2.3: Role	of Application Comment			
#	Comment	Contributor	WG Response	Notes
General	Comments		•	
	Supports Early Warning and AGB-consensus advice; welcomes dialogue to increase transparency and fairness; opposes the PDP making recommendations on GAC activities; notes that change to the likely operator of a gTLD should invoke notification requirement and possible re-evaluation, including public comment: With regard to the role of Application Comment, the GAC reiterates its comments on GAC Early Warnings and other objections to proposed strings, as follows: "The GAC believes that the Early Warning arrangements applied in the recent gTLD round were a useful mechanism to identify applications that raise public policy concerns. This also applies to GAC advice to the Board and the specific "AGB-GAC consensus advice." They should be an integral part of any future rounds. Constructive dialogue through this process can help applicants better understand the concerns of governments and help governments better understand the planned operation of proposed gTLDs. The GAC would welcome the opportunity to discuss options to increase the transparency and fairness of these arrangements (including providing a rationale for objections and giving applicants subject to Early Warnings the opportunity for direct dialogue with the GAC). Any rationale provided by the GAC would be based on its role under the Bylaws to "consider and provide advice on the activities of ICANN as they relate to governments, particularly matters where there may be an interaction between ICANN's policies and various laws and international agreements or where they may affect public policy issues." However, the GAC does not consider that the PDP should make recommendations on GAC activities, which are carried out in accordance with the Bylaws and GAC's internal procedures."			
	Accordingly, with regard to both the Role of Application comment and Change requests, the GAC believes that ICANN should enforce section 1.2.7 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook to require applicants to disclose to ICANN any material changes or updates pertaining to their application, including any agreements whereby an applicant has agreed to transfer or seek ICANN's approval to transfer to another entity the right to operate a new gTLD that could be authorized in response to a pending application. As stated in 1.2.7 of the gTLD Applicant Guidebook: "If at any time during the evaluation process information previously submitted by an applicant becomes untrue or inaccurate, the applicant must promptly notify ICANN via submission of the appropriate forms." The GAC believes that a change to the likely operator of the new gTLD would constitute a material change in the application that invokes the notification requirement in 1.2.7 and that ICANN may require a re-evaluation of the application, including a new public comment period, for competition concerns. Implementing section 1.2.7 in this manner will serve the public interest by providing the GAC and other members of the public the opportunity to identify and comment at the earliest possible time in the new gTLD application process competition and other issues, such as security questions, that may depend on the identity of the new gTLD operator. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000003.html)	GAC	Comments (see column B) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
1	mups.//mm.icamin.org/pipermaii/comments-new-guo-subsequent-procedures-supp-initiai-300ct 16/20 18q4/000003.html)	UAL	Agreement (Supports the WG's preliminary recommendations 2.3.c. 1 — optimize the mechanisms and system for Application Comment; 2.3.c.2 — ICANN to be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized;	
	Supports 2.3.c.1 and 2.3.c.2: Supportive of 2.3.e.1 and 2.3.e.3: The ALAC supports the WG's preliminary recommendations 2.3.c.1 to optimize the mechanisms and system for Application Comment and 2.3.c.2 for ICANN to be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized. In pursuit of fairness, we are supportive of the idea of limiting the comment period for CPE to run parallel to the Initial Evaluation comment period. We also think it is appropriate to allow applicants an additional but limited period of 7 days after the close of a 60-day public comment period strictly to enable applicants to respond to late comments if they so choose.		2.3.e.1 CPE to run parallel to the Initial Evaluation comment period; 2.3.e.3 applicants limited period to respond to late comments) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
2	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000006.html)	ALAC	was done.]	Copied to: 2.3.c.1, 2.3.c.2, 2.3.e.1 and 2.3.e.3
	Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of commenter. Believes longer comment period for community applications makes sense: The BC agrees with only requiring a response from an applicant when a comment may impact scoring. We would also advise requiring confirmation and verification of the identity of the commenter. Identity of the commenter would not need to be disclosed to the public but anonymous or false identity used in submitting comments would appear to be another way to "game the system" and could financially impact an applicant unfairly. A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the application and provide comments if appropriate		Agreement (2.3.c.2 Requiring response when comment may impact scoring; 2.3.c.1 Verifying commenter; 2.3.c.1 longer comment period) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT	
3	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000007.html)	ВС	COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	Copied to: 2.3.c.1, 2.3.c.2, and 2.3.e.1

	Commenter about the unified and amiliant about the allowed to remand. The keybore is transcribed		Agreement (2.3.c.1 verifying commenter; 2.3.c.2 and 2.3.e.2	
9	Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency. If a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and ICANN must verify the identity of commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be		allow applicants to respond) WG Response:	
F	permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments.		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
4 ((https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html)	RrSG	was done.]	Copied to 2.3.c.1 and 2.3.c.2
believes to the limplement of the limplement of the limber	he Working Group supports continuing the guidance in Implementation Guideline C, particularly around the provision of c that the mechanism and system could be further optimized. entation Guidance under consideration: The system used to collect application comment should better ensure that the en entation Guidance: The system used to collect application comment should support a filtering and/or sorting mechanism	nail and name used t	or an account are verified in some	
	hould also allow for the inclusion of attachments.			START HERE FOR MEETING ON 04 MARCH
f c	Supports continuing guidance in Implementation Guideline C, use of verification methods, and inclusion of a filtering/sorting mechanism for comments: [The Working Group supports continuing the guidance in Implementation Guideline C, particularly around the provision of comment forums. However, the Working Group believes that the mechanism and system could be further optimized.] The BRG supports the preliminary recommendation for continuing Implementation Recommendation C relating to the provision of comment forums during the application process. This provides the broader ICANN community an appropriation to submit feedback, positive or negative, about an application. If the provision of comment forums during the application process. This provides the broader ICANN community an appropriation Guidance under consideration: The system used to collect application comment should better ensure that the semail and name used for an account are verified in some manner.] During the last application round, it was not always clear who or which organisation submitted comments, as this information was not validated. The BRG agrees that the submitter of any comment must be captured and the source verified to minimise frivolous claims from being submitted, avoid comments by comments where comments may have a material impact on action taken against a particular application. Implementation Guidance: The system used to collect application comment should support a filtering and/or sorting mechanism to better review a high volume of comments. The system should also allow for the inclusion of attachments] The BRG agrees with the implementation guidance and believes that these enhancements would alid applicants in reviewing and prioritising the comments. Pre- determined categories of responses, based on experiences of the 2012 round, could help filter the comments for		Agreement (Supports continuing guidance in Implementation Guideline C, use of verification methods, and inclusion of a	
l c c	the applicant and the evaluation panels, identifying comments that could impact the scoring, or trigger clarifying questions. However, all comments should require substantiation of the issue as it pertains to the particular comment. The system should continue to allow applicants to respond publicly to comments, especially to correct any false assertions submitted in public comments. In this respect, time to respond to comments received towards the end of the comment period should be available to the applicant, e.g. a period of 7-10 days where the applicant has an opportunity to reply. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000005.html)	BRG	filtering/sorting mechanism for comments) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
\$	Supports recommendation: The ALAC supports these proposed optimization to the application comment system.		Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
2 ((https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/00006.html)	ALAC	was done.]	
\$ 22 A	Supports 2.3.c.1 and 2.3.c.2: Supportive of 2.3.e.1 and 2.3.e.3: The ALAC supports the WG's preliminary recommendations 2.3.c.1 to optimize the mechanisms and system for Application Comment and 2.3.c.2 for ICANN to be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized. In pursuit of fairness, we are supportive of the idea of limiting the comment period for CPE to run parallel to the Initial Evaluation comment period. We also think it is appropriate to allow applicants an additional but limited period of 7 days after the close of a 60-day public comment period strictly to enable applicants to respond to late comments if they so choose.		Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]Copied from General	
3 ((https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000006.html)	ALAC	Comments	Copied from General Comments
[9	Supports implementation guidance: [Re: Implelemtation Guidance] We support improved verification of name and email in the application comment collection system. The public comment process should be transparent and not used as a mechanism to try and 'sabotage' applications. [Re: Implelemtation Guidance] We support a filtering and/or sorting mechanism to better review a high volume of comments. We support the system allowing for the inclusion of attachments, so evidence for comments can be provided. We suggest that a form be used for collecting public comments to limit the elements of applications that can be commented on. [https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000011.html)	IPC	Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
(pow	ı J	dono.j	I

Supports implementation guidance: The RySS supports confirming the spiciance in implementation C, specifically the provision of comments through which the submitted of any comment must be applied and the submitted of any comment must be applied and the submitted of any comment must be applied and the submitted of any comment must be applied and the submitted of any comment must be applied and the submitted of any comment must be applied and the submitted of any comment must be applied and submitted of any comment of comments and applied on advantage of a submitted of any comment of comments and applied on advantage of any comments and applied on a comments and applied on a comments and applied on a comment and applied on a submitted of a comment and applied on a comment and applied on a submitted of a submitted on a comment and applied on a comment and applied on a submitted of a submitted on a comment and applied on a submitted on a comment and applied on a submitted of a submitted on a comment and applied on a submitted on a submitted on a comment and applied on a submitted on a sub					
of comment faurant, which protects the broader (CAM) comment must be captured and the access where the superfixer of any comment must be captured and the access where the superfixer of any comment must be captured and the access where the superfixer of any comment must be captured and the access where the superfixer of any comment must be captured and the superfixer of the same process of the superfixer of any comment must be captured and the superfixer of the same process of the superfixer of the superfixer of the same process of the superfixer of the superfixer of the same process of the superfixer of the super		Supports implementation guidance: The RvSG supports continuing the guidance in Implementation C. specifically the provision			
The PisSQ also believes that the automater of any comment must be optioned and the source services to minimal through dama for the being automated, year decided comments by competitions with ularist motions, and prevent repeated comments from the same assume. 2009-11 and why the source of comments where comments may since a comment in the prevent of comments where comments are going and comments of the prevent of comments where comments are going and comments are going and comments. Provided and applicant the same applicant to an expectation of the provided part of the comments are going and comments are going an					
The PySG data believes that the admitted of any comment must be systemed and the source world to minimis fivilizes claims to how being substitute, and comments by compositions will use for most and project on soft on the project of the project on soft or project or					
for the bing submitted, award comments by competitions with ulterior motives, and provent registed convents from the same account CLONA standard works are confident agent country. In a instruction of comments were an amendated and the comments of the applicated and the application and the applicated and the applicated and the applicated and the applicated and the application and the applicated and the applicated and the application and the applicated and the app	. 1				
for the bing submitted, award comments by competitions with ulterior motives, and provent registed convents from the same account CLONA standard works are confident agent country. In a instruction of comments were an amendated and the comments of the applicated and the application and the applicated and the applicated and the applicated and the applicated and the application and the applicated and the applicated and the application and the applicated and the app	. 1	The RvSG also believes that the submitter of any comment must be captured and the source verified to minimise frivolous claims			
source. ICANN created where source of comments were comments where comments and have a particular application. The improved system functionally supposed would be vectored by the FySC. as an act to preventing and promising the comments may be a supposed or an application, and the contract of the comments and the contract of the comments and the contract of the comments are submitted. Predeficially, and the contract of the comments are submitted to the comments are submitted. Predeficially, and the contract of the comments are submitted to the comments are submitted. Predeficially, and the contract of the comments are submitted to the comments are submitted. Predeficially, and the contract of the comments are submitted to the comments of the comments are submitted to the comments. The system introduction of the comments are submitted to the comments of the comments are submitted to the comments. The system is applicated to the comments of the comments are submitted to comments. The system is applicated to the comments of the comments. The system is applicated and submitted to comments of the comments o					
Disports only requiring response when command may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments. Supports only requiring response when command may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments. Supports only requiring response when command may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments. Supports only requiring response when command may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments. Supports only requiring response when command may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments. Supports only requiring response when command may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of commenter. Believes longer comment period for community applications makes sense. The BC agrees with only requiring response to the comments of the comm					
The improved system functionally suggested would be variousles of the comment of					
comments received by an applicant, especially where high volumes of comments are submitted. Predetermined categories of responses, begate on exportance of the 2012 round, columbs first the comments for the applicant and the evaluation panels, substantiation of the issue as it periasis to the particular comment in the substantiation of the issue as it periasis to the particular comment in the substantiation of the issue as it periasis to the particular comment. The system should comments in this specific with comments expected to comments, expectably to correct any false seasons submitted in patient, e.g., a period of 7 to days where the expectation of comments are an apportunity of present and reportunity of the comments of the comments and any open things of the comments of the substantial to the expectation of comments and any open things of the comments and the comments are comments and the comments and the comments are comments and the comments and the comments are comments and the comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments and the comments of the comments and the comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments are comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments are comments and the comments are comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments are comments are comments are comments. Seekly impact an applicant and confident comments are comments. Seekly impact an applicant are comments are comments. Seekly impact an application are comments are comments are comments are comments are comments. Seekly impact an application are comments are comm	. 1				
comments received by an applicant, especially where high volumes of comments are submitted. Predetermined categories of responses, begate on exportance of the 2012 round, columbs first the comments for the applicant and the evaluation panels, substantiation of the issue as it periasis to the particular comment in the substantiation of the issue as it periasis to the particular comment in the substantiation of the issue as it periasis to the particular comment. The system should comments in this specific with comments expected to comments, expectably to correct any false seasons submitted in patient, e.g., a period of 7 to days where the expectation of comments are an apportunity of present and reportunity of the comments of the comments and any open things of the comments of the substantial to the expectation of comments and any open things of the comments and the comments are comments and the comments and the comments are comments and the comments and the comments are comments and the comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments and the comments of the comments and the comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments are comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments are comments and the comments are comments. Seekly of the comments are comments are comments are comments are comments are comments. Seekly impact an applicant and confident comments are comments. Seekly impact an applicant are comments are comments. Seekly impact an application are comments are comments are comments are comments are comments. Seekly impact an application are comments are comm	. 1	The improved system functionality suggested would be welcomed by the RySG, as an aid to reviewing and prioritising the			
responses, based on experiences of the 2012 round, could help filter the comments for the applicant and the evaluation panels, identifying comments the sould response the sequence of publicly to comment the sould response the sequence of publicly to comments the sequence of public to comments and the sequence of public comments the sequence of public comments the sequence of public comments the sequence of the		comments received by an applicant, especially where high volumes of comments are submitted. Predetermined categories of			
substantiation of the issue as it pertains to the particular comment. The system should on public by the comments, appealably to concert any false associations authentiated in public comments. This respect in the present of the public comments appealably to concert any false associations authentiated to the supplicant. e.g. a period of 718 days where applicant has an opportunity to reply. Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments period for community applications makes sense: The 86 agrees with only requiring a response to the comment period for community applications makes sense: The 86 agrees with only requiring a response to the comment period for community applications makes sense: The 86 agrees with only requiring a response to the applicant when a comment may impact scoring. We would also added resigning or the supplicant and eventication of one that the comment is a sense of the applicant when a comment and provide comments of appropriate and provide for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the applicant under a provide and provide comments of appropriate and provide comments are applicant under a provide and provide comments are applicant and provide comments and provide comments. Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed for responsit. The key have by transparancy. If a comment is provide and provide and provides a		responses, based on experiences of the 2012 round, could help filter the comments for the applicant and the evaluation panels,			
publicly to comments, specially to correct any faste assertions submitted in public comments. In this respect, time to respond to comments recoved towards the end of the comment proof actual to a submitted to the applicant of the special manner. The proof of the public comments are used for the comment proof actual to a submitted to the applicant of the special manner. The proof of the public comments are used for the public comments are used for the public comments are used for the public comments are used to the public comments are used for the public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant of the public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant should be allowed to respond. The key here is transparency, if a comment is group to the manner to public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant should be allowed to respond. The key here is transparency, if a comment is group to the manner to public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant should be allowed to respond. The key here is transparency, if a comment is group to the manner to public, too in their media to be public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant should be allowed to respond. The key here is transparency, if a comment is group to the manner to public, too in their media to be a comment of the public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant should be allowed to respond. The key here is transparency, if a comment is group to the manner to public, the manner to public the public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant should be allowed to respond. The key here is transparency, if a comment is group to the public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant should be permitted to addresses when the public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant should be permitted to addresses when the public comments are used for an account are verified and applicant public to the public comments ar					
comments received towards the end of the comment period should be available to the applicant, e.g. a period of 7-10 days where the applicant has an opportunity to recy). If the period of 7-10 days where the applicant has an opportunity to recy). Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments and supports of the comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments and supports from an applicant when a comment may impact scoring. Vie word also achieve requiring confirmation and without continuity application makes sense in the Ricagness with only requiring a response from an applicant when a comment may impact scoring. Vie word also achieve requiring comments would appear to be ambient way to grame they seylend and could financially impact an applicant variable. A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the applicant on and provide comments of the sense public, then there media to be transparancy in who is commenting application of variable and applicant should be evided and applicant should be to be transparancy in who is commenting and ICANN must verty the identity of commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is usualled to identify the comment of sould be commented. (2.4.1) Period comments are commented in a provide and applicant should be the flag period of the comment in a received, the Applicant comment of the Applicant comment to "Application of what was done.] Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context; (2.4.1) Period transproy recommendation and a support of the comment. (2.4.1) and the period of an account are verified in some name of and support Titleng and/or sorting. ICANN or gound the to make the PDP Working Comments are vigitated in account by providing name, email address, and optionally are very provided in the period of comments and add					
the applicant has an opportunity to regiv. Action Taker: (COMPLETED / NoT COMPLETED / Instruction of what was done) Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of commenter. Believes longer comment partied for community applications makes sense: The IC agrees with only requiring a response from an applicant when a comment may impact soon was required in the sense requiring the commenter destroy of the commenter it with office of the identity of the commenter may impact soon was required in the sense requiring verification of the identity of the commenter required in the sense of the public but an only more and applicant of the commenter required in the sense of the public but an only more and provides commented in a proportion of the sense of the public but and provides comments and provides a					
(https://mm.icann.org/lipermalikomments-new-gitd-subsequent-procedures-supp-initias-30cc118/2018q4(000008.html) Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of comments. Believes longer comment prod for community applications makes senser. The Ed agrees with only requiring response from an applicant when a comment may impact scoring. We would also advise requiring confirmation and verification of the identity of the commenter would not send to be disclosed to the public but an anymous or false identity of the commenter would not send to be disclosed to the public but an anymous or false identity of the commenter is required to advise requiring confirmation and verification of commenters and provide comments and applicant should be required to advise and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key level is transparency. If a comment is application of commenters and an applicant should be allowed to respond: The key level is transparency. If a comment is comment and an applicant should be allowed to respond: The key level is transparency. If a comment is comment is appropriate comment is required to a comment is required to a comment is required to a comment is comment in a comment in a comment is comment in a comment is comment in a comment in a comment is comment in a co				WG Response:	
Compression of the provided comments and programment of the system and provided from the system and the system and provided from the system and		the applicant has an opportunity to reply.			
Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of commenter. Believes longer comment period for community applications makes sense. The BC agrees with only requiring a response from an applicant when a comment may impact social and applications of the supplication and provide comments are supplicant with a comment may impact social and applications of the supplication and provide comments would appear to be another way to "game the system" and could financially impact an applicant unifairly. A longer comment would appear to be another way to "game the system" and could financially impact an applicant unifairly. A longer comment and provide comments are special subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30cot182018q4(000007.html) BC was done. Commenter should be verified and applicant struct be allowed to respond: The key here is transpeapency. If a comment is commenter and the subsequent period of comments are subsequently in the subsequent period of comments are subsequently in the subsequent period of comments and the subsequently in the comment and the subsequently in the comments are sould not be periodically applicant struct be allowed to respond: The key here is transpeapency. If a comment is periodically and the subsequently in the comment and an and units of an account are verified in soon enamer and authority the comment and an annual to the subsequently into the subsequently					
Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of commenter. Believes longer comment profer for community applications makes sense: The SC agrees with only requiring a response from an applicant when a comment may impact scoring. We would also advise requiring confirmation and verification of the comments of the comments of the public but annoymous or false identify with the comments of the public but annoymous or false identify with the comments and the public but annoymous or false identify. A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the application and provide comments if appropriate an applicant when the public but annoymous or false identify with the public of the public but annoymous or false identify and the public but annoymous or false identification of comments of comments and the public but annoymous or false identification of comments of comments and the public but annoymous or false identification of comments or comments and the public but annoymous comments or comments and the public but annoymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted probably for the public but annoymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted probably for once a comment is needed to every false and the public but annoymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted probably for the public but annoymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the comments of the identity of COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED / N		(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000008.html)			
Believes fonger comment period for community applications makes sense: The BC agrees with only requiring a response from an applicant when a comment may impact socioning. We would also advise requiring confirmation and verification of the identity of the commenter flowing or the commenter would not need to be disclosed to the public but annoymous or tiles elegited to the commenter flowing or the commenter would not need to be disclosed to the public but annoymous or tiles elegited or commenter would not need to be disclosed to the public but annoymous or tiles elegited to the comment of the application and provide comments if appropriate A conger comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the application and provide comments if appropriate Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparancy, if a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparancy in who is commenting, and ICANN must verify the identity of commenters. Annoymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should be verified and applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. Provides clarity about bow system was designed in 2013 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context; (23.s.1) Perpliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 sits better that public comments and support filtering andior sorting. ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment to of allows and provides a public and support shall be considered with that comment, users must first evaluate account by providing name, small address, and spoknibly affiliation. The application comment to disclose allowed to an account are verified in some manner and support filtering andior sorting. ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment to allowed to provide and the comment, subject of the comment, subject of the comment	5		RySG	was done.]	
from an applicant when a comment may impact sooring. We would also advise requiring confirmation and verification of the identity of the comment revoked in the the public but annoymous or false identity and in submitting comments would appear to be another way to "game the system" and could financially impact an applicant window," Alonger comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the application and provide comments if appropriate 6. https://mm.icann.org/ippermali/comments.new-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018/e4000077.html) Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency, if a comment is given to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in his observable of commentary, once a comment is neceived, the Applicant should be permitted to addressible all comments. 7. https://mm.icann.org/ippermali/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018/e400001.html) 7. https://mm.icann.org/ippermali/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedure-supp-initial-30oct18/2018/e400001.html) 7. https://mm.icann.org/ippermali/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedure-supp-initial-30oct18/2018/e400001.html) 7. https://mm.icann.org/ippermali/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedure-supp-initial-30oct18/2018/e400001.html) 7. https://mm.icann.org/ippermali/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedure-supp-initial-30oct18/2018/e400001.html) 8. resident subsequent-procedure-supp-initial-30oct18/2018/e400001.html) 8. resident subsequent-procedu	7	Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of commenter.			
sidently of the commenter identify of the commenter would not need to be disclosed to the public but anonymous or false identify used in sufmitting comments would appear to be earnor was of a possible and a supplication and provide comments if appropriate A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the applicant and provide comments if appropriate Sommenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here in transparency. If a comment is commenter about be twentiled and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here in transparency. If a comment is commenter about be a verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here in transparency. If a comment is commenter about be a verified and applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. To this immentation of the public better the provided of the public better the public and the public better the public and the public better the commenter about be verified and applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. To this immentation of public then there exists in the applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. To this immentation of the public better the public and the public them them them them them them them them					
useful in submitting comments would appear to be another way to "game the system" and could financially impact an applicant unifarity. A longer comment particular or community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the applicant and provide comments if appropriate Onther inches in a provide comments of appropriate or comments of the propriate or comments of provide comments if appropriate or comments of the propriate or comments of the provide comments of the provide comments and provide comments or comments or comments where (CANN is unable to leferthly the comment of the comment is going to be made upublic. Then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and (CANN must verify the identity of comments. Another comments or comments where (CANN is unable to leferthly the comments where it is unable to leferthly the comments or comments or comments where (CANN is unable to leferthly the comments or comments or comments where (CANN is unable to leferthly the comments or comments or comments where (CANN is unable to leferthly the comments or comments or comments where (CANN is unable to leferthly the comments or comments or comments where (CANN is unable to leferthly the comments or comments or comments where (CANN is unable to leferthly the comment is comment to comments or com					
urlarity. A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the application and provide comments if appropriate 6. https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gild-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4(000007, html) Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respondt. The key here is transparancy, in a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparancy in who is commenting, and ICANN must very five identity of commenters. Annoymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted/posted. Furthermore, one a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address-should all comments. 7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gild-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4(000010.html) RYSG Provides clarify about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context (2.2.b.) the learning recommendation and unable of an account set verified in some manner and support "filtering anited sorting." ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features, in order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmation (e System selfors an account is created. The Application Comment tool already provides these features, in order to submit a comment is directed to, and clare of submission). A search by application structure of information (e System selfors an account is created. The Application Comment tool already provides these features, in order to submit a comment is directed to, and clare of submission). A search by application structure of information (e System selfors are counted to comment and the end and end agreement is directed to, and clare of submis					
A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the application and provide comments if appropriate 6 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/20184/000007.html) 8C (CMPLETED Instruction of what was done.] Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transpatency. If a comment is grown provided to the transpatency as who is commenties. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is usuable to identify of commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is usuable to identify of commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is usuable to identify of comments. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is usuable to identify the comment should be commented to address/rebut all comments. 7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/20184/400001.html) R7SG (CMPLETED Instruction of what was done.] CANN org would like to make the EPD Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool should better ensure that the email and manus used to an account are verified in some manner? and support if their grown of comment is decided to, and a darger stop and a comment of comment is decided to, and a darger stop and a comment of comment is decided to, and a darger stop and a comment of comment is decided to, and a darger stop and the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment is directed to, and a darger stop and the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Previous year recommendation ID, name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Previous year recommendation in the event of the decided to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Previous year recommendation in the previous provides that the previous provides that the previous provides					
A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the application and provide comments if appropriate and provide comments if appropriate and provide comments if appropriate and provides of the provided and provided comments if appropriate and provided in the provided and applicant should be allowed to respond. The key here is transparency, if a comment is comment to be transparency, if a comment is comment to be transparency and CABN may be represented to the make public in the transparency and CABN may be represented to the make public in the transparency and is a comment and and applicant should be allowed to respond. The key here is transparency, if a comment is comment to the transparency and CABN may be represented to comment to comment to comment to comment to early of the periodic products. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED / NOT		unfairly.			
application and provide comments if appropriate 6 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000007.htm) Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency. If a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and iCNAN must verify the identity of comments. Anonymous comments or comments where ICASN is unable to identify the comment should not be permitted to address, and in the permitted to address and in the permitted in address and optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address and optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in the permitted in a decided in the permitted in address. All intended in the permitted in address. All intended in the permitted in address. All intended in the permitted in a decided in the permitted in a decided in the permitted in address. An optionally all intended in t				WG Response:	
Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency. If a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and LCANN must verify the identity of commenters. Annonymous comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. 7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermali/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html) RrSG Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prolim recommendation should be considered with that context (2.3.c.1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 states that the Application Comment tool should better ensure that the ental and name used for an account revertified in some manner and stopport "filtering and revorting" and propertified in address which the comment is directed to, and date of summers, used sorting of all of the comment, subject of the comment, subject of the comment, subject of the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of summers, or a special post of the comment is directed to, and date of summers, or a special post of the comment is directed to, and date of summers, or a special post of the comment is directed to, and date of summers, or a special post of the comment is directed to, and date of summers, or a special post of the comment is directed to, and date of summers, or a special post of the comment is directed to, and date of summers, or a special post of the comment is directed to, and date of summers, or a special post of the comment of th				l	
Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency, if a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and ICANN must verify the identity of commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted objects. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. 7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gild-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html) Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context: (23.c.1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 states that the Application Comment to 1'should be tere used to the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner' and support 'filtering and/or sorting.' CANN org vaudd like to nake the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment to address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment to all address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment to all address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment to all address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment to all address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment to all allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make vering of comments easier. Allowing for attachments were performed in the preliminary recommendation to make vering of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean one information the second provided the more registed to the store understored by applicants of a performed. CANN org (https://mm.icann.org/pipe		application and provide comments if appropriate			
Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency, if a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and ICANN must verify the identity of commenters. Annoymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. 7 (https://mm.ican.org/pipermail/comments-neve-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30cct18/2018q4/000010.html) Provides clarify about the way state was designed in 2012 at suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context; (2.3.c.1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 states that the Application Comment to of should better ensure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner' and support filtering and/or sorting. ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features. In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (i.e., applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and annee of person who submitted the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and annee of person who submitted the comment is directed to, and annee of person who submitted the comment is directed to, and annee of person who submitted the comment and applicant stransparency. If the permitter of t	ا	(III) (IIII) (III) (IIII	DO.		0
Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency. If a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and ICANN must verify the identity of commenters. Anonymous comments or comments received, the Applicant should be permitted-posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted-posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/review and to address/review as done.] Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context; (23.5.1 st) stess that the Application Comment tool 'should be terre insure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner' and support 'illering and/or sorting.' ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features, in order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address must exceed the person who submitted the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by applicant, string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by applicant string, evaluation and objection ground the comment is directed to, and anew of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, evaluation and objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, evaluation and objection ground the comment as directed to, and date of submission). A search by application that the evaluation and objection ground the comment as an ame of person who submitted the comment of the permitted was done. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments would also means more informating the	6	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000007.html)	BC	<u> </u>	Copied from General Comments
going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and ICANN must reflect to identify the commenter should now comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should now members. 7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gild-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html) Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prolim recommendation should be considered with that context; (2.3.c.1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 states that the Application Comment tool 'should better ensure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner' and support 'filtering and/or sorting.' ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features. In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address sure to received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (e. applicant, sting, application). In ame of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applications and the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applications are objection ground the comment is directed to, and an email of person who submitted the comment, evaluation and control to comment and account in the person who submitted the comment, evaluation and control to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would recomment is an evaluation and objection panels would be more explicit in the Applicant duidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluation panels, etc., applic					
commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANIN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted/posted. Furthermore, note a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. 7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermall/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html) Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context: (2.3.c1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c1 states that the Application Comment tool already provides these resures that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner' and support 'filtering and/or sorting.' ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features. In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and policy and previous and solid of the columns of information (i.e., application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, application ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, application ground the comment is directed to, and status applicant string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and status applicant string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and status applicant string, evaluation already provides these features). Concerns (about problems with searching and sorting of attachments were not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments agreed to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermall/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedures-suppl-initial-30oct					
permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. 7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gitd-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html) Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context: (2.3.c.1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 states that the Application Comment tool instouch better ensure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner and support filtering and/or sorting: ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features, in order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address smust be received by the system before an account its oreside. The Application Comment tool already in forment tool, i.e., applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, subject of the comment, subject of the comment, subject of the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). As search by application status, applicant, string, evaluation panel and application 2.3.c.1 state that Applicant Comment to all address provided and provided string of a state of the Applicant Comment to all address provided and provides these features. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 state the Applicant Comment to all the performent. From the provided provid				WG Response:	
7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gitd-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html) RrSG was done.] Provides clarify about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context (2.3.c.1 Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 stress that the Application Comment to Dischould better ensure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner' and support 'filtering and/or sorting.' (ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool aready provides these features. In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address smust be received by the system before an account its created. The Application Comment to all soles performed. Preliminary recomment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, application from ment is directed to, and date of submission is a search by applicant of status, applicant, string, application ground the comment is directed to, and hare of person who submitted the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and hare of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments be provided. ICANN org working and objection panels would need to review, impacing application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. In the previous of the p					
Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation about be considered with that context: (2.3.c.1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 states that the Application Comment tool "should better ensure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner" and support "filtering and/or sorting." CANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group wave that the Application Comment tool are day provides these features, in order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends are mail to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends are mail to the email and foress provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address of the comment, subject of the comment and subjection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed, already provides these features). Concerns (about problems with searching and sorting of all all the problems with searching and sorting of attachments would also mean more information that the weak viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the weak viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the weak viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the weak viewing of comments are		permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments.			
Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered with that context: (2.3.c.1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 states that the Application Comment tool should better ensure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner" and support "filtering and/or sorting." ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features. In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (i.e., applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment, as also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Application Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gitd-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) ICANN org Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] instruction of what was done.] Agreement (Supports th	!				L
with that context: (2.3.c.1) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 states that the Application Comment tool "should better ensure that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner" and support "filtering and/or sorting." ICANN or would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features. In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (i.e., applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the columns of information (i.e., applicant, string, application, ID, name of person who submitted the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attainments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gitd-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) ICANN org WG Response: 4 (CANN org WG Response) Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED / Instruction of what was done.] Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED / Instruction of what the process of the pr			RrSG	was done.]	Copied from General Comments
that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner" and support "filtering and/or sorting." ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features. In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all off the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gitd-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) 13.c.2.2 (ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., and to what twent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments.					
ICANN org would like to make the PDP Working Group aware that the Application Comment tool already provides these features. In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (i.e., applicants, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, subject of the comment availation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and after of by application status, applicant, string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Croup might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. [IcANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED / Instruction of what COMPLETED / Instruction of what CANN org WG Response: COMPLETED / Instruction of what COMPLETED / Instruction of what CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response: CANN org WG Response					
In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (i.e., applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/00009.html) ICANN org was done.] 2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., and to what extent different types of comments will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants must have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was an opportunity to respond to those comments.		that the email and name used for an account are verified in some manner" and support "filtering and/or sorting."			
In order to submit a comment, users must first create an account by providing name, email address, and optionally affiliation. The system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (i.e., applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/00009.html) ICANN org was done.] 2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., and to what extent different types of comments will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants must have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was an opportunity to respond to those comments.					
system sends an email to the email address provided and affirmative confirmation from the email address must be received by the system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (i.e., applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Agreement (Supports the recommendations)					
system before an account is created. The Application Comment tool also allows sorting of all of the columns of information (i.e., application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. [CANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Agreement (Supports the recommendations					
applicant, string, application ID, name of person who submitted the comment, subject of the comment, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gitd-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) 1.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. CANN org					
objection ground the comment is directed to, and date of submission). A search by application status, applicant, string, evaluation panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN or gwould like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. [Instruction of what was done.] Soc.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc. and to what exitent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Action Taken: [COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.] Action Taken: [COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what Action Taken: [Completed to the extent of the provides these features) Comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Action Taken: [Completed to the recommendations] Action Taken: [Completed to the recommendations] Action Taken: [Completed to the recommendation of the recommendations] Action Taken: [Completed to the recommendation of the recommendations] Action Taken: [Completed to the recommendati					
panel or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed. Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. [Instruction of what was done.] 3.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., and to what to different tighteen types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants not account to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants not account to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants not account by the evaluators are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants not account by the evaluators are to be taken into account by the evaluators are to be taken into account by the evaluators are to be taken into account by the evaluators. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what the recommendation of what the provides these features. Action Taken: [COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what the preliminary attachments are to be taken into account by the evaluators. Action Taken: [Instruction of what the preliminary attachments are to be taken into account by the evaluators.]					
Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) 2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc. and to what state this fifterent types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Addition Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what the public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in the public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in the public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in the public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in the public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in the public comment					
Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be provided. ICANN org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/00009.html) 1.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc. and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants must have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) will Group the recommendations will or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., applicants will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants must have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) will Group the recommendations will group the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., applicants and the recommendations will group the relevant evaluators. Action Taken: [COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what]		parier or objection ground the comment is directed to, and name of person who submitted the comment can also be performed.			
org would like to note that attachments are not searchable and sortable, which appears to conflict with the intent of the preliminary recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gttd-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) ICANN org 1.2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what the process of commendation of the process of commendations] Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what the process of the process		Proliminary recommendation 2.2 o.1 also suggests that the Applicant Comment tool allows for attachments to be accorded.			
recommendation to make viewing of comments easier. Allowing for attachments would also mean more information that the evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. 5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) ICANN org was done.] 2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what commendations] Action Taken: [COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what commendation of what the recommendation of what commendation of the commendation of what commendation of what commendation of the commendation of what commendation of what commendation of the commendation of what commendation of the commen					
evaluation and objection panels would need to review, impacting application processing costs and timelines. The PDP Working Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) ICANN org					
Group might want to take this into consideration as it continues discussions on this topic. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) (2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc. and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants nust have an opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: dotgay LLC fully supports this recommendation. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what				WG Response.	
5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) 2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc. and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in a count by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants and opportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response:				Action Taken: ICOMPLETED / NOT	
5 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html) ICANN org was done.] 2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc., and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in a poportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response:		Group might want to take this into ornsheration as it continues discussions on this topic.			
2.3.c.2: ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators, panels, etc. and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in a poportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	5	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018g4/000009 btml)	ICANN org		
extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring. In addition, to the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the evaluators, panels, etc., applicants in a poportunity to respond to those comments. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: dotgay LLC fully supports this recommendation. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what]				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: dotgay LLC fully supports this recommendation. Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what					
Agreement (Supports the recommendations) WG Response: dotgay LLC fully supports this recommendation. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what			no account by the e	valuators, pariers, etc., applicants	
dotgay LLC fully supports this recommendation. dotgay LLC fully supports this recommendation. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	aot na	is an opposition, to recognize to allow comments.		Agraement (Supports the	
WG Response: dotgay LLC fully supports this recommendation. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what					
dotgay LLC fully supports this recommendation. Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what					
COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what				WG Response.	
COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what		detasy LLC fully supports this recommendation		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT	
		adigay LEC rany supports this recommendation.			
Temposition of programment of the control of the co	4	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018g4/000001 html)	dotgay LLC		
		, trapsminioarimorg.pipormain.commente-new-gua-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-societo/201044/000001.html)	Lacidal FFO	mad done.j	

	Supports recommendation, provides rationale: The ALAC supports this preliminary recommendation on the basis that:		Agreement (Supports the	
	It provides greater clarity to the application process, identifies the need and avenues for remediation and possibly inclusion of		recommendations)	
	voluntary Public Interest Commitments (PICs); and Subject to timing issues, it would in principle assist in an applicant's preparations for responding to comments that could help		WG Response:	
	Subject to tilling issues, it would in principle assist in an applicant's preparations for responding to comments that could help with the remediation process.		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT	
		ALAC	COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
2	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000006.html) Supports 2.3.c.1 and 2.3.c.2: Supportive of 2.3.e.1 and 2.3.e.3: The ALAC supports the WG's preliminary recommendations	ALAC	was done.]	
	2.3.c.1 to optimize the mechanisms and system for Application Comment and 2.3.c.2 for ICANN to be more explicit in the			
	Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized.		Agreement (Supports the recommendations)	
	In pursuit of fairness, we are supportive of the idea of limiting the comment period for CPE to run parallel to the Initial Evaluation		WG Response:	
	comment period. We also think it is appropriate to allow applicants an additional but limited period of 7 days after the close of a			
	60-day public comment period strictly to enable applicants to respond to late comments if they so choose.		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
3	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000006.html)	ALAC	was done.]	Copied from General Comments
ĺ			Agreement (Supports the	
			recommendations) WG Response:	
	Supports recommendation: We support this recommendation. Explicitly defining the role of public comments will assist with the			
	predictability and transparency of the evaluation process.		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
4	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000011.html)	IPC	was done.]	
	Provides clarity about how system was designed in 2012 and suggests prelim recommendation should be considered			
	with that context: Provides clarity about how (2.3.c.2) Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.2 states that "ICANN should be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized or taken into account by the relevant evaluators,			
	panels, etc. and to what extent different types of comments will or will not impact scoring."			
	It would be helpful if the PDP Working Group could clarify what is meant by being "more explicit" in how different types of			
	comments will or will not impact scoring. In the 2012 round, it was the job of the evaluation and objection panels to review and			
	determine the relevance of the comments, as well as whether they impact evaluation scores or the objection. Section 1.1.2.3 of the Applicant Guidebook states: "Evaluators will perform due diligence on the application comments (i.e., determine their relevance			
	the Applicant Guidebook states. Evaluators will perform due diligence on the application comments (i.e., determine their relevance to the evaluation, verify the accuracy of claims, analyze meaningfulness of references cited) and take the information provided in			
	these comments into consideration." As it relates to objections, this section of the Application Guidebook states: "These			
	comments will be available to any may be subsequently considered by an expert panel during a dispute resolution proceeding." Is it the view of the PDP Working Group that new rules and guidelines should be developed to govern the review and determinations			
	of application comments? If yes, what should those new rules and guidelines be?			
	Preliminary recommendation 2.3.c.2 also states: "[T]o the extent that public comments are to be taken into account by the			
	evaluators, panels, etc., applicants must have an opportunity to respond to those comments." Section 1.1.2.3 of the Applicant			
	Guidebook states: "In cases where consideration of the comments has impacted the scoring of the application, the evaluators will seek clarification from the applicant." Accordingly, evaluation panels (except for Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) which has			
	its own processes and procedures) issued clarification questions if a comment is determined to have a potential impact to the			
	score of the application.			
	Given this, it would be helpful if the PDP Working Group could clarify the new requirement being recommended (i.e., is the new			
	recommendation that clarifying question opportunities be extended to CPE applications if an application comment impacts scoring of the application?) Applicants were allowed to submit changes to their applications to address the clarifying questions. Is it		Agreement (but requesting clarifications in the context of the	
	envisioned that CPE applicants would be afforded the same opportunity? If so, considerations should be given to the objective of		2012 process)	
	the CPE process and whether that objective can be achieved if CPE applicants are given opportunities to amend their		WG Response:	
	applications. Considerations should also be given to the impact to other related processes (i.e., community objection, GAC advice), and how interested stakeholders can participate/engage meaningfully in the processes.		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT	
_		LOANIN	COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
5	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000009.html)	ICANN org	was done.] Agreement (Support for applicant to	
	Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency. If a comment is		respond)	
	going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and ICANN must verify the identity of		WG Response:	
	commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments.		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
6	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html)	RrSG	was done.]	Copied from General Comments

Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The I going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, at commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be p	nd ICANN must verify the identity of he commenter should not be ermitted to address/rebut all comments.	RrSG	Agreement (Supports allowing applicants to respond) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
7 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initia		RrSG	was done.]	
Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports Believes longer comment period for community applications makes sense: The E from an applicant when a comment may impact scoring. We would also advise requirin identity of the commenter. Identity of the commenter would not need to be disclosed to used in submitting comments would appear to be another way to "game the system" ar unfairly. A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the com application and provide comments if appropriate 8 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initia	C agrees with only requiring a response g confirmation and verification of the the public but anonymous or false identity id could financially impact an applicant munities impacted to become aware of the	BC	Agreement (Supports requiring response when comment may impact scoring) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
o (https://min.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initia	1-3000(10/201044/000007.11(111)	ВС	-	
Supports intent of recommendation and encourages more details to be added: The preliminary recommendation, which is to improve predictability. However, more detailed terms of the types of comments, how they would be interpreted by the evaluators and the needed to fully assess the impact of this proposal. We would not support a recommend define new actions to be taken against applications on the basis of public comments as	d information and definitions are required in heir impact on the application scoring is lation that leaves ICANN discretion to		Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Concerns (needs more details) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
9 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initia	.l-30oct18/2018q4/000005.html)	BRG	was done.]	
Supports recommendation with qualifications: The RySG supports the intent of this to improve predictability. However, more detailed information and definitions are required they would be interpreted by the evaluators and their impact on the application scoring proposal. We would not support a recommendation that leaves ICANN discretion to defapplications on the basis of public comments as part of the implementation process.	ed in terms of the types of comments, how is needed to fully assess the impact of this fine new actions to be taken against	P. CC	Agreement (Supports the recommendations) Concerns (need more details) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
10 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initia	I-30oct18/2018q4/000008.html)	RySG	was done.]	
2.3.e.1: The Working Group has noted that while there was a cutoff for application comme in the process, allowing for a much longer period of time for comments to be received for only after program elements like Initial Evaluation, Extended Evaluation, and objections c CPE extend longer than for Initial Evaluation? Do you believe it makes sense to shorten the Evaluation comment period?	this evaluation element. The longer periodoclude). Is this, or other factors, valid rea	od of time allowed was	as due to the timing of CPE (i.e., to have the comment period for	
Agrees with change: The ALAC agrees that it was unfair for applications undergoing of subjected to a longer comment period than for Initial Evaluation and therefore thinks it is			recommendations) WG Response:	
CPE to run parallel to the Initial Evaluation comment period. 1 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-atld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initia	I-30oct18/2018a4/000006.html)	ALAC	Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
1 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial Supports 2.3.c.1 and 2.3.c.2: Supportive of 2.3.e.1 and 2.3.e.3: The ALAC supports 2.3.c.1 to optimize the mechanisms and system for Application Comment and 2.3.c.2 for Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized. In pursuit of fairness, we are supportive of the idea of limiting the comment period for Comment period. We also think it is appropriate to allow applicants an additional but lim 60-day public comment period strictly to enable applicants to respond to late comments 2 (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initia)	the WG's preliminary recommendations or ICANN to be more explicit in the PE to run parallel to the Initial Evaluation ited period of 7 days after the close of a sift hey so choose.	ALAC		Copied from General Comments
(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial Supports 2.3.c.1 and 2.3.c.2: Supportive of 2.3.e.1 and 2.3.e.3: The ALAC supports 2.3.c.1 to optimize the mechanisms and system for Application Comment and 2.3.c.2 for Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized. In pursuit of fairness, we are supportive of the idea of limiting the comment period for Comment period. We also think it is appropriate to allow applicants an additional but lim 60-day public comment period strictly to enable applicants to respond to late comments.	the WG's preliminary recommendations or ICANN to be more explicit in the PE to run parallel to the Initial Evaluation lited period of 7 days after the close of a sif they so choose. Il-30oct18/2018q4/000006.html) rechange requests: We support a clearly applications should be the same time period subsequent change to an application (see a resul; t of a change, then this should run we adequate notice and opportunity to		COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.] Agreement (support for limiting the comment period for CPE) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	Copied from General Comments

	Support for a consistent and equal length of time for public comments that open and conclude at the same time,			
	applicable to all applications and application types: We fully support public comment on all applications, but subsequent			
	procedures must ensure fairness and equity among all application types when accepting and considering public comments. There was not equity or fairness in the 2012 round.			
	We believe there should be a consistent and equal length of time for public comments that open and conclude at the same time, applicable to all applications and application types. The public comment period should in no way, or for any reason, extend beyond the point when the first application in a subsequent procedure has completed Initial Evaluation. This ensures that all applications receive equal time for public comment, without disadvantaging or further scrutinizing any particular application or application type simply because of when their Initial Evaluation is scheduled or because they are required to participate in additional evaluations within the new gTLD program. This can be accomplished by simply disabling the public comment website so that no further submissions are accepted.			
	We further believe that "letters of opposition" should be considered a form of public comment and should adhere to the same submission deadlines. It is unclear why in the 2012 round ICANN allowed community organizations additional time to register their comments (in this case opposition) against Community Applications, even accepting such comments years after the public comment period was closed. This has merely introduced a new gaming opportunity for competitive interests to pursue late in the application review process, providing them additional time to isolate and influence a community organization(s) against a Community Application. If community opposition exists against a Community Application, and the opposition does not intend to participate in a Community Objection, then it should be required that the expressed opposition be registered during the public comment period in the form of a letter of opposition. This will add to the transparency and legitimacy of the opposition going into Community Priority Evaluations, and lessen the ability and impact of gaming from competitive interests.		Agreement (qualified equal length of time for all public comments) New Idea (letters of opposition as public comments) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT	
4	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000001.html)	dotgay LLC	COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
	Does not support changes to the extended comment period for community applications: In view of the different treatment of community applications to standard applications, which included the evaluation of the level of support or opposition to community applications, the BRG does not recommend any changes to the extended comment period for these applications.		Divergence (opposes changes to extended comment period) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
5	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000005.html)	BRG	was done.]	
6	Does not support changes to the extended comment period for these applications: In view of the different treatment of community applications to standard applications, which included the evaluation of the level of support or opposition to community applications, the RySG does not recommend any changes to the extended comment period for these applications. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000008.html)	RvSG	Divergence (opposes changes to the extended comment period) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
-	(mps://minicalm.org/pipermai/comments-new-guo-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-oboct/10/2010/q-/000000.minity	rtyso	Divergence (opposes changes to	
	Does not support shortening the period: With regards to the Community Priority Evaluation (question 2.3.e.1), the NCSG finds that CPE is a useful evaluation mechanism and we do not support the idea of shortening its period. Ideally, the time frame would be long enough to allow non-commercial organisations to make their observations and, thereby, broadening the pool of commercial interest inputs.		the extended comment period) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
7	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000013.html)	NCSG	was done.]	
	Supports only requiring response when comment may impact scoring. Supports requiring verification of commenter. Believes longer comment period for community applications makes sense: The BC agrees with only requiring a response from an applicant when a comment may impact scoring. We would also advise requiring confirmation and verification of the identity of the commenter. Identity of the commenter would not need to be disclosed to the public but annonymous or false identity used in submitting comments would appear to be another way to "game the system" and could financially impact an applicant unfairly. A longer comment period for community applications makes sense to allow for the communities impacted to become aware of the		Divergence (opposes changes to the extended comment period) WG Response:	
	application and provide comments if appropriate		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT	
8	(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000007.html)	вс	COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	Copied from General Comments
reduced	n the 2012 round, applicants were given the opportunity through Clarifying Questions to respond to comments that might the incentive for applicants to respond to all input received through the public forum, including comments that may be pe			
triat riee	ds to be addressed? If so, what measures do you propose in response to this problem?			

