Affirmation 33.1: The Working Group affirms that the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP)[228] and the Registration Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP) should remain available to those harmed by a new gTLD registry operator's conduct, subject to the recommendation below.

Recommendation 33.2: For the Public Interest Commitment Dispute Resolution Procedure (PICDRP) and the Registration Restrictions Dispute Resolution Procedure (RRDRP), clearer, more detailed, and better-defined guidance on the scope of the procedure, the role of all parties, and the adjudication process must be publicly available.

b. Deliberations and rationale for recommendations and/or implementation guidelines

Rationale for Affirmation 33.1 and Recommendation 33.2: The Working Group believes that post-delegation dispute resolution procedures continue to be appropriate mechanisms to provide those harmed by a new gTLD registry operator's conduct an avenue to complain about that conduct. The Working Group believes, however, that in support of transparency and predictability, clearer and more detailed documentation for these procedures should be published.

c. New issues raised in deliberations since publication of the Initial Report, if applicable.

The Working Group did not conduct an exhaustive review of the PICDRP, because at the beginning of the PDP, no PICDRP cases had been filed. Since that time, only two cases had been filed, which the Working Group felt was too few to support an intensive review.

d. Dependencies/relationships with other areas of this report or external efforts

- This topic provides recommendations about the PICDRP, the dispute resolution procedure associated with Registry Voluntary Commitments (RVCs) and mandatory Public Interest Commitments (PICs). RVCs and PICs are discussed further under Topic 9: Registry Voluntary Commitments / Public Interest Commitments.

Commented [A44]: Action Item 27-10-1

Deleted: process

2.9 Deliberations and Recommendations: String Contention Resolution

Topic 34: Community Applications

---

[228] The PICDRP will apply to both mandatory PICs and Registry Voluntary Commitments, formerly called voluntary PICs.

a. Recommendations and/or implementation guidelines

Implementation Guideline F from the 2007 policy is affirmed with modification under Topic 35: Auctions: Mechanisms of Last Resort / Private Resolution of Contention Sets. Implementation Guideline F is also relevant to this topic.

Affirmation 34.1: The Working Group affirms the continued prioritization of applications in contention sets that have passed Community Priority Evaluation (CPE). The Working Group further affirms Implementation Guideline H* from the 2007 policy, which states: "Where an applicant lays any claim that the TLD is intended to support a particular community such as a sponsored TLD, or any other TLD intended for a specified community, that claim will be taken on trust with the following exceptions: (i) the claim relates to a string that is also subject to another application and the claim to support a community is being used to gain priority for the application; and (ii) a formal objection process is initiated. Under these exceptions, Staff Evaluators will devise criteria and procedures to investigate the claim. Under exception (ii), an expert panel will apply the process, guidelines, and definitions set forth in IG P."

Implementation Guideline 34.2: In the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, the following text is included under Definitions for CPE Criterion 1-A Delineation: "Notably, as "community" is used throughout the application, there should be: . . . (b) some understanding of the community's existence prior to September 2007 (when the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed). . ." and " "Pre-existing" means that a community has been active as such since before the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed in September 2007." The corresponding section of the CPE Evaluation Guidelines states, "The following questions must be scored when evaluating the application: . . *Has the community been active since at least September 2007?"* For subsequent procedures, references to "September 2007" should be changed to "the beginning of the then current application submission period."

Implementation Guideline 34.3: Under Criterion 1-A Delineation, the Evaluation Guidelines from the 2012 round include a non-exhaustive list of "elements of straight-forward member definitions." This list should continue to include elements applicable to economic communities with a formal membership structure, but it should also include elements applicable to communities that are not economic in nature, including linguistic and cultural communities, that have clear and straight-forward membership definition.

Implementation Guideline 34.4: In the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, the following text is included under Definitions for CPE Criterion 1-A Delineation: " "Organized" implies that there is at least one entity mainly dedicated to the community, with documented evidence of community activities." The interpretation in the Evaluation Guidelines of the term "mainly" should make clear that it is possible for more than one entity to administer a community.

Implementation Guideline 34.5: In the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, text regarding CPE Criterion 2-A Nexus includes guidance on scoring in relation to criterion. Corresponding text included in the Evaluation Guidelines should be more specific and clear regarding scoring to eliminate any ambiguity in interpretation. The Working Group suggests the following text to include in the Evaluation Guidelines: "With respect to "Nexus", For a score of 3, the essential aspect is that the applied-for string matches the name of the community. Where an exact match is not established but the applied-for string is established as commonly known by others as a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community, it will also be eligible for a score of 3. Where the applied-for string does not match the name of the community or is not a well-known short-form or abbreviation of the community, it may score a 2 if it identifies the Community - i.e. closely describes either the Community or a reasonably understood boundary of the Community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the Community. An applied-for string which identified the Community but over-reaches substantially into a community will score a zero."

Implementation Guideline 34.6: In the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, text regarding CPE Criterion 2-B Uniqueness includes the following definition: " "Identify" means that the applied for string closely describes the community or the community members, without over-reaching substantially beyond the community." The corresponding Evaluation Guidelines should make clear that there are two distinct paths to establish if an applied for string identifies the community: 1. describing the community OR 2. describing the community members. The Guidelines should explicitly state that these paths are not interconnected or contingent on one another.

Implementation Guideline 34.7: The Evaulation Guidelines regarding Criterion 2-B Uniqueness should make clear that evaluators should not be making a qualitative assessment of whether the a term is the most appropriate or descriptive term for a given community compared to other possible terms. Instead, they should be examining whether this is a term that the public in general associates with this community as opposed to another meaning.

Implementation Guideline 34.8: CPE Evaluation Guidelines regarding scoring for Criterion 4-A Support should make clear that it is not assumed for the purposes of scoring that only a single organization will serve as the representative for an entire community and that other considerations may be taken into account in scoring for this criterion if multiple organizations represent a community.

Implementation Guideline 34.9: The following text included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook Section 4.2.3 Community Priority Evaluation Criteria should also be incorporated into the CPE Evaluation Guidelines: "The sequence of the criteria reflects the order in which they will be assessed by the panel. The utmost care has been taken to avoid any "double-counting" - any negative aspect

found in assessing an application for one criterion should only be counted there and should not affect the assessment for other criteria."

Recommendation 34.10: The Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process must be efficient, transparent and predictable.

Implementation Guideline 34.11: To support predictability, the CPE guidelines, or as amended, should be considered a part of the policy adopted by the Working Group.

Implementation Guideline 34.12: ICANN org should examine ways to make the CPE process more efficient in terms of costs and timing.

Recommendation 34.13: All Community Priority Evaluation procedures (including any supplemental dispute provider rules) must be developed and published before the opening of the application submission period and must be readily and publicly available.

Recommendation 34.14: Evaluators must continue to be able to send Clarifying Questions to CPE applicants but further, must be able to engage in written dialogue with them as well.

Recommendation 34.15: Evaluators must be able to issue Clarifying Questions, or utilize similar methods to address potential issues, to those who submit letters of opposition to community-based applications.

Recommendation 34.16: Letters of opposition to a community-based application, if any, must be considered in balance with documented support for the application.

Implementation Guideline 34.17: The 2012 Applicant Guidebook includes the following text regarding scoring for CPE Criterion 4-B Opposition: "Opposition: 2= No opposition of relevance; 1= Relevant opposition from one group of non-negligible size; 0= Relevant opposition from two or more groups of non-negligible size." In listing considerations for determining whether an organization is of "non-neglible size," the Evaluation Guidelines should include text indicating that the determination of what is non-neglible must be relative to the size of the community that that applicant is proporting to serve.

Recommendation 34.18: If the Community Priority Evaluation Panel conducts independent research while evaluating an application, limitations on this research and additional requirements must apply. The Working Group recommends including the following text in the Applicant Guidebook: "The Community Priority Evaluation Panel may perform independent research deemed necessary to evaluate the application (the "Limited Research"), provided, however, that the evaluator shall disclose the results of such Limited Research to the applicant and the applicant shall have an opportunity to respond. The applicant shall be provided 30 days to respond before the evaluation decision is rendered. When conducting any such Limited Research, panelists are

---

Deleted: 23 November 202023 November 202019 November 20209 November 20203 November 20202 November 20202 November 202028 October 2020

Commented [A52]: Action Item 1-10-3

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 3

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 5

Deleted: 6

Deleted: 7

Deleted: 8

Commented [A53]: Action Item 1-10-1

Deleted: 9

cautioned not to assume an advocacy role either for or against the applicant or application."

> Implementation Guideline 34.19: To support transparency, if the Community Priority Evaluation Panel relied on research for the decision it should be cited and a link to the information provided.

b. Deliberations and rationale for recommendations and/or implementation guidelines

In considering this topic, the Working Group notes that the ICANN Board previously identified Communities as one of the areas for potential policy development work for subsequent procedures.[229] The Working Group offers the above recommendations in an effort to guide improvements in the Community Priority Evaluation process.

The Working Group believed that although the Applicant Guidebook had reflected the the ICANN community's perspective on how Community Applications should be evaluated. That said, the Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines[230] ("Guidelines"), which served as the reference manual for the CPE evaluator, fell short on meeting the expectations of the ICANN community both in terms of transparency and in substance. As stated in Recommendation _____, all criteria, gruidelines and any other relevant material must be made available to applicants in, or at least at the same time as, the Applicant Guidebook. It is only logical that applicants are aware of all of the criteria by which they will be measured.

In addition, in the view of the Working Group, as well as many of the public comments it received, the Guidelines were explicitly (and in practice) biased towards favoring economic-based communities and disadvantaged non-economic communities such as cultural, linguistic, ethnic groupings, Indigenous, minority and civil society advocacy groups andcommunities. Therefore, many of the recommendations and implementation guidance proposals are geared towards providing greater clarity but also flexibility to the CPE evaluators in using the criteria to assess whether an application should gain community status and ultimately priority in a contention set.

With these changes, the Working Group believes that the community priority evaluation process will greater reflect the original purposes set forth in the original GNSO policies and will hopefully reduce the amount of complaints the CPE process received during the 2012 new gTLD application round.

Rationale for Affirmation 34.1: The Working Group supports the overall approach used in the 2012 round for community-based applications, as well as the continued prioritization of applications in contention sets that have passed Community Priority

---

[229] See 17 November 2014 Board resolution: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/resolutions-annex-a-17nov14-en.pdf

[230] Insert Link

Evaluation. Therefore, the Working Group affirms this approach as well as Implementation Guideline H* from 2007.

Rationale for Implementation Guideline 34.2: In the 2012 round, a community was considered "pre-existing" for the purposes of CPE if the community had been "active as such since before the new gTLD policy recommendations were completed in September 2007." The Working Group believes that the time period used in this definition is arbitrary and further believes that legitimate communities may exist that have been active for a relatively short period of time. The Working Group understands that the original criterion may have sought to prevent the formation of communities solely for the purpose of CPE, but considers the risk of "gaming" in this regard to be low. Therefore the Working Group believes that it is sufficient and appropriate to require only that the community has been existence since the beginning of the then current application submission period.

> **Commented [A54]:** Action Item 17-9-1

Rationale for Implementation Guideline 34.3: The Working Group notes that some communities have a clear and straightforward membership definition without having "card carrying" members. The Working Group believes that the 2012 Evaluation Guidelines interpreted Applicant Guidebook provisions regarding Delineation too narrowly to focus exclusively on communities and associations that are economic in nature and should also recognize membership attributes of other types of communities, including linguistic and cultural communities, in evaluating Delineation.

> **Commented [A55]:** Action Item 17-9-2

Rationale for Implementation Guideline 34.4: The Working Group emphasizes that the Evaluation Guidelines should not be interpreted for scoring purposes to mean that there can only be one entity to administer a community. The Working Group believes that the Evaluation Guidelines should be clearer in this regard.

> **Commented [A56]:** Action Item 17-9-3

Rationale for Implementation Guideline 34.5: The Working Group believes that clear guidance regarding scoring in relation to the Nexus criteria should be included in the Evaluation Guidelines and has suggested text in this regard.

> **Commented [A57]:** Action Item 24-9-2

Rationale for Implementation Guideline 34.6: The Working Group believes that the intent of the Applicant Guidebook was clear with respect to the definition of Identify, but that EIU mistakenly interpreted the text to mean that the applied for string must closely describe both the community and the community members rather than providing for two different tracks as indicated in the Applicant Guidebook text. It is the Working Group's view that the Evaluation Guidelines should be updated to reflect the intent of the Applicant Guidebook to prevent possible misinterpretation.

> **Commented [A58]:** Action Item 24-9-1

Rationale for Implementation Guideline 34.7: The Working Group believes that it is important to clarify the Evaluation Guidelines regarding Criterion 2-B Uniqueness to indicate not only the factors that should be taken into account with respect to the criterion, but also factors that should not be taken into account to prevent possible misinterpretation.

> **Commented [A59]:** Action Item 24-9-3

Rationale for Implementation Guideline 34.8: The Working Group believes that the Application Guidelines should be explicit that multiple organizations may represent the same community simultaneously and and that Application Guidelines should emphasize that if there is more than one organization representing a community, the additional questions provided should be considered to determine scoring.

Rationale for Implementation Guideline 34.9: The Working Group seeks to ensure that each CPE evaluation criterion is fully independent of other criteria with respect to scoring of applications. To reinforce the importance of this principle, the Working Group believes that text in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook regarding this issue should also be incorporated into the Evaluation Guidelines.

Rationale for Recommendations 34.10 and 34.13 and Implementation Guidance 34.11: The Working Group believes that the 2012 CPE process lacked the appropriate level of transparency and predictability. The Working Group believes that transparency and predictability are essential objectives in the implementation of CPE and recommends that ICANN org seek opportunities to improve the evaluation process to ensure that evaluation criteria and the application of these criteria are transparent and predictable to all parties. The Working Group has provided specific suggestions in this regard through implementation guidance. In further support of transparency and predictability, the Working Group has recommended that evaluation procedures (including any supplemental dispute provider rules) are widely available before the opening of the application submission period.

Rationale for Implementation Guidance 34.12: The Working Group believes that the CPE process was too costly for applicants, considering that the actual cost incurred by applicants was essentially double compared to what was predicted in the Applicant Guidebook, and further believes that the process took too long to complete. The Working Groups believes that drawing on lessons learned from the 2012 round, the CPE process should be able to realize efficiencies in both costs and time in subsequent rounds.

Rationale for Recommendations 34.14 and 34.15: In the 2012 application round, evaluators could submit Clarifying Questions (CQs) to CPE applicants through ICANN org.[231] The Working Group believes, however, that evaluators should have additional resources at their disposal to gather information about a CPE application and any opposition to that application.

Rationale for Recommendation 34.16 and Implementation Guideline 34.17: The Working Group believes that the The 2012 Community Priority Evaluation Guidelines were not sufficiently clear in defining "relevance" under Criterion 4-B Opposition, which may have resulted in panelists evaluating letters of opposition in isolation without also considering the level of support for an application. The Working Group therefore recommends that it must be clear that any letters of opposition are to be considered in

---

[231] For specific information about the circumstances under which CQs were issued in CPE, please see 126-127 of the Program Implementation Review Report.

balance with documented support for an application. The Working Group has suggested an update to the Evaluation Guidelines to ensure that one misaligned community member/entity does not have the power to impact CPE scores of a largely aligned community.

Rationale for Recommendation 34.18 and Implementation Guidance 34.19: Section 4.2.3 of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook states: "The [Community Priority Evaluation Panel] may also perform independent research, if deemed necessary to reach informed scoring decisions." To reduce the risk of introducing inaccurate information and bias into the evaluation process and to support transparency, the Working Group has provided alternate language to include in the Applicant Guidebook for subsequent procedures. To promote transparency, the Working Group suggests that if the Community Priority Evaluation Panel relied on research for the decision it should be cited and a link to the information provided.

In developing recommendations on this topic, the Working Group reviewed relevant GAC Consensus Advice included in the Beijing Communiqué (ICANN46),[232] Durban Communiqué (ICANN47),[233] Singapore Communiqué (ICANN49),[234] Los Angeles Communiqué (ICANN51),[235] Buenos Aires Communiqué (ICANN53),[236] and Dublin Communiqué (ICANN54).[237] The Working Group further reviewed relevant At-Large

---

[232] "The GAC advises the Board that in those cases where a community, which is clearly impacted by a set of new gTLD applications in contention, has expressed a collective and clear opinion on those applications, such opinion should be duly taken into account, together with all other relevant information." See: https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann46-beijing-communique
[233] "The GAC advises the ICANN Board to consider to take better account of community views, and improve outcomes for communities, within the existing framework, independent of whether those communities have utilized ICANN's formal community processes to date." See https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann47-durban-communique
[234] "The GAC Advises ICANN to continue to protect the public interest and improve outcomes for communities, and to work with the applicants in an open and transparent manner in an effort to assist those communities. The GAC further notes that a range of issues relating to community applications will need to be dealt with in future rounds." See https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann49-singapore-communique
[235] "The GAC has concerns about the consistency of the Community Priority Evaluation Process, following the rejection of a number of applications. There is a need to ensure that criteria for community priority treatment are applied consistently across the various applications. The GAC requests the ICANN Board to examine the feasibility of implementing an appeal mechanism in the current round in case an applicant contests the decision of a community priority evaluation panel." See https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann51-los-angeles-communique
[236] "The GAC continues to keep under review the community application process for new gTLDs, noting that it does not appear to have met applicant expectations. The GAC looks forward to seeing the report of the ICANN Ombudsman on this matter following his current inquiry and will review the situation at its meeting in Dublin." See https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann53-buenos-aires-communique
[237] "The GAC advises the ICANN Board that: i. The GAC reiterates previously expressed concerns that the Community Priority Evaluation (CPE) process has not met the expectations of applicants and notes that all the successful applications are currently the subject dispute resolution procedures; ii. The GAC expects the current specific problems faced by individual applicants to be resolved without any unreasonable delay, and in a manner in which justified community interests are best served; iii. The GAC notes possibly unforeseen

---

Deleted: 23 November 202023 November 202019 November 20209 November 20203 November 20202 November 20202 November 20202 November 202028 October 2020

Deleted: d

Commented [A62]: Action Item 1-10-1

Deleted: 9

Deleted: 10

Statements on Community Expertise in Community Priority Evaluation[238] and Preferential Treatment for Community Applications in String Contention.[239] The Working Group has not identified any conflicts between the Working Group's recommendations and the Advice provided by the GAC and ALAC. The Working Group believes that its recommendations for improved transparency and predictability are aligned with concerns expressed by the GAC that greater consistency is needed in the Community Priority Evaluation process. The Working Group further notes that it is recommending the establishment of a limited challenge/appeals mechanism for the New gTLD Program that would enable applicants and other parties to challenge or appeal decisions made in the application process, including the results of Community Priority Evaluation (see Topic 32: Limited Challenge/Appeal Mechanism for additional information). The Working Group believes that this mechanism has the potential to support more consistent outcomes in CPE for subsequent procedures.

The Working Group notes that CCT-RT Recommendation 34 states: "A thorough review of the procedures and objectives for community based applications should be carried out and improvements made to address and correct the concerns raised before a new gTLD application process is launched. Revisions or adjustments should be clearly reflected in an updated version of the 2012 AGB." This recommendation was directed to the Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group. The ICANN Board passed this recommendation through to the Working Group. The Working Group has extensively discussed this in the Community Priority Evaluation process and put forward the above recommendations to address concerns raised about CPE in the 2012 round. The Working Group believes that the work it has completed is in line with that recommended by the CCT-RT.

c. New issues raised in deliberations since publication of the Initial Report, if applicable.

The Working Group considered feedback that it might be beneficial to have a less restrictive word count for communities to engage in clarifying and providing information. The Working Group did not come to a conclusion on this issue.

---

consequences for community applicants of recourse by competing applicants to other accountability mechanisms; and the specific challenges faced by some community applicants in auctions when in competition with commercial applicants; iv. The GAC will take into account the final report of the ICANN Ombudsman on this issue when preparing the GAC's input into the GNSO's review of issues for improving procedures relating to community-based applications in the next gTLD round; and the Competition, Trust, and Consumer Choice Review (CCT) under the Affirmation of Commitments." See https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann54-dublin-communique
[238] "1. The ALAC has concerns about the sufficiency of community expertise in panels that evaluate new gTLD community applications. 2. The ALAC stands ready to offer appropriate ICANN community volunteers to serve as panel members or advisors." See https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/7201
[239] "Applications with demonstrable support, appropriate safeguards and strong emphasis on community service should be accorded preferential treatment in the new gTLD string contention resolution process." See https://atlarge.icann.org/advice_statements/7211

The Working Group discussed a proposal to grant "extra credit" in CPE to applicants that help or solve a problem inside a community to which the proposed gTLD relates. In reviewing this proposal, it was raised that most community applicants felt that they were solving a problem within the community they served, and therefore it is unclear why this criterion should be used to grant "extra credit." It was further raised that the proposal lacks detail about the definition of "a problem inside a community." The Working Group did not make a recommendation on this issue.

The Working Group considered input regarding the composition of the CPE panel. Specifically the Working Group noted the perspective that those evaluating community applications should have significant expertise in applying the concept of "community." The Working Group did not come to any conclusions on this point.

The Working Group notes the perspective raised in discussions that additional steps should be taken to ensure the legitimacy of any opposition expressed to the community-based application. Specifically, the Working Group notes the suggestion that those raising opposition should be prepared to engage in an ongoing dialogue regarding their opposition. It also notes the suggestion that a public and transparent verification process should be conducted on any opposition letter to ensure that the author of the letter represents the organization that it claims to represent.

The GAC's ICANN67 Communiqué[241] included a summary of GAC discussions on the Working Group's draft recommendations regarding community applications. The Working Group reviewed the Communiqué. On 4 May 2020, the GAC provided consolidated input from individual GAC members on the topics discussed at ICANN67, including community applications.[242] In this informal input, many of the respondents expressed support for the draft recommendations on this topic, although some expressed that they still have outstanding concerns about the CPE process and its effectiveness. Several respondents noted that additional details would need to be filled in to ensure that concerns about CPE from the 2012 round are addressed in the implementation of subsequent rounds. In addition, a few comments made specific suggestions about possible changes to the CPE process and criteria.[243]

d. Dependencies/relationships with other areas of this report or external efforts

- This topic addresses the Community Priority Evaluation. Discussion of Community Objections is included under Topic 31: Objections.

---

[241] https://gac.icann.org/contentMigrated/icann67-gac-communique

[242]
https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/93129620/GAC%20Written%20Consultation_%20Input%20Received-%20Updated%209%20May.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1589186135000&api=v2

[243] This reference to informal GAC input is not intended to be a comprehensive summary of all comments. Please review the compilation of comments for full text of the input received.

- A recommendation on the length of and timing of the Application Comment Period for Community-Based Applications is included under Topic 28: Role of Application Comment.

Topic 35: Auctions: Mechanisms of Last Resort / Private Resolution of Contention Sets

a. Recommendations and/or implementation guidelines

Affirmation with Modification 35.1: Implementation Guideline F from 2007 states: "If there is contention for strings, applicants may: i) resolve contention between them within a pre-established timeframe ii) if there is no mutual agreement, a claim to support a community by one party will be a reason to award priority to that application. If there is no such claim, and no mutual agreement a process will be put in place to enable efficient resolution of contention and; iii) the ICANN Board may be used to make a final decision, using advice from staff and expert panels."

The Working Group affirms this Implementation Guideline with the following changes in italicized text: "If there is contention for strings, applicants may: i) resolve contention between them within a pre-established timeframe *in accordance with the Applicant Guidebook and supporting documents* ii) if there is no mutual agreement, a claim to support a community by one party will be a reason to award priority to that application. If there is no such claim, and no mutual agreement, *contention will be resolved through an ICANN Auction of Last Resort* and; iii) the ICANN Board *may use expert panels to make Community Priority Evaluation determinations*."

The revision to part i) specifies that any private resolution of contention must be in accordance with the Application Guidebook and supporting documents, including the Application Change request process and Terms and Conditions. Adjustments in the text of ii) and iii) describe in greater specificity program elements as they were implemented in the 2012 round, which will carry over into subsequent rounds.

Recommendation 35.2: Consistent with the Application Change processes set forth under Topic 20: Application Change Requests, the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) must reflect that applicants will be permitted to creatively resolve contention sets in a multitude of manners, including but not limited to business combinations or other forms of joint ventures and private resolutions (including private auctions).
- All private resolutions reached by means of forming business combinations or other joint ventures resulting in the withdrawal of one or more applications are subject to the Application Change processes set forth under Topic 20: Application Change Requests.
- Any materially modified application resulting from a private resolution will be subject to a new operational comment period on the changes as well as a new period to file objections; provided however, objections during this new period