

Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding

Competition, Consumer Trust, and Consumer Choice Review Team – New Sections to Draft Report of Recommendations

Publication Date: 15 February 2018

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

Public Comment Proceeding

Open Date: 27 Nov 2017

Close Date: 15 Jan 2018

Staff Report Due Date: 15 Feb 2018

Important Information Links

[Announcement](#)

[Public Comment Proceeding](#)

[View Comments Submitted](#)

Staff Contact: Negar Farzinnia

Email: negar.farzinnia@icann.org

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

The purpose of this second call for input was to gather community input on the new sections to the draft report (previously [published for public comment](#) on 7 March 2017).

In its draft report, the Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team (CCT) 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 CCT is analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data to produce recommendations for the ICANN Board to consider and adopt (as appropriate).

New sections to the draft report include new findings and recommendations, pertaining to DNS abuse, costs to trademark holders, parking and consumer choice related sections. The CCT Review Team reflected results from the "Statistical Analysis of DNS Abuse in gTLDs" Report (see [here](#) for more information) and addressed costs to trademark holders, based on a survey conducted by the International Trademark Association (INTA) (see [here](#) [PDF, 1.4 MB] for more information).

The CCT Review Team will carefully consider input received as it shapes its final recommendations for Board consideration.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of seventeen (17) 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
Verified Top-Level Domains Consortium	Craig Schwartz	CS
National Association of Boards of Pharmacy	Gertrude "Gg" Levine	GL
Messaging, Malware and Mobile Anti-Abuse Working Group	Jerry Upton	JU
International Trademark Association	Lori Schulman	LS
Registries Stakeholder Group	Stéphane Van Gelder	SVG
Brand Registry Group	Martin Sutton	MS
At-Large	ICANN Policy Staff	ALAC
Intellectual Property Constituency	Brian Scarpelli	BS
Registrar Stakeholder Group	Zoe Bonython	ZB
www.hosterstats.com	John McCormac	JMC
Non Commercial Stakeholders Group	Rafik Dammak	RD
Business Constituency	Steve DelBianco	SDB
Governmental Advisory Committee	Fabien Betremieux	FB
ICANN organization	Trang Nguyen	TN

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Kiran Kumar		KK
Aaron Pace		AP
A concerned anonymous registrar		

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: 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 [summary of public comments](#) [XLSX, 715KB]. An overview of input received is available for each recommendation.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: *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 CCT Review Team has reviewed all public comments received and will address the public comment received on its recommendations in its final report, as it deems appropriate and necessary. Please refer to the summary of public comments for more details.