

# New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Draft Final Report - Public Comment Input Form

This Public Comment forum seeks community feedback on the draft Final Report published by the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group.

**\* Required**

## 1. Email address \*

---

>>> IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS >>> PLEASE READ BEFORE PROCEEDING >>>

### Please submit your public comments via this form only

If you are unable to use Google forms, alternative arrangements can be made. Please contact [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org) for assistance.

### Word format form to enter and save work

The most secure, and strongly recommended, method to complete the survey is to enter your responses into the Word format form available at the link below, and then copy the information into the Google survey form.

- Word: Link TBD
- PDF (for reference): Link TBD

### There is no obligation to complete all sections within this form

Respond to as many or as few questions as desired. The only "mandatory" questions are those related to commenter's personal data in Section 1 and Section 2 of this form.

### You may enter general comments in the last section (Section X)

There is an opportunity to comment on the general content of this Draft Final Report and provide input that may not be tied to any specific items that the Working Group is seeking community input.

### There is a limit of 2,000 characters (about 350-400 words) for each "comment box" question

In the event you reach the character limit, you may send an email to [policy-staff@icann.org](mailto:policy-staff@icann.org), and the Working Group Support Staff will assist you and manually enter your responses.

## To stop and save your work for later, you MUST (to avoid losing your work):

1. Provide your email address above in order to receive a copy of your submitted responses;
2. Click "Submit" at the end of the Google Form (the last question in every section allows you to quickly jump to the end of the Google Form to submit);
3. After you click "Submit," you will receive an email to the above-provided email address; within the email, click the "Edit Response" button at top of the email;
4. After you click the "Edit Response" button, you will be directed to the Google Form to return and complete;
5. Repeat the above steps 2-4 every time you wish to quit the form and save your progress.

## When the commenter hits the "Submit" button, all submitted comments will be displayed publicly via an automatically-generated Google Spreadsheet

Note: Email addresses provided by commenters will not be displayed.

## The final date of the Public Comment forum is INSERT

This form will be closed by INSERT. Any comments received after that date/time will not be reviewed/discussed by the Working Group.

## Other Important Instructions and Outputs in the Final Report

- This is a standard format for collecting public comment. It seeks to:
  - Clearly link comments to specific topics of the draft Final Report
  - Encourage commenters to provide reasoning or rationale for their opinions
  - Enable the sorting of comments so that the Working Group can more easily read all the comments on any one topic
- Outputs in the Final Report: There are 5 types of outputs: (a) Affirmation, (b) Affirmation with Modification, (c) Recommendation, (d) Implementation Guidance, and/or (e) No Agreement.
- Please go to the referenced topic in the draft Final Report at the beginning of each section in the Google Form to read the details and context of each Output.

### Section 2: Consent & Authorization

By submitting my personal data, I agree that my personal data will be processed in accordance with the ICANN Privacy Policy (<https://www.icann.org/privacy/policy>), and agree to abide by the website Terms of Service (<https://www.icann.org/privacy/tos>).

2. Please provide your name: \*

---

3. Please provide your affiliation \*

---

4. Are you providing input on behalf of another group (e.g., organization, company, government)? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

Yes

No

5. If yes, please explain:

---

---

---

---

---

### Save Your Progress

6. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

Yes

No, I would like to continue to the next section

Topic 1:  
Continuing  
Subsequent  
Procedures

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page 14 of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- Affirmed purposes for introducing gTLDs.

7. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

8. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

9. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

10. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

11. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 2:  
Predictability

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page 15 of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- Added details to the Initial Report’s conceptual Predictability Framework, including defining different "buckets" of changes, clarifying which parties can raise issues, and explaining in more detail the jurisdiction of the Framework/SPIRT.
- Added specific details to the structure of the SPIRT, governance model and operating procedures.

12. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

13. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

14. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

15. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

## 16. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---

Topic 3:  
Applications  
Assessed in  
Rounds  
(Application  
Submission  
Periods)

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

### Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:

- Simplified recommendation to make it clear that the New gTLD Program would be conducted in rounds.
- Added recommendations on when future rounds can be initiated (even if applications may still be pending from the previous round).
- Added clarity on the circumstances when a new application may be submitted for a string that was not delegated in the previous round.
- Added recommendations on the need for a predictable cadence of future rounds and that future reviews of the program should be conducted concurrently with the program.
- Added recommendation that material changes from reviews/policy development should apply only to the next subsequent round.

### 17. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

18. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

19. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

20. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

21. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---



Topic 4:  
Different  
TLD  
Types

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g,+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- More detail provided on different categories of TLD applications and how those are treated (e.g., how the type of application, string, or applicant will result in differential treatment during the application evaluation process).
- Added Category 1 - GAC Safeguards, IGO and governments, and Applicant Support as different TLD Types.
- Added recommendation that creating types should be exceptional and need-based, but that there should be a predictable process to have potential changes considered by the community.

22. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

23. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

24. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

25. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

26. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

**Topic 5:  
Application  
Submission  
Limits**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

27. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

28. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

29. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

30. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

31. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

### Save Your Progress

32. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

Yes

No, I would like to continue to the next section

Topic 6:  
Registry  
Service  
Provider  
Pre-  
Evaluation

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g,+Draft+Final+Report>

### Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:

- Renamed the service to better align with its function (RSP Pre-Evaluation). Clarified that substantively, the program is more about timing of the review rather than introducing new evaluation requirements.
- Confirmed that new and existing RSPs are eligible for pre-evaluation (no automatic approval for existing RSPs).
- Provided guidance on timing and applicability of pre-evaluation (only applies to the specific round and that in the future, streamlining the process may be appropriate).
- Confirmed that pre-evaluated RSPs are not “contracted parties” for purposes of the GNSO Structure.
- Recommended that for usability, a list of pre-evaluated RSPs must be made available well enough in advance of the application submission window, so as to be useful for prospective applicants.

33. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

34. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

35. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

36. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

37. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 7:  
Metrics  
and  
Monitoring

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- The section itself is new, but the content is not. This new section simply aggregates the metrics and monitoring recommendations from various sections.

38. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

39. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

40. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

41. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

42. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

**Topic 8:  
Conflicts  
of  
Interest**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- The section itself is new, but the content is not. This concept was originally captured in Objections, but the WG deemed it to be broadly applicable to all vendors that support the program (e.g., evaluators, objections providers).

43. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

44. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

45. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

46. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered



## 47. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---

Topic 9:  
Registry  
Voluntary  
Commitments  
/ Public  
Interest  
Commitments

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g,+Draft+Final+Report>

### Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:

- Added specificity to mandatory PICs (i.e., reference to specification 11 3(a)-(d)).
- Added a recommendation to allow for single-registrant TLDs to obtain waivers for 11 3(a) and 3(b)
- Added specificity to voluntary PICs (which were renamed Registry Voluntary Commitments, or RVCs), including when and for what reasons they may be added and that they be treated as application change requests (to allow for public consideration).
- Recommended that the PICDRP be updated to account for name change.
- Added a recommendation to improve access for being able to review RVCs, in line with CCT-RT recommendation 25.
- Added a set of recommendations for Category 1 Safeguards, which affirms the NGPC framework and suggests that strings be evaluated as an evaluation element, to determine if they fall into any of the NGPC framework groupings.
- Added a recommendation that DNS Abuse should be addressed holistically, instead of just in the context of future new gTLDs.

### 48. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

49. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

50. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

51. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

52. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 10:  
Applicant  
Freedom  
of  
Expression

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

53. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

54. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

55. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

56. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

57. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

### Save Your Progress

58. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

Yes

No, I would like to continue to the next section

#### Topic 11: Universal Acceptance

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g,+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

59. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

60. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

61. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

62. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

63. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---

Topic 12:  
Applicant  
Guidebook

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- Emphasis was placed on the need for enhancing language support in the 6 UN languages

64. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

65. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

66. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

67. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

68. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic 13:  
Communications

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

69. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

70. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

71. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

72. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered



73. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic  
14:  
Systems

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

74. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

75. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

76. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

77. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

78. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

**Topic 15:  
Application  
Fees**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- Combined the Application Fees and Variable Fees section.
- Clarified that applicants utilizing a pre-evaluated RSP would not incur costs for the technical/operational evaluation element and that applicants qualifying for Applicant Support would necessarily be subject to a different fee structure.

79. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

80. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

81. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

82. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

83. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

### Save Your Progress

84. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

Yes

No, I would like to continue to the next section

Topic 16:  
Applications  
Submission  
Period

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- As indicated above, combined with Application Fees.

85. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

86. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

87. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

88. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

89. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic 17:  
Applicant  
Support

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

**\*\*PLEASE NOTE:** There is an additional question below for Community Input.\*\*

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- In regards to support beyond the application fee, registry fees were removed.
- Suggested that an IRT dedicated to implementation of the ASP may be warranted.
- Added greater detail on outreach and collaboration with local partners to accomplish that outreach.
- Added recommendation that the dedicated IRT establish metrics for success (with a non-exhaustive list of potential metrics included).
- Added Implementation Guidance that the dedicated IRT consider allocation of support if the number of qualified applicants exceed funds.
- Added recommendation that ICANN develop a plan for funding the Applicant Support Program and potentially seek funding partners.

90. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

91. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

92. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

93. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

94. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

## Question for Consideration and Comment

Under Topic 17: Applicant Support, Recommendation 17.2 states: "The Working Group recommends expanding the scope of financial support provided to Applicant Support Program beneficiaries beyond the application fee to also cover costs such as application writing fees and attorney fees related to the application process."

Question: Should the Applicant Support Program also include the reduction or elimination for eligible candidates of ongoing registry fees specified in Article 6 of the Registry Agreement? If so, how should the financial impact to ICANN be accounted for?

95. If you have a response to the question please enter your response here:

---



---



---



---

### Topic 18: Terms and Conditions

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

96. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion



97. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

98. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

99. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

100. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 19:  
Application  
Queuing

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- Added recommendation to equitably prioritize IDN applications, including a detailed formula if relatively high volumes of IDN applications are received.

101. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

102. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

103. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

104. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

105. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---

**Topic 20:  
Application  
Change  
Requests**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- Recommends allowance of resolving string contention 1) through business combinations and 2) through string change for .Brand TLDs in limited circumstances.

106. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

107. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

108. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

109. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

110. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

**Save Your Progress**

111. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No, I would like to continue to the next section

**Topic 21:  
Reserved  
Names**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- For consistency with other top-level Reserved Names, the WG altered the recommendation related to Public Technical Identifiers to only reserve the PTI acronym, not the full names.

112. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

113. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

114. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

115. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

116. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic 21.1:  
Geographic  
Names at  
the Top-  
Level  
(Annex I)

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

Please see Annex I, which contains the Final Report of Work Track 5 on Geographic Names at the Top Level of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences**

117. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

118. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

119. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

120. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

121. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---

Topic 22:  
Registrant  
Protections

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- The Initial Report provided options to consider as alternatives to the Continuing Operations Instrument. Although the WG did not agree on a specific alternative, the WG did add a recommendation that alternatives be explored during implementation.

122. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

123. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)



124. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

125. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

126. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic 23:  
Closed  
Generics  
(also  
known as  
Exclusive  
Generics)

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

**\*\*PLEASE NOTE: There is an additional question below for Community Input.\*\***

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- For the purposes of the draft Final Report, the WG designated the status as No Agreement and continued to make no recommendations with respect to either allowing or disallowing Closed Generics. However, with widely diverging viewpoints, the WG asked WG members to contribute proposals for consideration, to help identify circumstances when a closed generic may be permitted. These proposals were not thoroughly vetted by the WG and therefore none of the proposals at this point in time have any agreement within the WG to pursue. However, the WG is very interested in community feedback regarding the three proposals received, in regards to both the high level principles and the details (where provided). Thus, any feedback is appreciated.

127. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

128. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

129. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

130. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

131. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

**Question for Community Input:**

Which, if any, of the following proposals do you believe warrant further consideration by the WG, and why? Are there elements or high-level principles in any of the proposals that you believe are critical to permitting closed generics even if you may disagree with some of the details? If so, please explain. Please review the proposals here:

Proposal 1 (submitted by Alan Greenberg, Kathy Kleiman, George Sadowsky, Greg Shatan):  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/Proposals+Included+in+Draft+Final+Report?preview=/144376220/144376262/ProposalforPICGnTLDs.pdf>

Proposal 2 (submitted by Kurt Pritz, Marc Trachtenberg, Mike Rodenbaugh):  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/Proposals+Included+in+Draft+Final+Report?preview=/144376220/144376263/ClosedGenerics24July2020.pdf>

Proposal 3 (submitted by Jeff Neuman):  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/Proposals+Included+in+Draft+Final+Report?preview=/144376220/144376261/Neuman%20Closed%20Generics%20Proposal.pdf>

132. If you have a response to the questions please enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 24:  
String  
Similarity  
Evaluations

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- The WG added detail and precision around its recommendations, especially around singular/plurals.
- The concept of "intended usage" was integrated into the singular/plural standard, meaning that in circumstances where string combinations that could be considered singular/plural, but where the applicants intend to use the strings in connection with different meanings, both can possibly be delegated. In this case, applicants must agree to mandatory PICs to use the string in line with their intended usage as described in the application.

133. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

134. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

135. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

136. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

137. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic  
25:  
IDNs

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- Added Implementation Guidance to allow applicants to apply for a string in a script that is not yet part of RZ-LGR, though it will not be allowed to proceed to contracting.
- Added additional recommendations/detail around same entity requirements for IDN variants at the top and second levels.
- Added recommendation that second-level IDN variants are not required to behave identically.

138. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

139. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

140. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

141. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

142. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

### Save Your Progress

143. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

Yes

No, I would like to continue to the next section

Topic  
26:  
Security  
and  
Stability

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

### Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:

- Refined recommendations related to root zone scaling, focusing on the rate of change for the root zone for a shorter period of time (e.g. monthly basis) rather than on a yearly basis.
- Added Implementation Guidance intended to promote the conservative expansion of the DNS.
- While previously discussed, formalized as a recommendation that emojis should not be allowed at any level in gTLDs.

144. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

145. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

146. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

147. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered



148. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 27:  
Applicant  
Reviews:  
Technical &  
Operational,  
Financial  
and Registry  
Services

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- Structural and grammatical changes made for ease of understanding.

149. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

150. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

151. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

152. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

153. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

**Topic 28:  
Role of  
Application  
Comment**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- Recommendations are better aligned and consistent with what occurred in the 2012 round, resulting in some recommendations being converted to affirmations instead. With more detail and precision overall, several recommendations were broken into discrete elements, expanding the number of overall recommendations in this section.

154. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

155. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

156. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

157. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

158. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic 29:  
Name  
Collisions

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- Affirmed the use of the New gTLD Collision Occurrence Management framework, unless it is replaced by a new Board approved framework (e.g., as a result of the NCAP studies)
- Focused recommendations more on criteria for assessing name collision risk, relying less so on prescribed lists (e.g., High, Aggravated, Low).

159. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

160. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

161. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

162. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

163. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---

Topic 30:  
 GAC  
 Consensus  
 Advice  
 and GAC  
 Early  
 Warning

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- Created this separate section on GAC Early Warning and GAC Consensus Advice, apart from Objections.
- In recognition of the GAC's role under the ICANN Bylaws, the recommendations were made consistent with the GAC's role. The WG expressed its preference for certain outcomes (e.g., providing GAC Consensus Advice on TLD types ahead of program launch), but acknowledged that it is unable to impose such requirements on the GAC.
- The WG solidified its proposal to remove the language in the AGB that creates a "strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved," which the WG believes is consistent with the GAC's role under the ICANN Bylaws and encourages mutually beneficial outcomes rather than creating a presumption of rejected applications.
- Clarified that GAC Early Warnings must also include rationale for the warning, which should also promote mutually beneficial outcomes.
- Converted potential guidance in the Initial Report to a recommendation: RVCs should be allowed as a mechanism to address or mitigate concerns in GAC Early Warning or GAC Consensus Advice.

164. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

165. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

166. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

167. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

168. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

**Save Your Progress**

169. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No, I would like to continue to the next section

**Topic 31:  
Objections**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- Added Implementation Guidance aimed at improving accessibility to objections (e.g., reducing costs, timing requirements).
- Added recommendation to allow parties to mutually agree to one or three-expert panels.
- Added a recommendation and Implementation Guidance aimed at improving clarity in the process and transparency of outcomes (e.g., criteria and/or processes and fees/refunds should be available ahead of program launch and in the Applicant Guidebook; any additional panel requirements should be available in a central location).

170. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion



171. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

172. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

173. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

174. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 32:  
Limited  
Challenge /  
Appeal  
Mechanism

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- The draft Final Report now includes a substantial amount of additional detail regarding challenges and appeals.
- The recommendations identify which evaluation mechanisms can be challenged and which objection decisions can be appealed. An Annex is included, which provides clarity around standing, the arbiter of the challenge/appeal, who is responsible for costs, standard for appeal ("clearly erroneous" for everything but conflicts of interests), and remedies.
- The recommendations seek to limit the impact that challenges/appeals may have on program timing and costs.

175. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

176. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

177. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

178. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

179. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic 33:  
Dispute  
Resolution  
Procedures  
After  
Delegation

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

180. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

181. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

182. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

183. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

184. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 34:  
Community  
Applications

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

**\*\*PLEASE NOTE:** There is an additional question below for Community Input.\*\*

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

- Added recommendation that letters of opposition should be considered in balance with letters of support.
- Added recommendation intending to clarify the scope of additional research done in performing CPE, and noting that any research impacting the decision should be disclosed to the applicant.

185. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

186. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

187. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

188. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

189. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

### Question for Community Input:

Implementation Guideline 34.3 states: "To support predictability, the CPE guidelines, or as amended, should be considered a part of the policy adopted by the Working Group." In deliberations, the Working Group considered proposals for specific changes to the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) Guidelines from 2012, but did not ultimately recommend any specific changes to the text of the Guidelines (see proposals at <https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/cpe/guidelines-27sep13-en.pdf>). Do you support any of the proposed changes? Please explain. Are there other changes to the Guidelines that you believe the Working Group should recommend?

190. If you have a response to the questions please enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic 35:  
Auctions:  
Mechanisms  
of Last  
Resort /  
Private  
Resolution  
of  
Contention  
Sets

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

**\*\*PLEASE NOTE:** There is an additional question below for Community Input.\*\*

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: Substantive differences include the following:**

191. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

192. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

193. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

194. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

195. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

**Question for Community Input:**

TBD



196. If you have a response to the questions please enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

**Save Your Progress**

197. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

Yes

No, I would like to continue to the next section

**Topic 36:**  
**Base**  
**Registry**  
**Agreement**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

**\*\*PLEASE NOTE:** There is an additional questions below for Community Input.\*\*

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- The WG is converting questions in the Initial Report to recommendations.

198. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

199. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

200. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

201. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

202. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

**Question for Community Input:**

The Working Group discussed specific circumstances in which it may be appropriate for ICANN to grant Code of Conduct exemptions. In particular the Working Group considered a proposal that if a registry makes a good faith effort to get registrars to carry a TLD, but is unable to do so after a given period of time, the registry should have the opportunity to seek a Code of Conduct exemption so that it can be its own registrar without needing to maintain separate books and records and legally separate entities. What standard should be followed or what evidence should be required of the registry in evaluating if a "good faith effort" has been made? Is a Code of Conduct exemption as it currently exists the right mechanism for a registry that lacks registrar support for its gTLD, considering that the Code of Conduct is primarily focused on registrant protection?

203. If you have a response to the question please enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

**Question for Community Input:**

Recommendation 26.4 states: "ICANN must add a contractual provision stating that the registry operator will not engage in fraudulent or deceptive practices." The Working Group discussed two options for implementing the recommendation: the addition of a PIC or a provision in the Registry Agreement. A new PIC would allow third parties to file a complaint regarding fraudulent and deceptive practices. ICANN would then have the discretion to initiate a PICDRP using the third-party complaint. If a provision regarding fraudulent and deceptive practices would be included in the RA, enforcement would take place through ICANN exclusively. Which option is preferable and why?

204. If you have a response to the question please enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 37:  
Registrar Non-  
Discrimination &  
Registry/Registrar  
Standardization

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

205. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

206. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

207. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

208. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

209. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

**Topic 38:  
Registrar  
Support  
for New  
gTLDs**

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

210. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

211. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

212. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

213. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

214. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---

Topic

39:

Registry

System

Testing

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences, but minor differences include the following:**

- Structural and grammatical changes made for ease of understanding.

215. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

216. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

217. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

218. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

219. Enter your response here:

---



---



---



---



---

Topic  
40:  
TLD  
Rollout

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:  
<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**



220. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

221. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

222. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

223. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

- New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

224. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

Topic 41:  
Contractual  
Compliance

The below description of difference is intended to serve as a resource for readers to better understand which report topics have evolved significantly from the Initial Report to the draft Final Report. The differences are listed in a descriptive fashion and readers should review the full set of Outputs for the relevant topic as a package, to better understand the full context of the Outputs and changes made.

See page X of the draft Final Report:

<https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/g.+Draft+Final+Report>

**Description of Difference: No substantive differences.**

225. If you choose one of the following responses there is no need to submit comments:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Support Output(s) as written
- Not ideal, but willing to accept Outputs as written
- No Opinion

226. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below what should change and why:

*Mark only one oval.*

- Do not support certain aspects or all of the Output(s)

227. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

228. If you choose the following response, please indicate in the text box below the new information or interests that the Working Group has not considered:

*Mark only one oval.*

New information or interests that the Working Group has not considered

229. Enter your response here:

---

---

---

---

---

### Save Your Progress

230. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

- Yes
- No, I would like to continue to the next section

### Section 3: Other Comments & Submission

231. Are there any additional recommendations that you believe the Working Group should consider making? If yes, please provide details below.

---

---

---

---

---

232. Are there any other comments or issues you would like to raise pertaining to the Draft Final Report? If yes, please enter your comments here. If applicable, please specify the line or page number in the Draft Final Report to which your comments refer.

---

---

---

---

---

### Save Your Progress

233. Do you want to save your progress and quit for now? You will be able to return to the form to complete at a later time.

*Mark only one oval.*

Yes

No, I would like to go to another section

---

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.



