Your name: Kathy Kleiman

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Applicable text (please quote directly)** | **Number and name of applicable report section** | **Cannot live with rationale** | **Proposed changes (taking into account whether others would be able to live with them)** |
|  | Namely, if communications and outreach efforts are effective prior to the point at which the window opens, prospective applicants will be prepared to apply and will therefore need less time to actually submit the application. | Page 14, b, first paragraph | It’s unclear in current text who should be reponsivle for the communications and outreach efforts. Since it’s ICANN, we should make that quite clear. It’s ICANN’s outreach into communities around the world, including the Global South, that will help to generate the diversity of applications we are seeking. | Namely, if **ICANN’s** communications and outreach efforts are effective prior to the point at which the window opens, prospective applicants will be prepared to apply and will therefore need less time to actually submit the [application. |
|  | Implementation Guidance xx (rationale 1): Fees for the technical and operational evaluation for the core registry services should be charged to an applicant if they are using a registry service provider that is not pre-evaluated (“Technical Evaluation Fee”). The Technical Evaluation Fee should be the same regardless of whether the evaluation occurs as part of the Pre-Evaluation Process or as part of the application process. For example, if the Technical Evaluation Fee portion of the overall Application Fee is $US25,000, that portion of the Application Fee should only be charged to those applicants that do not select a pre-evaluated registry service provider. |  |  | For example, if the Technical Evaluation Fee portion of the overall Application Fee is $US25,000, that portion of the Application Fee should only be charged to those applicants that do not select a pre-evaluated registry service provider **(which has not been removed from the pre-evaluated registry acceptance list and does not have major incident reports pending against it).** |
|  | Allow autofill in applications for all questions but Questions 16, 18(a), 18(b), 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 (but only if additional services are specified) | 2.4.3. – p. 7 – 5th bullet point | Applicants should not automatically autofill all pre-approved services at the time of application and wait until after application to specify additional services. These fields, and their differentiation, is critical for public review. Plus this was the agreement after extensive discussion.  Also the “but” is slightly ambiguous in this context. | Allow autofill in applications for all questions **except** Questions 16, 18(a), 18(b), 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23 **which must each be individually filled out.**  **Delete: “**(but only if additional services are specified)” |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |