Your name: Anne Aikman-Scalese (IPC)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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)** |
|  | No text exists re external efforts | 2.2.1.d. | In light of all the text in Rationale 1 and references to the March 1, 2019 Board Resolution, Section 2.2.1.d. should refer to Jeff Neuman’s letter to the GNSO Council re DNS Abuse | Add the following: The Working Group Chair has directed a letter to GNSO Council relative to addressing CCT-RT recommendations re DNS Abuse holistically. The letter is dated \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and is attached to this report as \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. |
|  | “It should not be possible to apply for a string that is still being processed from a previous application round…” | 2.2.3  Implementation Guidance xx (Rationale 2) | Dissenting Views should be noted in the draft final report with more prominence and particularity as to the rationale for the Dissenting View. | Dissenting View: In recognition Principle G, Applicant Freedom of Expression, timely applications for any string previously applied for but not yet delegated should be permitted, but such applications should not be processed further unless and until the matching  string from the previous round has been classified as “Will Not Proceed:”.  **ADD the following to text on page 28:**  The stated rationale for the Dissenting View was that applicants from prior rounds would retain too much power to (a) insist on non-compliance with new policy requirements applicable to subsequent procedures and (b) be able to effectively block later applicants for the same string who are willing to comply with new subsequent procedures policy requirements. Examples provided related to evolving name collisions policy and closed generics policy. |
|  | “More specifically, prior to the commencement of the next Application Submission Period, ICANN shall publish either (a) the date in which the next subsequent round of new gTLDs will take place or (b) the specific set of criteria and/or events that must occur prior to the opening up of the next subsequent round” | 2.2.3  Recommendation xx (Rationale 2) | What do we mean by the use of the word, “shall”? Do we mean ICANN “must”? Or ICANN “should”? This is a Recommendation so we need to be very specific.  What are the conventions in relation to the use of the terms, “shall”, “must”, and “should” in the draft Final Report? | Suggest we replace “shall” with “must” if that is what we mean. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |