Your name: Justine Chew

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 (rationale 3): For all types of objections, the parties to a proceeding must be given the opportunity to mutually agree upon a single panelist or a three-person panel, bearing the costs accordingly. | 2.8.1 Objections ~pg 133 | Just flagging:  What is the conclusion to the question raised of what happens if parties do not agree on a single panelist or 3-person panel? | Awaiting proposed changes to the same question from a topic under Package 5. |
|  | Implementation Guidance xx (rationale 4): All criteria to be used by panelists for the filing of, response to, and evaluation of each objection, should be included in the Applicant Guidebook. | 2.8.1 Objections ~pg 133 | Question on language:  Why would there be criteria used by panelists to file objections? | Subject to clarification. |
|  | Rationale for Affirmations xx-xx and Implementation Guidance xx (rationale 1): 2nd para ….The Working Group expressed concerns about the effectiveness and execution of the Independent Objector (IO), but believes that the role should be maintained, with similar rules and procedures in place, though it notes that stricter adherence to constraints may improve effectiveness | 2.8.1 Objections ~pg 135 | Question on language:  What does “and execution of the Independent Objector” mean? | Subject to clarification. |
|  | * Implementation Guideline xx (rationale 2): To support predictability, the CPE guidelines, or as amended, should be considered a part of the policy adopted by the Working Group. * Implementation Guideline xx (rationale 3): ICANN org should examine ways to make the CPE process more efficient in terms of costs and timing. * c. New issues raised | 2.9.1 Community Applications ~pg 138 and 142 | Not disagreeing with the text but taking the opportunity to table a document, “Revised Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines – A Proposal by At-Large” which is At-Large’s amendment of the CPE guidelines of 27 Sep 2013, and which could be useful as Implementation Guidance. | Please refer to the “[**Revised Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines – A Proposal by At-Large**](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/111390697/01B.%20CPE%20Guidelines%20-%20At-Large%20Proposal%2011.06.2020.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1592012489000&api=v2)”. This version of 11 June may be subject to amendment by At-Large but if that happens, then the updated version would likely be shared vide ALAC’s response to the upcoming public comment process for the Final Report.  NB. There is a second document “[**At-Large Interventions on Community-based Applications and Community Priority Evaluation**](https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/111390697/01C.%20At-Large%20Interventions%20on%20CBA%20%26%20CPE%20as%20at%2011.06.2020.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1592012475000&api=v2)” which includes, inter alia:   * some high level explanation on key amendments to the CPE guidelines of 27 Sep 2013) * desired criteria for a CPE provide/panelists |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |