications”.</li> <li>• The AGB envisioned GAC Advice to be on an application by application basis.</li> </ul>
		<b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GAC may wish to follow upcoming draft final recommendations from the PDP WG as there is significant interest in the role of the GAC and support to impose requirements on GAC actions in future rounds and policy discussions in the Sub Pro PDP WG are not consistent with GAC positions and interests.</li> <li>• In particular, the GAC may wish to consider whether it accepts having to provide justification for its advice and to request specific action from applicants in the future.</li> </ul>

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

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<b>Policy Development Process</b>	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC1</a> (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o GAC Notes range of <b>ongoing interconnected reviews and policy development processes</b> relevant to new gTLDs</li> <li>o Take a <b>comprehensive and measured approach</b> to new gTLD policy in a <b>sequential and coordinated</b> way rather than through too many parallel and overlapping efforts</li> <li>o <b>Cross-community working environment essential</b> to the development of workable policies that maximise benefits to all relevant stakeholders</li> <li>o GNSO process to be complemented by the input from other SOs/ACs, and ICANN Board when not appropriately reflected in the outcome</li> <li>o Experience suggests conclusion of a <b>PDP on such a wide-ranging set of issues unlikely to be end-point</b> agreed by all stakeholders. GAC will make every effort to participate in agreed post-PDP policy processes.</li> <li>o Consider <b>metrics</b> to support both policy development and ongoing implementation as a specific stream of work</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support   Ongoing Discussion   Last discussed 26 Nov. 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• According to the <a href="#">GNSO Review of the GAC Kobe Communiqué</a> (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 <a href="#">resolution</a> (1 March 2019) are being considered in the course of the PDP WG's deliberations</li> <li>• Per its most recent discussions (21-26 November), the WG reviewed all CCT-RT recommendations directed at it again. The WG believes that it has duly considered all relevant CCT-RT recommendations, even if in the end, the WG may not always adopt the solutions as prescribed by the CCT-RT. This secondary review of the CCT-RT recommendations does not seem to indicate any major policy upheavals.</li> <li>• The WG will describe its consideration of the CCT-RT recommendations in its Final Report (though it will be informed by its <a href="#">working document</a>).</li> <li>• PDP WG discussed whether the program should only utilize "rounds" and there were no major objections, 6 Feb. 2020.</li> </ul>
	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Final Report</a> (11 December 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Increased data collection on consumer trust, DNS abuse, domain wholesale and retail pricing, reseller information, WHOIS accuracy</b> [...] 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)</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update, clarify or set specific expectations in terms of policy outcomes stemming from relevant interconnected reviews and PDPs</li> <li>• Provide guidance on where data and metrics should be leveraged by Sub Pro PDP WG deliberations.</li> <li>• Follow GAC deliberations on the consideration of the CCT Review Recommendations which are not addressed in the Sub Pro PDP WG</li> </ul>



Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<p><b>Future Releases of New gTLDs (Timing and Prerequisites)</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC1</a> (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reiterated GAC Helsinki Communiqué Advice on this matter</li> <li>Lack of clarity on realization of the <b>expected benefits of new gTLDs</b> (per pre-2012 <a href="#">economic analysis</a>)</li> <li><b>Development and collection of metrics</b> far from complete</li> <li>ICANN, registries and registrars should commit to <b>gathering appropriate data on security and consumer safety</b> issues in a transparent manner</li> <li>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 <b>assessment of costs and benefits</b>.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Draft Report</a> (19 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CCT-RT's contribution is critical in <b>evaluating the overall impact of the new gTLD Program</b> and identifying corrective measures and enhancements</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reiterates GAC Helsinki &amp; Hyderabad Communiqué and previous input that <b>costs and benefits of new gTLDs should be reviewed before any further rounds</b>, noting it does not seem addressed directly by PDP</li> <li>Further expansion should take into account the <b>CCT Review recommendations identified as prerequisites</b></li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Final Report</a> (11 December 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the GAC endorses recommendations in the final report that encourage the <b>collection of data</b> to better inform policy making <b>before increasing the number of new gTLDs</b> (Need for data)</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Accepted Recommendations - Plan for Implementation and Next Steps</a> (21 October 2019)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the GAC reiterates concern with the outcome of the Board's consideration of the majority of the CCT Review Team consensus recommendations, which to date are still in pending status.</li> <li>As many pending Recommendations relate to vital public policy issues, including DNS Abuse, the GAC encourages the Board and the Review Team to consider what steps need to be taken to progress on the majority of Recommendations that still remain in the "pending" status.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</b> <b>PDP WG Deliberation Stage:</b> Analysis   No High Level Agreement Reached   <a href="#">6 February 2020</a></p> <p><b>Status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PDP WG discussed Continuing Subsequent Procedures on 6 Feb. 2020. No current objections within PDP WG to the New gTLD Program continuing nor to the collection of data and metrics for assessing the impact of the program.</li> <li>The Sub Pro PDP WG has not conducted cost/benefit analysis of further releases of new gTLDs. This is based in part 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> (<a href="#">New gTLD Applicant Guidebook</a>, section 1.1.6). The PDP WG Co-Chair (J. Neuman) signaled during an ICANN64 <a href="#">GAC plenary session</a> that Policy recommendation on this matter may be at odds with GAC Advice. However, the WG has taken note that the CCT-RT had a number of economic and consumer surveys at its disposal, which ultimately led to the CCT-RT outcomes indicating some level of benefit from the program.</li> <li>In terms of data collection, the Sub Pro PDP WG <a href="#">deliberations</a> point to the need for assessing gaps in the <a href="#">Global Consumer Survey</a> (29 May 2015) and <a href="#">Assessment of Competitive Effects</a> (11 Oct. 2016) that were conducted in connection with the CCT Review.</li> <li>In its <a href="#">response</a> (15 May 2019) to the <a href="#">GAC Kobe Communiqué</a> Follow-up (14 March 2019) on the <a href="#">Helsinki Advice</a> (30 June 2016), the ICANN Board responded: <i>"As noted in the <a href="#">Helsinki Scorecard</a>, 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>.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine whether the current status of work in the Sub Pro PDP requires revisiting GAC's expectations, in particular as formulated in the GAC Helsinki Communiqué regarding costs/benefits analysis.</li> <li>Evaluate conclusions of the <a href="#">Global Consumer Survey</a> and <a href="#">Assessment of Competitive Effects</a> to assess relevance and consideration by the PDP</li> </ul>

	<p>GAC Advice <a href="#">Montreal Communiqué</a> on CCT Review and Subsequent Rounds of New gTLDs: The GAC Advises the Board: i. not to proceed with a new round of gTLDs until after the complete implementation of the recommendations in the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review that were identified as "prerequisites" or as "high priority".</p> <p>GAC <a href="#">Response</a> (20 Jan. 2020) to <a href="#">ICANN Board Clarification Questions</a> on GAC Montreal Communiqué Advice on CCT Recommendations and Subsequent Rounds of new gTLDs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seek clarification as to how expected CCT-RT prerequisites are being incorporated into PDP policy recommendations, &amp; whether some may require follow-up at later stages of the process.</li> </ul>
--	---	---

### 3. New gTLD Applications Process

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
Clarity and Predictability of Application Process	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC1</a> (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“<b>Continuous delegation</b>” could provide long-term certainty, reduce opportunities for gaming the system and enable more efficient allocation of resources by ICANN, the community and applicants.</li> <li>Need for process flexibility to respond to emerging issues</li> <li>Need mechanism to alert, allow application by and giving a say to parties interested in name applied for</li> <li>GAC Appreciates <b>importance of predictability</b> at the pre-application, application and ongoing post-application stages. However, this should <b>not</b> be the <b>prime or only consideration</b></li> <li>The GAC needs a degree of <b>flexibility to respond to emerging issues</b> 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</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support   Ongoing Discussion   Last Discussed: <a href="#">12 Dec. 2019</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Sub Pro PDP WG issued a <a href="#">preliminary recommendation</a> (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</li> <li>Details are being developed in a <a href="#">“New Predictability Framework Document”</a>, and in <a href="#">“Open Questions about the SPIRT”</a> which proposes the creation of a Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team (“SPIRT”), a new GNSO structure to advise its Council, and with which ICANN org would be required to consult when it considers a change/modification to the New gTLD program after its launch (that is after new applications have been received).</li> <li>It is generally agreed in the Sub Pro PDP that the Predictability Framework, and the SPIRT it suggests creating, is advisory in nature and would not impact the ability of the GNSO and other SO/ACs from performing their roles assigned under the ICANN Bylaws.</li> </ul>
	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GAC supports any <b>reasonable measures that streamline application procedures</b> (thereby reducing compliance costs) but that also enable <b>due consideration of public policy issues</b> raised by GAC</li> <li>Reiterates response to Sub Pro PDP CC1 regarding flexibility to respond to emerging issues, including after conclusion of PDP</li> </ul>	<p><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p>

	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reiterates response to Sub Pro PDP CC1 on need for flexibility to respond to emerging issues</li> </ul>	<p>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.</p>
--	--	--

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<p><b>Application Procedures</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Critical assessment should be made</b> on whether <b>Applicant Guidebook</b> or single place on ICANN's website should be preferred in future</li> <li>○ If Applicant Guidebook is retained, partitioning in different <b>audience-driven</b> sections <b>or by type of application</b> has merit</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Supplemental Initial Report</a> (19 Dec. 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Concur that better guidance provided by ICANN would be helpful regarding <b>possible changes in applications once submitted</b> and their consequences in terms of publication and evaluation.</li> <li>○ Care is required so as not to allow changes that could undermine the role of Application comments</li> <li>○ A change to the likely operator of the new gTLD would constitute a <b>material change</b> and require notification (AGB 1.2.7) and possibly re-evaluation as well as public comments for competition and other concerns.</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG Deliberation Stage:</b> Ongoing Discussion   High Level Agreement Reached   Draft Final Recommendation Ongoing</p> <p><b>PDP WG Last discussed this topic on:</b> <a href="#">6 February 2020</a></p> <p><b>Status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● The Applicant Guidebook is expected to be retained and made available in the 6 UN Languages.</li> <li>● The WG is leaning towards requiring that the translations must all be available a certain period of time before the application window can open. See section 2.4.1 Applicant Guidebook.</li> <li>● The PDP WG Recommendation for ICANN org to provide better guidance to the Applicant is also expected to be retained.</li> <li>● The Working Group recommends focusing on the user when drafting future versions of the Applicant Guidebook and prioritizing <b>usability, clarity, and practicality</b> in developing the AGB for subsequent procedures. The AGB should effectively address the needs of new applicants as well as those already familiar with the application process. It should also effectively serve those who do not speak English as a first language in addition to native English speakers.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider providing specific guidance to ICANN once policy development is complete and ICANN begin implementation work, including editing the New gTLD Applicant Guidebook</li> <li>Pursue the definition of categories (see other <a href="#">section</a> in this scorecard)</li> </ul>
--	--

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
Freedom of Expression	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>No clear evidence of infringement</b> of an applicant's freedom of expression rights in the recent gTLD round</li> <li>Freedom of expression, especially from commercial players, is <b>important but not absolute</b>.</li> <li>As in any fundamental rights <b>analysis all affected rights have to be considered</b>, including, inter alia, intellectual property rights, applicable national laws on protection of certain terms etc.</li> <li>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</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG Deliberation Stage:</b> Ongoing Discussion   High Level Agreement</p> <p><b>PDP WG Last discussed this topic on:</b> 15 July 2019</p> <p><b>Status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Deliberations on <a href="#">public comments received</a> on this topic occurred on 15 July 2019. <a href="#">Public comments</a> 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. The WG has not yet come to agreement on what specific guidance is needed to help balance the various rights in this regard.</li> <li>WG High Level Agreement: <a href="#">it would be helpful to provide additional implementation guidance in relation to [support of] protecting applicant freedom of expression rights.</a> (page 9)</li> </ul>
		<b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitor WG deliberations and potential policy recommendation outcomes</li> </ul>

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<b>TLD Categories (or Types)</b>	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC1</a> (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reiterates GAC Nairobi Communiqué Advice calling for <b>further exploration of categories</b></li> <li><b>Limited geographic and category diversity</b> of 2012 application should inform discussions</li> <li>GAC 2007 Principles and Durban Communiqué suggest <b>certain types of TLDs which may deserve a differential treatment</b>, including sensitive strings and highly regulated sectors</li> <li>Differential treatment may require <b>different tracks for application and different procedures, rules and criteria</b>. To be confirmed with data gathering.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reiterates GAC Nairobi Communiqué Advice in relation to possible <b>variable fee structure per type of application</b></li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on the <a href="#">Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in New gTLDs</a> (19 September 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is still significant scope for the <b>development and enhancement of current mitigation measures and safeguards</b>, 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)</li> <li>Fisk levels also varies <b>depending on the strictness of the registration policy</b> (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)</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reiterates GAC Nairobi Communiqué Advice calling for further exploration of categories and addressing fees</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG Deliberation Stage:</b> Ongoing Discussion   High Level Agreement</p> <p><b>PDP WG Last discussed this topic on:</b> 25 July 2019</p> <p><b>Status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High level agreement notes support from most commenters to maintain existing categories and to not create additional categories, with the exception of formally adopting the .Brand category. However, the WG is still deliberating the concept of Verified TLDs, which appear similar to sensitive strings and highly regulated sectors.</li> <li>High level agreement notes support for a single application fee (e.g., against variable fees) in most cases, with the exception of Applicant Support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>Allowing for a variable fee structure may need to be pursued specifically</li> </ul>

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
Community Based Applications	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Draft Report</a> (19 May 2017):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Conduct a <b>thorough review of procedures and objectives</b> for Community-based applications (Draft Rec. 48, Final Rec. 34)</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Where a <b>community which is impacted</b> by a new gTLD application has expressed a collective and clear opinion, that <b>opinion should be duly taken into account</b> as part of the application. (Beijing Communiqué)</li> <li>o <b>Take better account of community views</b>, regardless of whether those communities have utilised the ICANN formal community process or not (Durban Communiqué 2013)</li> <li>o The GAC proposes the establishment of an <b>appeal mechanism for community applications</b></li> <li>o The GAC has recently referred to the PDP Working Group for consideration the recommendations of a <a href="#">report on community applications</a> commissioned by the Council of Europe.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Supports proposal in the Initial Report</li> <li>o The <a href="#">study</a> of this matter by the Council of Europe should be considered</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Final Report</a> (11 December 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o a <b>thorough review</b> of procedures and objectives related Community-Based Applications <b>be conducted prior to the launch of any future round of New gTLD Application</b> (Final Rec. 34)</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG Deliberation Stage:</b> Ongoing Discussion   No High Level Agreement Reached  </p> <p><b>PDP WG Last discussed this topic on:</b> 10 October 2019</p> <p><b>Status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="#">Public Comments</a> 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.</li> <li>• Reflected outcome of <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP WG Call of 7 October</a>: no high level agreement to date. GNSO Support Staff has updated the <a href="#">limited appeals mechanism matrix</a> to address several items identified during the call (e.g., background screening, Community Priority Evaluation, Independent Objector). PDP WG members are encouraged to review and comment.</li> <li>• <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP WG call of 10 October</a>: no high level agreements, but PDP WG discussed whether <a href="#">CPE guidelines</a> or similar guidelines should be adopted and attached to applicant in advance. No objection on the call was flagged for preliminary recommendation that notes that the CPE process should include a process for evaluators to engage in dialogue with the applicant during the CPE process. Subsequent dialogue has taken place on the email list to refine the CPE Guidelines, but there appears to be general support for the inclusion of this additional guidance.</li> <li>• Open questions remain on the definition of “community” and whether any additional considerations for communities should be introduced beyond CPE.</li> </ul>
	<p><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor outcomes on the consideration of <a href="#">CCT Review Recommendation 34</a>, both by ICANN Board and the Sub Pro PDP WG</li> <li>• 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 <a href="#">GAC plenary session</a>). The GAC may wish to leverage prior <a href="#">documentation</a> of the issues by the UK GAC Representative (16 October 2017) and the <a href="#">report</a> by the Council of Europe (May 2016)</li> </ul>	

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
Community Engagement	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC1</a> (29 July 2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Ensure/empower participation</b> from all relevant stakeholders from <b>affected communities</b> (as applicants or to have a fair say when legitimate interests affected by TLD applications)</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG Deliberation Stage:</b> Ongoing Discussion  </p> <p><b>PDP WG Last discussed this topic on:</b> 15 April 2019</p> <p><b>Status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliberations of Sub Pro PDP WG based on <a href="#">public comments received</a> in relation to the New gTLD Communications Strategy (2.4.2) are still pending.</li> <li>• 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 <a href="#">Initial Report</a> (p.16), that is still <a href="#">being developed</a> through the work of a dedicated <a href="#">Sub Team</a> of the PDP WG (see this <a href="#">other section</a> of this scorecard)</li> <li>• The WG is currently working on the draft final recommendations for communications, which focus on timeliness, broad outreach and accessibility as key priorities.</li> </ul>
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider monitoring and contributing specific input on the New gTLD Communication Strategy as well as other areas of WG deliberations such <a href="#">Comments</a> and <a href="#">Objections</a> on Applications.</li> </ul>



#### 4. New gTLD Applications Requirements

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<b>Applicant Evaluation and Accreditation Programs</b>	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Applicant evaluation and <b>Registry Service Provider pre-approval process</b> should include consideration of potential <b>security threats</b></li> <li>Such consideration should include <b>using tools such as ICANN's DAAR</b> to identify any potential security risks (and affiliated data) associated with an application</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG Deliberation Stage:</b> Ongoing Discussion   High Level Agreement Reached  </p> <p><b>PDP WG Last discussed this topic on:</b> 28 May 2019</p> <p><b>Status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support from most commenters for the use of the term "Pre-Approval Program" and establishment of such a program. Some concerns and a response in opposition are discussed below.</li> <li>The Working Group confirms that the only difference between a pre-approved RSP and one that is approved during application evaluation is the timing of when the approval takes place; Therefore, all criteria for evaluation and testing (if applicable) should be essentially identical.</li> <li>The WG is unsure of how to integrate data such as DAAR, which provides data for an already delegated TLD, into the evaluation process.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The GAC and PSWG particularly may wish to follow and contribute to <a href="#">deliberations</a> of Sub Pro PDP WG in this area as to ensure outcomes compatible with GAC expectations and threat landscape, consistent with previous GAC Advice<sup>1</sup></li> <li>The GAC may want to consider providing specific guidance on how tools like DAAR can benefit the evaluation process.</li> </ul>

<sup>1</sup> 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)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<b>Reserved Names</b>	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Existing reservations of names at the top level substantially reflect the <b>GAC Principles Regarding New gTLDs</b>.</li> <li>○ The GAC would expect that <b>any changes should be consistent</b> with these Principles</li> <li>○ The GAC wishes to draw the attention of the PDP to its most recent <b>advice on certain 2-character codes</b> at the second level (GAC Panama Communiqué)</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG High-level Agreement:</b> Ongoing Discussion   High Level Agreement Reached</p> <p><b>Status:</b> Last discussed on 19 August 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Reserved Names ["Unavailable Names," referred to in 2012 AGB as "Reserved Names"] at the Top Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Comments generally supported reserving the names for Public Technical Identifiers (i.e., PTI, PUBLIC TECHNICAL IDENTIFIERS, PUBLIC TECHNICAL IDENTIFIER).</li> <li>○ Comments generally supported reserving Special-Use Domain Names through the procedure described in IETF RFC 6761.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Reserved Names at the Second Level</li> <li>● Comments generally support updating Schedule 5 to include the measures for Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels to Avoid Confusion with Corresponding Country Codes adopted by the ICANN Board on 8 November 2016.</li> </ul>

## 5. New gTLD Applications Requirements - Safeguards and Public Interest Commitments

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
<p><b>Safeguards (Highly regulated sectors, Registration Restrictions, DNS Abuse)</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">CCT Review Team Draft Report</a> (19 May 2017): the GAC supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Incentives for registries to meet user expectations</b> regarding content, registrants in TLD, safety of personal data (Draft Rec. 14, Final Rec. 12)</li> <li>○ Further <b>gathering of data related to WHOIS Accuracy</b> and related complaints (Draft Rec. 17-18, Final Rec. 18)</li> <li>○ Regular gathering, analysis by ICANN of <b>data pertaining to abuse rates</b> in new gTLDs (Draft Rec. 19, Final Rec. 16)</li> <li>○ Review of Registry <b>Security Framework</b> (Draft Rec. 20, Final Rec. 19)</li> <li>○ Assessing whether mechanisms to report and handle <b>complaints</b> have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse and improving awareness of <b>Registries points of contact</b> to report abuse (Draft Rec. 21-22, Final Rec. 20)</li> <li>○ Collection of <b>additional information in complaints</b> to assess effectiveness of highly regulated strings Cat. 1 safeguards (Draft Rec. 23-24, Final Rec. 21)</li> <li>○ More data and information required for an <b>objective assessment of the effectiveness of safeguards</b> for highly regulated strings (Draft Rec. 25-30, Final Rec. 23)</li> <li>○ Survey registrant and ICANN compliance on enforcement of Safeguards related to <b>New gTLDs with Inherent Governmental Functions and Cyberbullying</b> (Draft. Rec 31-32, Final Rec. 24)</li> <li>○ Additional collection of data to assess <b>effects of restricted registration policies on TLD trustworthiness, DNS Abuse, competition, and costs</b> of compliance (Draft Rec. 33-36, Final Rec. 13)</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on the <a href="#">Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in New gTLDs</a> (19 September 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ There is still significant scope for the <b>development and enhancement of current mitigation measures and safeguards</b>, 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)</li> <li>○ Risk levels also varies <b>depending on the strictness of the registration policy</b> (bad actors prefer to register domains in standard new gTLDs, which are generally open for public registration, rather than in community new</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG High-level Agreement:</b> [Yes, see below   None] (As of [Date])</p> <p><b>Status:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● There appears to be <b>some support for the concept of a Verified TLD</b> (TLDs implying trust and related to regulated or professional sectors that have implications for consumer safety and well-being)</li> <li>● As indicated in the <a href="#">Policy Development Process section</a> of this scorecard, the <b>PDP WG believes that all CCT Review recommendations directed at the PDP are being considered</b> in the course of the PDP WG's deliberations</li> <li>● Per the PDP WG's <a href="#">working document</a>, <b>only 4 of the CCT Review recommendations identified as important by the GAC</b> in the area of safeguards (see Left) are being considered by the PDP ( Rec. 12, 14, 16, 23). All of these are <b>identified as requiring more consideration</b> in PDP WG deliberations</li> <li>● It should be noted that CCT Review <a href="#">Final Recommendations</a> have been <a href="#">considered</a> 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 <a href="#">dedicated scorecard</a>.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></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"> <li>● proactively engage or contribute position papers for consideration in PDP WG deliberations related to TLD Types/Categories or Global Public Interest. Timing to be confirmed (per <a href="#">WG Schedule</a>, subject to change)</li> <li>● 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.</li> </ul>

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)

## 6. New gTLD Applications Evaluation, Objections and String Contention

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
String Similarity	<p><a href="#">Response</a> to <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP CC2</a> (22 May 2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference to the GAC Hyderabad Communiqué <b>Advice regarding</b> the proposed guidelines on the second <b>IDN ccTLD string similarity review</b> process</li> <li>Reference to GAC Prague Communiqué advice “to create a <b>mechanism of appeal</b> that will allow challenging the decisions on confusability” in relations to applied-for IDN ccTLDs</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reaffirms previous advice (GAC Beijing and Singapore Communiqué) that <b>singular and plural</b> versions of the same string as a TLD could lead to consumer harm</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG High-level Agreement:</b> Ongoing Discussion   <b>Status:</b> Last discussed on 27 August 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>High Level Agreement under discussion: Comments generally support adding detailed guidance on the standard of confusing similarity as it applies to singular and plural versions of the same word, noting that this was an area where there was insufficient clarity in the 2012 round</li> </ul>
		<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>

Area of GAC interest	Summary of Previous GAC Input)	Status of PDP WG Deliberations
Auctions Procedures	<p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Initial Report</a> (8 October 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Auctions of last resort</b> should not be used in contentions between commercial and non-commercial applications</li> <li>○ <b>Private auctions</b> should be strongly disincentivised</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Comment</a> on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP Supplemental Initial Report</a> (19 Dec. 2018)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Reiterates comments made on the Initial Report</li> </ul>	<p>Confirmed w/ GNSO Support</p> <p><b>PDP WG High-level Agreement:</b> Ongoing Discussion   Yes, see below  </p> <p><b>Status:</b> Last discussed on 15 October 2019</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● High level agreements on <a href="#">Sub Pro PDP WG Call of 15 October</a>: There should be additional options for applicants to voluntarily resolve contention sets by mutual agreement before being forced into an ICANN auction of last resort.</li> <li>● The PDP WG seems to largely be in agreement that a sealed-bid auction is preferable to the ascending clock auction used in 2012. The WG has identified a number of goals it is seeking to achieve, which are important to consider as it tries to identify ideally, a single model.</li> </ul>
		<p><b>Possible Next Steps for the GAC</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Prepare to engage the WG to press on and bolster <a href="#">existing support by some members of the WG</a> (section 2.1.d.2.1) for specific consideration of non-commercial applications in auctions, or alternatives thereof.</li> <li>● Consider refining expectations and making proposals in terms of incentives for the avoidance of private auctions.</li> </ul>