

Final CCT Recommendations: Board Action (1 March 2019)

Rec #	Recommendation Description	Directed To	Board Action
Recommendations the Board Accepts Subject to Costing and Implementation Considerations			
1	Formalize and promote ongoing data collection.	ICANN organization	Accept the premise of this recommendation, as ICANN continues to be more focused on data collection to support the community's and its work, which necessitates the centralization of data collection. The Board understands the concerns raised by the CCT Review Team about having access to data. As such, the Board requests ICANN org to prepare a framework of data elements to be discussed with the community in relation to the group of data collection recommendations, and respecting the bandwidth of the community, consider appropriate timing and prioritization. The outcome of this work will inform Board's action on the other recommendations focusing on data collection (recommendations 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 16, 20, 23, 24, and 26).
17	ICANN should collect data about and publicize the chain of parties responsible for gTLD domain name registrations.	The ICANN Board, the GNSO Expedited PDP, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization, the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, SSAC	The Board notes that reseller information is already displayed within the publicly available WHOIS, reliant upon all contracted parties complying with ICANN Consensus Policies and contractual obligations to provide such data. To this extent, the recommendation is accepted. The Board notes, however, that the CCT-RT addressed this recommendation to a number of community groups. The Board notes that to the extent these groups may produce policy outcomes that impact this work, those will be taken into account when appropriate.
21	Include more detailed information on the subject matter of complaints in ICANN publicly available compliance reports. Specifically, more precise data on the subject matter of complaints, particularly: (1) the class/type of abuse; (2) the gTLD that is target of the abuse; (3) the safeguard that is at risk; (4) an indication of whether complaints relate to the protection of sensitive health or financial information; (5) what type of contractual breach is being complained of; and (6) resolution status of the complaints, including action details. These details would assist future review teams in their assessment of these safeguards.	ICANN organization	Accept the recommendation. The Board accepts recommendation 21, noting that items (1), (3), (4) and (5) listed within this recommendation are already part of ICANN Contractual Compliance Department's reporting process. In connection with item (2) of the recommendation relating to "the gTLD that is target of the abuse", the Board directs ICANN org to investigate the potential negative impacts of implementing this item on enforcement of compliance, track this effort and propose a mitigation plan in case of any negative effects.
22	Initiate engagement with relevant stakeholders to determine what best practices are being implemented to offer reasonable and appropriate security measures commensurate with the offering of services that involve the gathering of sensitive health and financial information. Such a discussion could include identifying what falls within the categories of "sensitive health and financial information" and what metrics could be used to measure compliance with this safeguard.	ICANN organization	Accept the recommendation. The Board directs ICANN org to initiate engagement within its existing budget, role, and work. The Board notes that while engagement can be initiated, it is unclear that ICANN org may have the ability to collect this data under the current contractual agreements and obligations.
30	Expand and improve outreach into the Global South.	ICANN organization	Accept the recommendation. The Board accepts the recommendation and directs ICANN org to provide the Board with a report on related engagement, noting that if the community wishes to have more resources dedicated to this activity, this should be addressed in the next budget cycle. Given the interdependency between this recommendation and recommendation 29, as both recommendations rely upon the undefined term "Global South", the Board notes that the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG could take on, should they choose to do so, defining the term "Global South" for this purpose in coordination with ICANN org, its engagement teams, and geographic regions definitions to create a workable definition, or agreeing on another term to describe underserved or underrepresented regions or stakeholders in coordination with ICANN org.
31	The ICANN organization to coordinate the pro bono assistance program.	ICANN organization	Accept contingent on the recommendation from the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG that the pro bono assistance program continue.
Recommendations the Board Is Passing Through (In Whole or In Part) to Noted Community Groups for Consideration			
9	The ICANN community should consider whether the costs related to defensive registration for the small number of brands registering a large number of domains can be reduced.	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community groups for their consideration.

