

Section	Subject	Description	Policy Development
Group 1			
4.2.1	Cancelling Subsequent Procedures	Should there in fact be new gTLD subsequent procedures and if not, what are the justifications for and ramification of discontinuing the program?	X
4.2.2	Predictability	How can changes to the program introduced after launch (e.g., digital archery/prioritization issues, name collision, registry agreement changes, public interest commitments (PICs), etc.) be avoided?	
4.2.3	Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice	Did the implementation meet or discourage these goals?	X
4.2.4	Community Engagement	How can participation from the community be better encouraged and integrated during the policy development process, implementation, and execution?	

4.2.5	Applicant Guidebook	Is the AGB the right implementation of the GNSO recommendations? If so, how can it be improved to ensure that it meets the needs of multiple audiences (e.g., applicants, those monitoring the policy implementation, registry service providers, escrow providers, etc.)	
4.2.6	Clarity of Application Process	How can the application process avoid developing processes on an as-needed basis (e.g., may have included the clarifying question process, change request process, customer support, etc.)	
4.2.7	Applications Assessed in Rounds	Has the scale of demand been made clear? Does the concept of rounds affect market behavior and should factors beyond demand affect the type of application acceptance mechanism?	X
4.2.8	Accreditation Programs	As there appears to be a limited set of technical service and Escrow providers, would the program benefit from an accreditation program for third party service providers? If so, would this simplify the application process with a set of pre-qualified providers to choose from? Are there other impacts that an accreditation program may have on the application process?	X
4.2.9	Systems	How can the systems used to support the New gTLD Program, such as TAS, Centralized Zone Data Service, Portal, etc. be made more robust, user friendly, and better integrated?	
4.2.10	Application Fees	Evaluate accuracy of cost estimates and/or review the methodology to develop the cost model, while adhering to the principle of cost recovery. Examine how payment processing can be improved.	
4.2.11	Communications	Examine access to and content within knowledge base as well as communication methods between the ICANN and the community.	
4.2.12	Application Queuing	Review whether first come first served guidance remains relevant and if not, whether another mechanism is more appropriate.	X
4.2.13	Application Submission Period	Is three months the proper amount of time? Is the concept of a fixed period of time for accepting applications the right approach?	

4.2.14	Support for Applicants From Developing Countries	Evaluate effectiveness of Applicant Support program to assess if the criteria were properly designed, outreach sufficient, monetary support sufficient, etc. In particular, was there enough outreach in developing economies to 1) contribute to the design and nature of the process and 2) to ensure awareness of the opportunity afforded?	X
4.2.15	Different TLD Types	Does the one-size-fits-all application and review process hamper innovation? Should things such as the application process, requirements, annual fees, contractual requirements, etc. be variable based on the TLD type? For instance, should an existing Registry Operator, that is fulfilling the requirements of its Registry Agreement, be subject to a different, more streamlined, application process?	X
4.2.16	Application Submission Limits	Should there be limits to the number of applications from a single applicant/group? Consider if the round could be restricted to a certain applicant type(s) (e.g., from least developed countries) or other limiting factor.	X
4.2.17	Variable Fees	Should the New gTLD application fee be variable based on such factors as application type (e.g., open or closed registries), multiple identical applications, or other factors?	
Group 2			
4.3.1	Reserved Names List	Review the composition of the reserved names list to determine if additions, modifications, or subtractions are needed (e.g., single letter, two letters, special characters, etc.). Evaluate if the implementation matched expectations (e.g., recommendations of the Reserved Names Working Group). Review whether geographic names requirements are appropriate.	X
4.3.2	Base Registry Agreement	Perform comprehensive review of the base agreement, including investigating how and why it was amended after program launch, whether a single base agreement is appropriate, whether Public Interest Commitments (PICs) are the right mechanism to protect the public interest, etc. Should the Article 7.7 review process be amended to allow for customized reviews by	X

		different registry types?	
4.3.3	Registrant Protections	The original PDP assumed there would always be registrants and they would need protecting from the consequences of Registry failure, although it may not make sense to impose registrant protection obligations such as EBERO and the LOC when there are no registrants to protect, such as in a closed registry. Should more relevant rules be established for certain specific cases?	X
4.3.4	Contractual Compliance	While no specific issues were identified, contractual compliance as it relates to New gTLDs may be considered in scope for discussion, though the role of contractual compliance (i.e., enforcing agreements) would not be considered within scope.	
4.3.5	Registrar Non-Discrimination	Are registrar requirements for registries still appropriate?	X
4.3.6	TLD Rollout	Was adequate time allowed for rollout of TLD? When should recurring fees due to ICANN begin?	X
4.3.7	Second-level Rights Protection Mechanisms	Review effectiveness and implementation of RPMs such as TMCH, URS, etc.	
4.3.8	Registry/Registrar Standardization	Consider whether the registry/registrar relationship should have additional standardization and regulation.	X
4.3.9	Global Public Interest	Existing policy advice does not define the application of “Public Interest” analysis as a guideline for evaluation determinations. Consider issues identified in GAC Advice on safeguards, public interest commitments (PICs), and associated questions of contractual commitment and enforcement. It may be useful to consider the global public interest in the context of ICANN’s limited technical coordination role, mission and core values and how it applies specifically to the New gTLD Program.	X

4.3.10	IGO/INGO Protections	The PDP for Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs and PDP for IGO-INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms are expected to address a number of issues. While no additional work is envisioned, if there are any remaining or new issues for discussion, they could be deliberated in the context of this PDP.	
4.3.11	Closed Generics	Should there be restrictions around exclusive use of generics TLDs?	X
Group 3			
4.4.1	New gTLD Applicant Freedom of Expression	Examine whether GAC Advice, community processes, and reserved names impacted this goal.	X
4.4.2	String Similarity	Were string contention evaluation results consistent and effective in preventing user confusion? Were the string contention resolution mechanisms fair and efficient?	X
4.4.3	Objections	Review rules around standing, fees, objection consolidation, consistency of proceedings and outcomes. Review functions and role of the independent objector. Consider oversight of process and appeal mechanisms.	X
4.4.4	Accountability Mechanisms	Examine whether dispute resolution and challenge processes provide adequate redress options or if additional redress options specific to the program are needed.	
4.4.5	Community Applications	Was the overall approach to communities consistent with recommendations and implementation guidance? Did the Community Priority Evaluation process achieve its purpose and result in anticipated outcomes? Were the recommendations adequate for community protection?	X
Group 4			
4.5.1	Internationalized Domain Names and Universal Acceptance	Consider how to encourage adoption of gTLDs. Evaluate whether rules around IDNs properly accounted for recommendations from IDN WG. Determine and address policy guidance needed for the implementation of IDN variant TLDs.	X
Group 5			

4.6.1	Security and Stability	Were the proper questions asked to minimize the risk to the DNS and ensure that applicants will be able to meet their obligations in the registry agreement? Should there be non-scored questions and if so, how should they be presented? Were the proper criteria established to avoid causing technical instability? Is the impact to the DNS from new gTLDs fully understood?	X
4.6.2	Applicant Reviews: Technical/Operational and Financial	Were Financial and Technical criteria designed properly to allow applicants to demonstrate their capabilities while allowing evaluators to validate their capabilities? How can the criteria be streamlined and made clearer?	X
4.6.3	Name Collisions	How should name collisions be incorporated into future new gTLD rounds? What measures may be needed to manage risks for 2012-round gTLDs beyond their 2 year anniversary of delegation, or gTLDs delegated prior to the 2012 round?	X