Your name:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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)** |
|  | The Working Group notes that if an applicant proposes changes to the application in response to public comments, additional processes apply, including an additional public comment period, where applicable. Please see section xx Application Change Requests for discussion of processes related to changes in the application. | 2.3 (p.45)Rationale for Recommendation xx and Implementation Guidance xx (rationale 5): | The Working Group notes that if an applicant proposes changes to the application in response to public comments, additional processes apply, including an additional public comment period, where applicable. Please see section xx Application Change Requests for discussion of processes related to changes in the application, ***with notification to the extent possible of those who made the requests for proposed changes.***   | We have asked for ICANN to collect information about the commenters, including email, so it should be relatively easy to notify commenters that, in response to public comment, a proposed change has been made (and fair too). Letting those providing the original comments know that a directly-related change has been proposed to the application and a public comment period has opened seems an easy follow-on to continue the discussion and foster review the proposed change.  |
|  | Recommendation xx (rationale 4): TLDs that have exemptions from the Code of Conduct (Specification 9), including .Brand TLDs qualified for Specification 13, must also receive an exemption from COI requirements or requirements for the successor to the COI.  | 2.7.2, p.47 | COI –> Conflict of Interest? Continuing Operations Instrument? | Recommend few abbreviations – life is hard enough for our readers ☺.  |
|  | Rationale for Affirmation xx and Implementation Guidance xx (rationale 2): The Working Group notes that PIRR recommendation 2.2.a states: “Consider whether background screening should be performed during IE or at the time of contract execution.” The Working Group reviewed that in the 2012 round, background screening took place during Initial Evaluation. Per the PIRR, | 2.7.2, p. 47 | PIRR -> I don’t even remember what this means.  | Ditto to above.  |
|  | Applications will not automatically be placed in the same contention set because they appear visually to be a single and plural of one another but have different intended uses. For example, .SPRING and .SPRINGS could both be allowed if one refers to the season and the other refers to elastic objects, because they are not singular and plural versions of the same word. However, if both are intended to be used in connection with the elastic object, then they will be placed into the same contention set. Similarly, if an existing TLD .SPRING is used in connection with the season and a new application for .SPRINGS is intended to be used in connection with elastic objects, the new application will not be automatically disqualified. | 2.7.4, pp.49-50 | Question/clarification. | What if they are both open gTLDs without specific use specified; or one is specific use, e.g., elastics, and one is open?  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |