Your name: Susan Payne

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Applicable text (please quote directly)** | **Number and name of applicable report section** | **Cannot live with rationale** | **Proposed changes (taking into account whether others would be able to live with them)** |
|  | Rationale for Affirmation xx (rationale 1): The existing policy for New gTLDs states that there will be a “systemized manner of applying for gTLDs to be developed in the long term.” Consistent with its overall approach, the Working Group approached this topic from the standpoint that there must be a compelling reason to recommend altering or superseding the existing policy (e.g., no longer allowing new gTLDs). | Continuing Subsequent Procedures2.2.1b Rationale for Affirmation xx (rationale 1) | The Final Report will contain a number of Affirmations of the existing policy. It makes more sense, and presumably was the intention, to have an overarching/introductory section which explains the Working Group’s overall approach, since this applies not just to this particular affirmation but to all of them. If that is not the case, then the overall approach applied ought to be specified against every other Affirmation the WG makes and not just in this case.  | Rationale for Affirmation xx (rationale 1): The existing policy for New gTLDs states that there will be a “systemized manner of applying for gTLDs to be developed in the long term.” **In affirming the continuation of this policy the Working Group applied the consistent approach outlined in [Introduction].**~~Consistent with its overall approach, the Working Group approached this topic from the standpoint that there must be a compelling reason to recommend altering or superseding the existing policy (e.g., no longer allowing new gTLDs).~~ |
|  | The Working Group took note of the Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust Review Team (CCT-RT) Final Report, which states that “on balance the expansion of the DNS marketplace has demonstrated increased competition and consumer choice.” While the Working Group recognizes that some parties believe the New gTLD market to already be saturated, the Working Group did not agree that a compelling reason was identified to override existing policy. | Continuing Subsequent Procedures2.2.1b Rationale for Affirmation xx (rationale 1) | Rationale focuses only on the negative opinion of some that the TLD market is “saturated” and does not also acknowledge that there are also areas of demand, including from among Dot Brands who do not rely on sale of second level names and thus are not impacted by any perceived market saturation at the second level (if this even exists), and would challenge the notion of market saturation at the top level. | The Working Group took note of the Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust Review Team (CCT-RT) Final Report, which states that “on balance the expansion of the DNS marketplace has demonstrated increased competition and consumer choice.” While the Working Group recognizes that some parties believe the New gTLD market to already be saturated, **others have indicated that they are aware of interested potential applicants, including dot Brands.  Overall, the** ~~The~~ Working Group did not agree that a compelling reason was identified to override existing policy. |