# **Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding**

# Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team Draft Report of Recommendations for New gTLDs

Publication Date: July 10, 2017

**Prepared By:** Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team

Public Comment Proceeding		
Open Date:	7 March 2017	
Close Date:	19 May 2017	
Staff Report Due Date:	10 July 2017	

Important Information Links		
<u>Announcement</u>		
Public Comment Proceeding		
View Comments Submitted		

Staff Contact: Karen Mulberry Email: karen.mulberry@icann.org

**Section I: General Overview and Next Steps** 

In its Draft Report, the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCTRT) assesses the New Generic Top-Level Domain (New gTLD) Program in three areas: competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, as well as the effectiveness of safeguards put in place to mitigate issues arising from the introduction of new gTLDs and the Program's application and evaluation process. The review examines the degree to which the process of implementing the New gTLD Program was successful in producing desired results and achieving the stated objectives. The CCTRT is analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data to produce recommendations for the ICANN Board to consider and adopt.

The Draft Report describes 50 recommendations, including several that are considered by the Review Team to be prerequisites to the opening of the next application period for new gTLDs.

The Review Team will carefully consider input received and incorporate it into the next version of its report, as it deems necessary and appropriate. The Draft Final Report will also be published for public comment.

## **Section II: Contributors**

At the time this report was prepared, a total of twenty-four (24) community submissions had been posted to the forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

# Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
.BZH Registry	Mathieu Crédou	MC
GNSO New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP WG	Steve Chan	SC
National Association of Boards of Pharmacy	Gertrude "Gg" Levine	GL
At Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ICANN At-Large staff	ALAC
Canadian International Pharmacy Association	Tim Smith	TS
Registries Stakeholder Group	Stéphane Van Gelder	SVG
Canadian International Pharmacy Association	Tim Smith	TS
NIXI	Siddhart Manohar	SM
Verified Top-Level Domains Consortium	Craig Schwartz	CS
ICANN Business Constituency	Steve DelBianco	SDB
.FEEDBACK PICDRP coalition / Mayer Brown LLP	Brian J. Winterfeldt	BJW
Governmental Advisory Committee	Tom Dale	TD
Com Laude & Valideus	Susan Payne	SP
DomainMondo.com	John Poole	JP
Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group	Rafik Dammak	RD
United Kingdom Government	Mark Carvell	MC
PharmacyChecker.com	Gabriel Levitt	GL
ICANN Organization	Trang Nguyen	TN
International Trademark Association	Lori Schulman	LS

Neustar, Inc.	Donna Austin	DA
Intellectual Property Constituency	Gregory S. Shatan	GSS
At Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)	ICANN At-Large staff	ALAC
United States Government	Ashley Heineman	AH

#### Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Thomas Busse		TB

# **Section III: Summary of Comments**

<u>General Disclaimer</u>: This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

Please refer to the <u>summary of public comments</u>. An overview of input received is available for each recommendation.

### **Section IV: Analysis of Comments**

<u>General Disclaimer</u>: This section intends to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments submitted along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

As part of its analysis, the Review Team has reviewed all public comments received, as appropriate and necessary, and will be addressing the public comment received on its recommendations in its Final Report. Please refer to the <u>summary of public comments</u> for more details.