		and/or Rights Protection Mechanisms (RPM) PDP Working Group	
10	The GNSO should initiate a new Policy Development Process (PDP) to create a consistent privacy baseline across all registries, including to explicitly cover cases of privacy infringements such as sharing or selling personal data without a lawful basis, such as the consent of that person. The GNSO PDP should consider limiting the collection and processing of personal data within rules which are mandatory for all gTLD registries. It should also consider not allowing registries to share personal data with third parties without a lawful basis, such as the consent of that person or under circumstances defined by applicable law (e.g. upon requests of government agencies, IP lawyers, etc.). Also, it is necessary to be aware of emerging, applicable regulations related to the processing of the personal data. For clarification, this recommendation does not relate to issues involving WHOIS or registration directory services data.	Generic Names Supporting Organization	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community group for their consideration.
12	Create incentives and/or eliminate current disincentives that encourage gTLD registries to meet user expectations regarding: (1) the relationship of content of a gTLD to its name; (2) restrictions as to who can register a domain name in certain gTLDs based upon implied messages of trust conveyed by the name of its gTLDs (particularly in sensitive or regulated industries) and (3) the safety and security of users' personal and sensitive information (including health and financial information). These incentives could relate to applicants who choose to make public interest commitments in their applications that relate to these expectations. Ensure that applicants for any subsequent rounds are aware of these public expectations by inserting information about the results of the ICANN surveys in the Applicant Guide Books.	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community group for their consideration.
16 ¹	Further study the relationship between specific registry operators, registrars, and DNS Security Abuse by commissioning ongoing data collection, including but not limited to, ICANN Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) initiatives. For transparency purposes, this information should be regularly published, ideally quarterly and no less than annually, in order to be able to identify registries and registrars that need to come under greater scrutiny, investigation, and potential enforcement action by ICANN organization. Upon identifying abuse phenomena, ICANN should put in place an action plan to respond to such studies, remedy problems identified, and define future ongoing data collection.	The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization, and the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, SSR2 Review Team.	[This action pertains to a portion of the recommendation language - refer to bold text.] Note the portion of the recommendation and pass it through to the noted community groups for consideration. The Board is not accepting the policy directives that may be inherent here but rather, passes on such elements of the recommendation to the relevant community groups to consider.
19	The next CCT should review the "Framework for Registry Operator to Respond to Security Threats" and assess whether the framework is a sufficiently clear and effective mechanism to mitigate abuse by providing for systemic and specified actions in response to security threats.	Future CCT Review Teams	Note the recommendation and direct ICANN org to pass it along as input to the next CCT review for its consideration recognizing that the CCT Review Teams have the ability to set their charter according to the Bylaws and the Board cannot mandate their scope/charter.
20 ²	Assess whether mechanisms to report and handle complaints have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse by determining: (1) the volume of reports of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD that registries receive from governmental and quasi-governmental agencies; (2) the volume of inquiries that registries receive from the public related to malicious conduct in the TLD; (3) whether more efforts are needed to publicize contact points to report complaints that involve abuse or illegal behavior within a TLD; and (4) what actions registries have taken to respond to complaints of illegal or malicious conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. Such efforts could include surveys, focus groups, or community discussions. If these methods proved ineffective, consideration could be given to amending future standard Registry Agreements to require registries to more prominently disclose their abuse points of contact and provide more granular information to ICANN. Once this information is gathered, future review teams should consider recommendations for appropriate follow up measures.	ICANN organization and future CCT Review Teams	[This action pertains to a portion of the recommendation language - refer to bold text.] Note the portion of the recommendation and pass it through to the noted group, recognizing that the CCT Review Teams have the ability to set their charter according to the Bylaws and the Board cannot mandate their scope/charter.
25	To the extent voluntary commitments are permitted in future gTLD application processes, all such commitments made by a gTLD applicant must state their intended goal and be submitted during the application process so that there is sufficient opportunity for community review and time to meet the deadlines for community and Limited Public Interest objections. Furthermore, such requirements should apply to the extent that voluntary commitments may be made after delegation. Such voluntary commitments, including existing voluntary PICs, should be made accessible in an organized, searchable online database to enhance data-driven policy development, community transparency, ICANN compliance, and the awareness of variables relevant to DNS abuse trends.	ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community group, noting that ICANN org's role is to implement the adopted recommendations resulting from the Sub Pro PDP WG's work. To the extent that policies are adopted consistent with the recommendations, ICANN org will update the Applicant Guide Book (AGB) accordingly.

¹ The Board is also taking action to place portions of Recommendation 16 into Pending Status in order to direct ICANN org to conduct further work.

² The Board is also taking action to place portions of Recommendation 20 into Pending Status in order to direct ICANN org to conduct further work.

27	Since the review team's initial draft recommendation, the PDP "Review of All Rights Protection Mechanisms in All gTLDs (RPM WG)" has started reviewing the Uniform Rapid Suspension system in detail and this is currently ongoing. Given this ongoing review, the CCT Review Team recommends that the RPM WG continues its review of the URS and also looks into the interoperability of the URS with the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP). Given the current timeline, it would appear that the appropriate time to do so will be when the UDRP review is carried out by the PDP WG and at this time consideration be given to how it should interoperate with the UDRP. The review team has encountered a lack of data for complete analysis in many respects. The RPM PDP WG appears to also be encountering this issue and this may well prevent it drawing firm conclusions. If modifications are not easily identified, then the review team recommends continued monitoring until more data is collected and made available for a review at a later date.	Generic Names Supporting Organization	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community group for their consideration.
28	A cost-benefit analysis and review of the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) and its scope should be carried out to provide quantifiable information on the costs and benefits associated with the present state of the TMCH services and thus to allow for an effective policy review. ⁴⁰ Since our initial draft recommendation, the RPM PDP has started reviewing the TMCH in detail and ICANN has appointed Analysis Group to develop and conduct the survey(s) to assess the use and effectiveness of the Sunrise and Trademark Claims RPMs. Provided that the RPM PDP has sufficient data from this survey or other surveys and is able to draw firm conclusions, the CCT Review Team does not consider that an additional review is necessary. However, the CCT Review Team reiterates its recommendation for a cost-benefit analysis to be carried out if such analysis can enable objective conclusions to be drawn. Such cost-benefit analysis should include but not necessarily be limited to looking at cost to brand owners, cost to registries, and cost to registrars of operating with the TMCH now and going forward and look at the interplay with premium pricing.	Generic Names Supporting Organization	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community group for their consideration.
29	Set objectives/metrics for applications from the Global South.	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group/Generic Supporting Names Organization	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community groups for their consideration. Given the interdependency between this recommendation and recommendation 30, as both recommendations rely upon the same undefined term "Global South", the Board notes that the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG could take on, should they choose to do so, defining the term "Global South" in coordination with ICANN org, its engagement teams, and geographic regions definitions to create a workable definition, or agreeing on another term to describe underserved or underrepresented regions or stakeholders in coordination with ICANN org.
32	Revisit the Applicant Support Program.	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community group for their consideration. The Board notes that this topic is being discussed in the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG and expectation is for a high-level program/guidance to be provided as a result of this work.
33	As required by the October 2016 Bylaws, Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) consensus advice to the Board regarding gTLDs should also be clearly enunciated, actionable, and accompanied by a rationale, permitting the Board to determine how to apply that advice. ICANN should provide a template to the GAC for advice related to specific TLDs, in order to provide a structure that includes all of these elements. In addition to providing a template, the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) should clarify the process and timelines by which GAC advice is expected for individual TLDs.	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group, GAC, ICANN organization	Note the recommendation and pass through to the noted community groups for their consideration. The Board notes that the Board-GAC Working Group could also serve as a valuable contributor to this work as that is an avenue for the Board and GAC to work together on receiving/acting on advice. Outputs of that work could inform the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG on how the GAC should be able to provide advice on individual gTLDs. The Board notes that the outcomes of that work could be improved if the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG and the GAC are able to work together on templates, timelines, etc.
34	A thorough review of the procedures and objectives for community-based applications should be carried out and improvements made to address and correct the concerns raised before a new gTLD application process is launched. Revisions or adjustments should be clearly reflected in an updated version of the 2012 AGB.	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community group for their consideration.
35	The New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP should consider adopting new policies to avoid the potential for inconsistent results in string confusion objections. In particular, the PDP should consider the following possibilities: 1. Determining through the initial string similarity review process that singular and plural versions of the same gTLD string should not be delegated. 2. Avoiding disparities in similar disputes by ensuring that all similar cases of plural versus singular strings	New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group	Note the recommendation and pass the recommendation through to the noted community group for their consideration.

	are examined by the same expert panelist. 3. Introducing a post-dispute resolution panel review mechanism.		
Recommendations the Board Is Placing In “Pending” Status [In Whole or In Part]			
2	Collect wholesale pricing for legacy gTLDs.	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status due to questions raised about the value of the data. The Board directs ICANN org, through engagement of a third party, to conduct an analysis to identify what types of data would be relevant in examining the potential impacts on competition and, whether that data is available, and how it could be collected in order to benefit the work of future CCT Review Teams. This analysis will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
3	Collect transactional pricing for the gTLD marketplace.	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status due to questions raised about the value of the data. The Board directs ICANN org, through engagement of a third party, to conduct an analysis to identify what types of data would be relevant in examining the potential impacts on competition and, whether that data is available, and how it could be collected in order to benefit the work of future CCT Review Teams. This analysis will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
4	Collect retail pricing for the domain marketplace.	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status due to questions raised about the value of the data. The Board directs ICANN org, through engagement of a third party, to conduct an analysis to identify what types of data would be relevant in examining the potential impacts on competition and, whether that data is available, and how it could be collected in order to benefit the work of future CCT Review Teams. This analysis will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
5	Collect secondary market data.	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status due to questions raised about the value of the data and direct ICANN org, through engagement of a third party, to conduct an analysis to identify what types of data would be relevant in examining the potential impacts on competition and, whether that data is available, and how it could be collected in order to benefit the work of future CCT Review Teams. This analysis will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
6	Partner with mechanisms and entities involved with the collection of TLD data. As feasible, collect TLD registration number data per TLD and registrar at a country-by-country level in order to perform analysis based on the same methods used in the Latin American and Caribbean DNS Marketplace (LAC) Study.	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status. ICANN org already has access to and has shared some data that serves this request, though it is unclear the scope of further collection that is feasible or available. The Board directs ICANN org to conduct a gap analysis and feasibility assessment to inform potential action on this recommendation. Additionally, the outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
7	Collect domain usage data to better understand the implications of parked domains	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status. The outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
8	Conduct periodic surveys of registrants that gathers both objective and subjective information with a goal of creating more concrete and actionable information.	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status. The Board notes that ICANN org has already conducted periodic surveys, so work toward this recommendation has already taken place. The Board directs ICANN org to perform a gap analysis over the what has already been completed towards this recommendation and measured against broader community considerations of information that might be needed to support future community efforts. Once the scope of such surveys is better defined, the Board directs ICANN org to advise on what the cost of implementation would be. Additionally, outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.

11	Conduct periodic end-user consumer surveys. Future review teams should work with survey experts to conceive more behavioral measures of consumer trust that gather both objective and subjective data with a goal toward generating more concrete and actionable information.	ICANN organization and future CCT Review Teams	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status. As ICANN org has already conducted such surveys, the Board directs ICANN org to perform a full impact assessment on whether there will be any duplication of work or gap analysis. Once the scope of such surveys is better defined, Board directs ICANN org to advise on what the cost of implementation would be. Additionally, the outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
13	ICANN should collect data in conjunction with its related data collection activities on the impact of restrictions on who can buy domains within certain new gTLDs (registration restrictions) to help regularly determine and report: 1. Whether consumers and registrants are aware that certain new gTLDs have registration restrictions; 2. Compare consumer trust levels between new gTLDs with varying degrees of registration restrictions; 3. Determine whether the lower abuse rates associated with gTLDs that impose stricter registration policies identified in the Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in gTLDs Study continue to be present within new gTLDs that impose registration restrictions as compared with new gTLDs that do not 4. Assess the costs and benefits of registration restrictions to contracted parties and the public (to include impacts on competition and consumer choice) and; 5. Determine whether and how such registration restrictions are enforced or challenged.	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status. The Board directs ICANN org to consider if there are already effort that could be leveraged to meet this recommendation, such as the continuation of the previous DNS abuse study. In considering potential implementation, the Board also directs ICANN org to consider availability of data as part of its planning efforts, and the types of information that are available through contract as opposed to voluntary compliance through contracted parties. Additionally, the outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
14	Consider directing ICANN organization, in its discussions with registries, to negotiate amendments to existing Registry Agreements, or in consideration of new Registry Agreements associated with subsequent rounds of new gTLDs, to include provisions in the agreements to provide incentives, including financial incentives for registries, especially open registries, to adopt proactive anti-abuse measures.	The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization, and the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG.	Place this recommendation in “Pending” status. The Board directs ICANN org to facilitate community efforts to develop a definition of “abuse” to inform further action on this recommendation. To negotiate “anti-abuse measures”, a common understanding of what “abuse” means must first be reached.
15	ICANN Org should, in its discussions with registrars and registries, negotiate amendments to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement and Registry Agreements to include provisions aimed at preventing systemic use of specific registrars or registries for DNS Security Abuse. With a view to implementing this recommendation as early as possible, and provided this can be done, then this could be brought into effect by a contractual amendment through the bilateral review of the Agreements. In particular, ICANN should establish thresholds of abuse at which compliance inquiries are automatically triggered, with a higher threshold at which registrars and registries are presumed to be in default of their agreements. If the community determines that ICANN org itself is ill-suited or unable to enforce such provisions, a DNS Abuse Dispute Resolution Policy (DADRP) should be considered as an additional means to enforce policies and deter against DNS Security Abuse. Furthermore, defining and identifying DNS Security Abuse is inherently complex and would benefit from analysis by the community, and thus we specifically recommend that the ICANN Board prioritize and support community work in this area to enhance safeguards and trust due to the negative impact of DNS Security Abuse on consumers and other users of the Internet.	The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization and the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG	Place this recommendation in “Pending” status. The Board directs ICANN org to facilitate community efforts to develop a definition of “abuse” to inform further action on this recommendation. To negotiate amendments to address DNS Security Abuse measures, a common understanding of what “abuse” means must first be reached.
16 ³	Further study the relationship between specific registry operators, registrars, and DNS Security Abuse by commissioning ongoing data collection, including but not limited to, ICANN Domain Abuse Activity Reporting (DAAR) initiatives. For transparency purposes, this information should be regularly published, ideally quarterly and no less than annually, in order to be able to identify registries and registrars that need to come under greater scrutiny, investigation, and potential enforcement action by ICANN organization. Upon identifying abuse phenomena, ICANN should put in place an action plan to respond to such studies, remedy problems identified, and define future ongoing data collection.	The ICANN Board, the Registry Stakeholders Group, the Registrar Stakeholders Group, the Generic Names Supporting Organization, and the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG, SSR2 Review Team.	[This action pertains to a portion of the recommendation language - refer to bold text.] Place these two elements of the recommendation in “Pending status” and directs ICANN org to conduct a gap analysis of the study suggested by the CCT-RT compared to existing collection effort to inform usefulness of the study, and to inform whether establishing future ongoing data collection would be meaningful. The analysis should take into account the work that the org is already performing, such as Contractual Compliance audits. Additionally, the outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.

³ The Board is also taking action to pass through portions of Recommendation 16 to the community groups with the appropriate remit.

18	<p>In order for the upcoming WHOIS Review Team to determine whether additional steps are needed to improve WHOIS accuracy, and whether to proceed with the identity phase of the Accuracy Reporting System (ARS) project, ICANN should gather data to assess whether a significant percentage of WHOIS-related complaints applicable to new gTLDs relate to the accuracy of the identity of the registrant.³⁰ This should include analysis of WHOIS accuracy complaints received by ICANN Contractual Compliance to identify the subject matter of the complaints (e.g., complaints about syntax, operability, or identity). The volume of these complaints between legacy gTLDs and new gTLDs should also be compared. ICANN should also identify other potential data sources of WHOIS complaints beyond those that are contractually required (including but not limited to complaints received directly by registrars, registries, ISPs, etc.) and attempt to obtain anonymized data from these sources. Future CCT Reviews may then also use these data.</p>	ICANN organization to gather required data, and to provide data to relevant review teams to consider the results and, if warranted, to assess feasibility and desirability of moving to identity validation phase of WHOIS ARS project.	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status until such time that the Board receives the RDS-WHOIS2 Final Report and has an opportunity to consider, with ICANN org, the interdependency with this recommendation. Upon release of the RDS-WHOIS2 Final Report, the Board directs ICANN org to perform a gap analysis of the types of information available to the RDS-WHOIS2 and the information the CCT-RT recommended to be available to that team, and to provide the Board with inputs on whether additional work is required to address this recommendation 18. This will inform Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation. Note that the CCT-RT started its work long before the RDS-WHOIS2 Review began, and while the CCT-RT work was pending, the RDS-WHOIS2 Review Team completed its work and plans to publish its Final Report shortly.
20 ⁴	<p>Assess whether mechanisms to report and handle complaints have led to more focused efforts to combat abuse by determining: (1) the volume of reports of illegal conduct in connection with the use of the TLD that registries receive from governmental and quasi-governmental agencies; (2) the volume of inquiries that registries receive from the public related to malicious conduct in the TLD; (3) whether more efforts are needed to publicize contact points to report complaints that involve abuse or illegal behavior within a TLD; and (4) what actions registries have taken to respond to complaints of illegal or malicious conduct in connection with the use of the TLD. Such efforts could include surveys, focus groups, or community discussions. If these methods proved ineffective, consideration could be given to amending future standard Registry Agreements to require registries to more prominently disclose their abuse points of contact and provide more granular information to ICANN. Once this information is gathered, future review teams should consider recommendations for appropriate follow up measures.</p>	ICANN organization and future CCT Review Teams	[This action pertains to a portion of the recommendation language - refer to bold text.] Place this recommendation in “Pending” status. The Board notes that this recommendation contains elements that are outside of ICANN org’s role (i.e. amendments to contractual agreements), while other elements of this recommendation are costly and will require community input for prioritization and cost/benefit analysis (i.e. data collection). Furthermore, the Board agrees that anti-abuse measures are very important and notes that ICANN org has already implemented initiatives to that end; namely, DAAR, Identifier Technology Health Indicators, and Spec 11(3)(B). The Board directs ICANN org to perform an analysis of the work/initiatives already underway to determine any gaps in work currently in progress and what work recommendation entails. The Board will then review the results of the analysis and determine the best action on this recommendation, insofar as it falls within the ICANN Board or org’s remit. Additionally, the outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
23	<p>ICANN should gather data on new gTLDs operating in highly-regulated sectors to include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A survey to determine: 1) the steps registry operators are taking to establish working relationships with relevant government or industry bodies; and 2) the volume of complaints received by registrants from government and regulatory bodies and their standard practices to respond to those complaints. - A review of a sample of domain websites within the highly-regulated sector category to assess whether contact information to file complaints is sufficiently easy to find. - An inquiry to ICANN Contractual Compliance and registrars/resellers of highly regulated domains seeking sufficiently detailed information to determine the volume and the subject matter of complaints regarding domains in highly regulated industries. - An inquiry to registry operators to obtain data to compare rates of abuse between those highly-regulated gTLDs that have voluntarily agreed to verify and validate credentials to those highly-regulated gTLDs that have not. - An audit to assess whether restrictions regarding possessing necessary credentials are being enforced by auditing registrars and resellers offering the highly-regulated TLDs (i.e., can an individual or entity without the proper credentials buy a highly-regulated domain?). <p>To the extent that current ICANN data collection initiatives and compliance audits could contribute to these efforts, we recommend that ICANN assess the most efficient way to proceed to avoid duplication of effort and leverage current work.</p>	ICANN organization, New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status and request ICANN org to provide a report on volume and nature of complaints received regarding gTLDs operating in highly-regulated sectors. This report will inform Board’s decision on next steps and whether the data warrants conducting audits or requesting further information from contracted parties. Additionally, the outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.
24	<p>a. Determine whether ICANN Contractual Compliance should report on a quarterly basis whether it has received complaints for a registry operator’s failure to comply with either the safeguard related to gTLDs with inherent governmental functions or the safeguard related to cyberbullying.</p> <p>b. Survey registries to determine: 1) whether they receive complaints related to cyberbullying and misrepresenting a governmental affiliation; and 2) how they enforce these safeguards.</p>	ICANN organization	Place the recommendation in “Pending” status and request ICANN org to identify where there is a gap between work currently in progress and what the recommendation entails. Once the gap analysis is completed, ICANN org will share the findings with the community to ensure alignment on next steps and any changes that need to be made. This analysis will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation. Additionally, the outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.

⁴ The Board is also taking action to pass through portions of Recommendation 20 to the community groups with the appropriate remit.

26	<p>A study to ascertain the impact of the New gTLD Program on the costs required to protect trademarks in the expanded DNS space should be repeated at regular intervals to see the evolution over time of those costs. The CCT Review Team recommends that the next study be completed within 18 months after issuance of the CCT Final Report, and that subsequent studies be repeated every 18 to 24 months.</p> <p>The CCT Review Team acknowledges that the Nielsen survey of INTA members in 2017 intended to provide such guidance yielded a lower response rate than anticipated. We recommend a more user friendly and perhaps shorter survey to help ensure a higher and more statistically significant response rate.</p>	ICANN organization	<p>Place the recommendation in “Pending” status and direct ICANN org to do an in-depth analysis of the value of data, the usefulness of the study, the cost associated with conducting the studies and the interdependencies with other relevant studies. Upon the completion of this analysis, and given all other studies requested in the CCT Final Report, the community should determine the priority levels for all relevant studies. The Board notes that the cost and prioritization could impact timing and ability to meet the requested 18-month implementation. Additionally, the outcome of the implementation of Recommendation 1 will inform the Board’s decision on next steps and whether this recommendation can be adopted to move into costing discussion phase of implementation.</p>