Your name: Anne Aikman-Scalese

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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)** |
|  | Recommendation xx: Other than the types listed in Recommendation xx, creating additional application types must only be done under exceptional circumstances. Creating additional application types, string types, or applicant types must be done solely when differential treatment is warranted and is NOT intended to validate or invalidate any other differences in applications.Implementation Guidance xx: To the extent that in the future, the then-current application process and/or base agreement unduly impedes an otherwise allowable TLD application by application type, string type, or applicant type, there should be a predictable community process by which potential changes can be considered. This process should follow the Predictability Framework discussed in Section xx. See also recommendation xx in Section xx Base Registry Agreement regarding processes for obtaining exemptions to certain provisions of the base Registry Agreement. | 2.2.4 | This text does not identify “Closed Generics” as a type of application. It has been treated by the Working Group as a type of application and has a separate section. To avoid confusion, this application “type” should be distinguished and set apart from this general WG recommendation. | Add a footnote: “The Working Group notes that the so-called ‘Closed Generic’ application is a separate type of application treated in Section 2.7.3 of this draft Final Report. The Recommendation and Implementation Guidance provided in this Section 2.2.4 is not intended to apply to Closed Generics as they are subject to a need for further policy efforts in the community. |
|  | The Working Group considered proposals for specific changes to the CPE Guidelines from 2012, but did not ultimately recommend any specific changes to the text of the Guidelines. Rather, this should be done by the Implementation Review Team taking into account all of the recommendations and implementation guidance described herein.  | 2.9.1.c. | Although the Working Group made some references to the CPE Guidelines with a view toward affirming the scoring mechanism for the next round, the full Working Group never actually discussed all the changes that would be needed to bring this document current for the next round. I don’t recall the Working Group making the decision that the appropriate revisions to the CPE Guidelines and scoring system should be left to the IRT. | The Working Group considered proposals for specific changes to the CPE Guidelines from 2012 but did not fully review and discuss the changes proposed by Working Group members to the CPE Guidelines. Accordingly, the Working Group is seeking public comment on the 2012 CPE Guidelines linked at Footnote 197 prior to the finalization of its recommendations for changes to those Guidelines and will incorporate the public comment into its consideration of the changes needed for the implementation of CPE Guidelines and scoring system to be appied in the next round. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |