Work Track 3 - String Contention Objections and Disputes

3.1 Objections

3.1.1 - Do you think that the policy recommendations (Recommendations 2, 3, 6, and 20) require any modifications? If so, what would you suggest?

3.1.2 - Do you believe that those recommendations (which led to the establishment of the String Confusion, Legal Rights, Limited Public Interest, and Community Objections grounds) were implemented effectively and in the spirit of the original policy recommendations?

3.1.3 - Do you believe there were any issues with standing requirements as defined in the Applicant Guidebook (AGB), or as carried out by the providers?

3.1.4 - Do you believe there is evidence of decisions that were inconsistent with other similar objections, the original policy recommendations, or the AGB?

3.1.5 - Are you aware of any instances where any party or parties attempted to 'game' the Objections procedures in the 2012 round? If so, please provide examples and any evidence you may have available.

3.1.6 - Do you believe that the use of an Independent Objector is warranted in future rounds? If not, then why? If yes, then would you propose any restrictions or modifications be placed on the IO in future rounds?

3.1.7 - Do you believe that parties to disputes should be able to choose between 1 and 3 member panels and should the costs of objections reflect that choice?

3.1.8 - Many community members have highlighted the high costs of objections. Do you believe that the costs of objections created a negative impact on their usage? If so, do you have suggestion for improving this issue? Are there issues beyond cost that might impact access, by various parties, to objections?

3.2 New gTLD Applicant Freedom of Expression

3.3 Community Applications (Community Priority Evaluations)

3.3.1 - There is a general sentiment that the CPE process did not provide consistency and predictability in the 2012 round. Do you believe this was the case and if so, do you have examples or evidence of these issues?

3.3.2 - Do you believe that the implementation and delivery of CPE was true to the policy recommendations and implementation guidance provided by the GNSO? If no, do you have suggested improvements to either the policy/implementation guidance or implementation?

3.3.3 - CPE was the one instance in the New gTLD Program where there an element of a comparative evaluation and such, there are inherently winners and losers created. Do you believe there is a need for community priority, or a similar mechanism, in subsequent procedures?

3.3.5 - Were the rights of communities (e.g., freedom of expression, freedom of association, freedom of religion, and principle of non-discrimination) infringed by the New gTLD Program?

3.3.6 - Besides CPE, are there other aspects of the New gTLD Program related to communities that should be considered in a more holistic fashion?

3.4 String Similarity (Evaluations)

3.4.1 - There was a perception that that consistency and predictability of the string similarity needs to be improved? Do you have examples or evidence of issues? If so, do you have suggested changes to the policy recommendations or implementation that may lead to improvement? For instance, should the standard of string confusion that the evaluation panel used be updated or refined in any way?

3.4.2 - Should the approach for string similarity in gTLDs be harmonized with how they are handled in ccTLDs?

3.4.3 - The WG, as well as the wider community, have noted issues specifically related to singles and plurals. Do you have suggestions on how develop guidance on singles and plurals that will lead to predictable outcomes?

3.4.4 - Do you believe that there should be some sort of mechanism to allow for a change of applied-for TLD when it is determined to be in contention with one or more other strings? If so, do you suggestions on a workable mechanism?

3.4.5 - Do you feel that the contention resolution mechanisms from the 2012 round (i.e., CPE and last-resort auctions) met the needs of the program in a sufficient manner?

3.5 Accountability Mechanisms

3.5.1 - Do you believe that the existing accountability mechanisms (Request for Reconsideration, Independent Review Process, and the Ombudsman) are adequate avenues to address issues encountered in the New gTLD Program?

3.5.2 - Should there be appeal mechanisms introduced into the program? If yes, for what areas of the program (e.g., evaluations, objections, CPE)? Do you have suggestions for high level requirements (e.g., if the appeal should limited to procedural and/or substantive issues, who conducts the review, who is the final arbiter, safeguards against abuse, etc.)