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)** |
|  | For the purposes of the draft Final Report, the Working Group designated the status as No Agreement and has made no recommendations with respect to either allowing or disallowing Closed Generics. However, with widely diverging viewpoints, the Working Group asked Working Group members to contribute additional proposals for consideration, to help identify circumstances when a Closed Generic may be permitted. These proposals were not thoroughly vetted by the Working Group and therefore none of the proposals at this point in time have any agreement within the Working Group to pursue. However, the Working Group is very interested in community feedback regarding the three proposals received, in regards to both the high level principles and the details (where provided). Thus, any feedback is appreciated. The Working Group is particularly interested to hear from the community about which proposals, if any, they believe warrant further consideration by the Working Group, and why. The Working Group would also like input on whether there are elements or high-level principles in any of the proposals that are critical to permitting Closed Generics, even if commenters may disagree with some of the details. | 2.7.3.c | The proposed wordking limits comments to the three proposals. It should also solicit other proposals from the community, if any | For the purposes of the draft Final Report, the Working Group designated the status as No Agreement and has made no recommendations with respect to either allowing or disallowing Closed Generics. However, with widely diverging viewpoints, the Working Group asked Working Group members to contribute additional proposals for consideration, to help identify circumstances when a Closed Generic may be permitted. These proposals were not thoroughly vetted by the Working Group and therefore none of the proposals at this point in time have any agreement within the Working Group to pursue. However, the Working Group is very interested in community feedback regarding the three proposals received, in regards to both the high level principles and the details (where provided), as well as any other proposals members of the community may with repsect to the availability of closed generic strings.Any feedback is appreciated. The Working Group is particularly interested to hear from the community about which proposals, if any, they believe warrant further consideration by the Working Group, and why or if there are any other proposals that members of the community may have with repect to the availability of closed generic strings. The Working Group would also like input on whether there are elements or high-level principles in any of the existing proposals put forth by the working Group members that are critical to permitting Closed Generics, even if commenters may disagree with some of the details. |
|  | Option 4: Allow Closed Generics with no additional conditions. Establish an objections process modelled on community objections. | 2.7.3.b | This language does not accurately capture our proposal/option. We proposed an option with no additional conditions for closed generics but did not propose that there should be any objections process based on community application objections | Option 4: Allow Closed Generics with no additional conditions.  |
|  | Some Working Group members felt that it may not be possible to define the public interest, but it may be possible to entrust an entity to judge whether a proposed Closed Generic is or is not in the public interest. | 2.7.3.b | You have not captured the view of some working group members including myself, Kurt, Mike, and Paul (and even Alex to some extent) that it simply is not possible to define the public interest. We did not say and do not agree that it would be possible to entrust an entity to judge whether a proposed Closed Generic is or is not in the public interest and we do not agree this is possible | Some Working Group members felt that it is not possible to define the public interest in any way that can be meangfully applied to new gTLDs. Sow other Working Group members believed that it may be possible to entrust an entity to judge whether a proposed Closed Generic is or is not in the public interest. For example, one Working Group member suggested allowing Closed Generic applications in line with GAC Advice only where the ICANN Board determined that the TLD would serve a public interest goal. Some proposed that the Board could only do this if the Board approved the application by a supermajority for example at least 90% of sitting, non-conflicted, Board members) that the TLD would serve a public interest goal. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |