Statement of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group on the [GNSO Community Comment 2 (CC2) on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process](#)

1. The Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group (NCSG) welcomes the opportunity to provide the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group with input on revisions which we request be made to existing new gTLD policy recommendations.

2. This public comment was divided into four work tracks. To aid in your analysis of our comments, we will group our remarks by these work tracks.

Work Track 1 - Overall Process, Support, and Outreach

3. The introduction of new top-level domain names is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, it represents an answer to a long-standing demand from potential applicants for additional new top-level domains. Secondly, it aids consumer choice through the potential to promote competition in the provision of registry services, , market differentiation, and geographical and service-provider diversity. These are all factors which should be taken into consideration by this community.

4. Efficiency, security, and stability are principles that must be guaranteed, therefore we strongly believe in the (a) accreditation processes for the Registry Service Providers (RSPs), (b) periodic evaluations for the RSPs in order to see if they meet the requirements of the program, and (c) the importance of creating a process through which to continually and consistently reassess the approved RSPs on a periodic basis.

5. Regarding the application process, granting support for applicants from developing countries, whether it is financial or not, is key given the fact that it increases global diversity and reduces the disadvantages that may keep applicants from these regions from participating in the New gTLD Program. We believe that either a better advertisement of the existence of the Applicant Support Program to these countries or the implementation of an exclusive round for applicants from developing countries would raise awareness and eventually result in increasing of the number of new gTLDs applications. Also, regarding the period of application and posterior evaluation, it would be clearer if there were rounds of applications followed by evaluation periods, instead of a single continuous process. Another suggestion would be to announce either via a webinar or an open call for an application tutoring process prior to the submission dates.

6. Also, the effort of having a more extensively publicized Applicant Guidebook directed to developing countries and also translating it to as many languages as possible would help in outreaching to as many prospective applicants as possible, acknowledging that Applicant Guidebook was translated to the UN languages.

Work Track 2 - Legal, Regulatory and Contractual Requirements

7.   We believe that a single base agreement applicable to all with specifications serving as additional contractual requirements that are required for specific registries category types would be the ideal model.

Work Track 3 - String Contention Objections and Disputes

9.   Regarding the 2007's Final Report recommendations 2, 3, 6, 12 and 20, NCSG presents the following considerations:

   A.   New gTLD Applicant Freedom of Expression – The goal of balancing the rights of applicants and rights holders settled by the Final Report on new gTLDs must continue with special attention to whether the GAC's Advice, Community processes or the reserved names have impacted this goal in any way. Bearing in mind that providing an adequate consideration to the protection of Human Rights, and therefore, the right of freedom of expression, freedom of association, freedom of religion and principle of non discrimination are of utmost importance in this process.

   B.   Community Applications and Community Priority – Also, both the Community Community Priority Evaluation process and the Panel should be more transparent as there are often doubts regarding the Panel's decision making process and the dissatisfaction with the results by the community based applicants or the ousted ones.

   C.   Evaluations String Similarity – String evaluation should be consistent and effective in avoiding confusion and loss of confidence in the DNS with the eventual delegation of strings similar to existing TLDs or reserved names. Therefore the adoption of efficient and fair resolution mechanisms is key. Last but not least, there should be longer periods for applicants to submit String Confusion Objections based on the String Similarity Review given the possibility of receiving delayed reviews caused by unique factors such as the high volume of unique strings.

   D.   Accountability Mechanisms – This topic is an exclusivity of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures as the work and further recommendations of the Cross Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability with the revision of the accountability mechanisms should be taken into consideration on this topic.

Conclusion

10.   We are grateful for this opportunity to share our views and trust you will find our recommendations helpful. As you move forward with your work, we ask that you please keep the NCSG updated on your progress.