Supports applicants having the option of responding to comments and provides additional guidance related to implementation of Application Comment: The BRG believes the applicant should continue to have the option to respond to public comments available, where the applicant feels appropriate to do so. However, to minimise frivolous comments and false assertions, the source of the comments should be obtained and verified before publishing. For comments that may have a material impact on application scoring, we believe it is appropriate to continue to allow both general responses through the public forum and directly to ICANN through the designated application response period. In some cases, applicants may have information that is pertinent to assessing the relevance of a comment that they do not wish to share publicly through the public comment forum. Applicants should have mechanisms at their disposal for providing both public and not public information that is responsive to comments received. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000005.html)	BRG	Agreement (supports the recommendation) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
Supports allowing applicants to respond: We support providing an opportunity for applicants to respond to comments. We recommend that after a public comment period, the applicants are given a separate window to respond to public comments (see 2.3.e.3). (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000011.html)	IPC	Agreement (support for applicant to respond) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency. If a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and ICANN must verify the identity of commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/00010.html)	RrSG	Agreement (support for applicant to respond) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
Supports allowing applicants to respond with qualifications: The RySG believes the applicant should continue to have the option to respond to public comments available, where the applicant feels appropriate to do so. However, to minimise frivolous comments and false assertions, the source of the comments should be obtained and verified before publishing. For comments that may have a material impact on application scoring, we believe it is appropriate to continue to allow both general responses through the public forum and directly to ICANN through the designated application response period. In some cases, applicants may have information that is pertinent to assessing the relevance of a comment that they do not wish to share publicly through the public comment forum. Applicants should have mechanisms at their disposal for providing both public and not public information that is responsive to comments received.	RySG	Agreement (but with verification) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
Believes that if applicants are given a period to respond, commenters should be given a response period as well: The NCSG believes that if applicants are allowed to respond to comment, commenters should be allowed another round of comments (question 2.3.e.2). As noted in the Deliberation, some comments are frivolous, but others are quite serious. They are raising key comments and concerns from the public and those impacted by the nature of the gTLD (open, restricted, etc). "Clarifying Questions" may or may not be sufficient to address concerns of a public seeking to understand what lawyers are including in a gTLD application. If the applicant responds, the public must be allowed to respond as well. Otherwise, false, misleading, or incorrect information may be provided by an applicant in response to legitimate concerns and questions raised by commenters. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000013.html)	NCSG	Agreement (but public must be allowed to respond to commenters responses) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
Disagrees with the point that applicants were given the chance to respond to comments that might impact scoring; suggests that letters of opposition are a form of public comment and that there should be clear parameters for accepting public comment: We disagree with the assertion that applicants were given the chance to respond to comments that might impact scoring, especially in Community Priority Evaluations. In our experience, no Clarifying Questions were issued despite a point in Criteria #4 being withheld because of a single letter of opposition, which we categorically believe fits the definition of a public comment and was logged in the public forum years after the pubic comment period had technically closed. We believe that without concluding that letters of opposition are a form of public comment, and without setting clear parameters for accepting public comment, it will be impossible for evaluators to understand their requirement to issue Clarifying Questions when scoring could be impacted in CPE. Letters of opposition must be included in the definition of public comments, and they must follow all applicable rules and submission deadlines for public comments as we have previously stated in 2.3.e.1 above.		Divergence (disagrees with the premise of the question) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000001.html) Does not believe necessary: The ALAC does not consider this an issue that needs to be addressed because we understand that applicants are free to determine for themselves whether to respond any comment and to judge the consequences of a response or non-response. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000006.html)	dotgay LLC ALAC	was done.] Divergence (disagrees that this is an issue to be addressed) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	

Potential support for this suggestion, depending on details of program implementation: We could support this suggestion. I think that many applicants believed some public comments didn't warrant or require a dignified response due to the inaccuracy, irrelevance or misguided nature of the comment, believing that due diligence on behalf of the evaluator would sort through the facts and mistruths. If the standard going forward is that due diligence by the evaluator(s) is not to be assumed, and that it is the applicants responsibility (not the evaluators) to clarify or defend even the most frivolous and/or outrageous of comments to avoid evaluator(s) shortcoming, then the additional time will be necessary for applicants to submit formal responses. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000001.html)	dotgay LLC	Agreement (Support for the recommendation) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
		Agreement (Cuppert for the	
Support for this suggestion: The BRG believes this is a sensible enhancement, providing the applicant with an opportunity to reply to comments, especially those received at the end of the comment period. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000005.html)	BRG	Agreement (Support for the recommendation) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
(https://min.cam.org/pipermai/comments-rew-glid-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-cooct/orze/req-rococos.ntmi)	BRO	was done.j	
Supports modified version - allow for response for comments submitted 7 days or less before close of 60-day period: The ALAC thinks it is appropriate to allow applicants an additional but limited period of 7 days after the close of a 60-day public comment period strictly to enable applicants to respond to late comments if they so choose. In other words, the additional 7 days is meant to allow applicants reasonable time to respond to comments that are submitted 7 days or less before the close of a 60-day public comment period.		Agreement (Support for the recommendation) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000006.html)	ALAC	was done.]	
Supports 2.3.c.1 and 2.3.c.2: Supportive of 2.3.e.1 and 2.3.e.3: The ALAC supports the WG's preliminary recommendations 2.3.c.1 to optimize the mechanisms and system for Application Comment and 2.3.c.2 for ICANN to be more explicit in the Applicant Guidebook on how public comments are to be utilized. In pursuit of fairness, we are supportive of the idea of limiting the comment period for CPE to run parallel to the Initial Evaluation comment period. We also think it is appropriate to allow applicants an additional but limited period of 7 days after the close of a 60-day public comment period strictly to enable applicants to respond to late comments if they so choose.	AL A.C.	Agreement (Support for the recommendation) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000006.html)	ALAC	was done.]	Copied from General Comments
Supports applicants being granted response period: We support an additional period at the conclusion of the public comment period for applicants to respond to the comments if they wish. This provides applicants with an opportunity to respond to all comments received and mitigates the risk of negative comments being submitted last minute to prevent the applicant from responding. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000011.html)	IPC	Agreement (Support for the recommendation) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
(https://min.icann.org/pipermaii/comments-new-gito-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-500ct16/2016q4/000011.html)	IPC	was done.j	
Supports the enhancement: Yes, the RySG believes this is a sensible enhancement, providing the applicant with an opportunity to reply to comments, especially those received at the end of the comment period. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-qtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000008.html)	RySG	Agreement (Support for the recommendation) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	
Supports period, no longer than 10 days, for applicants to respond. Period should be a part of the overall public comment period. Public response period needed as well: Wrapping up the 'Role of Application' section of the supplemental report, question 2.3.e.3 comments on the possibilities of (a) allowing an application comment period prior to evaluations, and (b) Applicants be given a certain amount of time to respond to the public comments prior to the consideration of those comments. The NCSG agrees that applicants should be given a short period of time to respond to comments. On the length and purpose of the	. ,		
period, we would like to note that applicants should indeed respond to more relevant comments and be allowed to include attachments. Additionally, this timeframe for applicant response should not be longer than 10 days - to be included in the public comment period. Last but not least, the broader community should be allowed to respond, critique and comment on the applicant's response. It is very important to have this public response period, following applicant's and something past experience shows it is critical for the future applicant avidablest to include		Agreement (Support for the recommendation) WG Response:	
is critical for the future applicant guidebook to include.		Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what	
(https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000013.html)	NCSG	was done.]	1

Commenter should be verified and applicant should be allowed to respond: The key here is transparency. If a comment is going to be made public, then there needs to be transparency in who is commenting, and ICANN must verify the identity of commenters. Anonymous comments or comments where ICANN is unable to identify the commenter should not be permitted/posted. Furthermore, once a comment is received, the Applicant should be permitted to address/rebut all comments. (https://mm.icann.org/pipermail/comments-new-gtld-subsequent-procedures-supp-initial-30oct18/2018q4/000010.html)	Agreement (Support for the recommendation) WG Response: Action Taken: [COMPLETED / NOT COMPLETED] - [Instruction of what was done.]	Copied from General Comments
	-	