

Tracking #	Topic	Meeting Date	Action Item	Status
17-9-1	Community Applications	17 September	<p>CPE Guidelines and WG Recommendations/Implementation Guidance:</p> <p>Re: "Pre-Existing":</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Add to "Pre-existing" the same language used above: "Some understanding that the community existed prior to the opening of the application window."</p>	Staff drafted edit on pgs 160 and 163
17-9-2	Community Applications	17 September	<p>Re: "Delineation":</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: WG can comment that the EIU's interpretation of "delineation" was too narrow and we think it should be [what we think in the positive].</p>	Staff drafted edit on pgs 160 and 163
17-9-3	Community Applications	17 September	<p>Guidelines re: Delineation: "'Mainly' could imply that the entity administering the community may have additional roles/functions beyond administering the community, but one of the key or primary purposes/functions of the entity is to administer a community or a community organization."</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Clarify that this text should not be interpreted to mean that there can only be one entity to administer a community.</p>	Staff drafted updates on pgs 160 and 163
24-9-1	Community Applications	24 September	<p>CPE Guidelines and WG Recommendations/Implementation Guidance:</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Add Implementation Guidance in the AGB that "Identify" means that the applied for string closely describes either "the community" or "the community members".</p>	Staff drafted updates on pgs 161 and 164
24-9-2	Community Applications	24 September	<p>Re: Criterion 2-A Guidelines</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Incorporate the guidance on "Nexus" provided by the At-Large proposal. Insert a note in the clean/WG version that if we put in the guidelines provided above by At-Large then that would eliminate the need for this row.</p>	Staff drafted updates on pgs 161 and 164

24-9-3	Community Applications	24 September	<p>Re: 2-B Uniqueness</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Add a comment to make it clear that it's not a subject determination that there are better names for the community or is that a name that most people associate with that community as opposed to many other things.</p>	Staff drafted updates on pgs 161 and 164
24-9-4	Community Applications	24 September	<p>Criterion #4: Community Endorsement – Re: Scoring: and “Consider whether the community institution or member organization is the clearly recognized representative of the community.”</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Change to “a clearly recognized representative of the community”.</p>	Staff drafted updates on pgs 161 and 164 -- note that in reviewing the recording, it appears that the action item should be revised slightly to read "Guidelines for 4-A Support should emphasize that it is not assumed that a single organization will serve as a representative to an entire community."
1-10-1	Community Applications	1 October	<p>4-B Opposition:</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Add to the Guidelines where it says for non-negligible size consider the proportion to the overall size of the community that the applicant is aiming to serve.</p>	Staff drafted updates to pgs 161 and 164.
1-10-2	Community Applications	1 October	<p>4-B Opposition:</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Check to see if the issue of whether there is a direct or remote connection between the group opposing and the string being applied for is captured in the existing Guidelines (see At-Large proposal).</p>	Staff reviewed the existing Guidelines and this appears to be included.
1-10-3	Community Applications	1 October	<p>Additional Action Item: Make sure language from the AGB regarding double counting in scoring is also included in the Guidelines.</p>	Staff drafted updates to pgs 161 and 164.
27-10-1	General Comments	27 October	<p>ACTION ITEM: Staff and Leadership to review the report to see where processes and procedures are mentioned in the Recommendations and Implementation Guidance and we'll see how big of a task it is to make the usage consistent.</p>	Staff drafted edits on pages: 18, 52, 84, 145, 147, 159, 229

27-10-2	General Comments	27 October	ACTION ITEM re: Implementation Guidance 24.4: Add a recommendation that a question should be asked of what's within the scope of the intended use and what is specifically excluded if anything from the scope of the intended use.	Staff drafted edits on pages: 105-106
27-10-3	Predictability	27 October	ACTION ITEM: Staff and Leadership to develop proposed language for the SPIRT that encompasses these points: 1) Need to have some kind of review of the Predictability Framework early on; 2) that review doesn't stop the work of the SPIRT, and 3) that review is under the supervision of the GNSO Council, 4) it should be lean and focused (look at Customer Standing Committee reviews as example).	Staff drafted edits on pages: 16
27-10-4	Predictability	27 October	ACTION ITEM: Move from Implementation Guidance to a Recommendation that the GNSO Operating Procedures take precedent over the SPIRT.	Staff drafted edits on pages: Text moved from page 17 to 16
29-10-1	Applicant Support	29 October	Row 19 – RySG: ACTION ITEM: Staff to review the RySG comments (17.9, 17.13, 17.17) to determine how they can be incorporated into the Final Report. Re: 17.5: Leadership to send a question to the list re: bid credits.	-Staff drafted edits on pages 69, 72, 73 -Co-Chairs to email list
29-10-2	Applicant Support	29 October	Row 23 – ALAC re: Metrics (also RySG suggested metrics)  ACTION ITEM: Add the metrics suggestions to the metrics section of the Final Report.	Staff drafted edits on page 71
29-10-4	Limited Challenge/Appeal Mechanism	29 October	ACTION ITEM: Flag the issue of the interrelationship between ICANN as an evaluator and the accountability mechanisms; add to the chart in Annex F where ICANN is the evaluator the parties that can challenge and the mechanism to address that challenge.	Jeff drafted edits, staff added on page 152
29-10-6	Applicant Guidebook	29 October	Row 13: ICANN org -- ACTION ITEM: re: 12.4 and clarity of language: Move the Implementation Guidance 12.8 into the recommendation 12.4; staff to reach out to ICANN org to see if that language addresses the issue.	Staff drafted edit on page 53

29-10-7	Communications	29 October	<p>Row 17 -- ICANN org re: Goals and Affirmation 6.1.1</p> <p>Re: "It would be helpful to understand the PDP WG's definition of the goals of the Program and whether this Recommendation is in reference to Affirmation 6.1.1."</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Re: ICANN org comments on goals and Affirmation 6.1.1: Ensure that the Recommendation on the goals of the Program is linked to Affirmation 6.1.1.</p>	Staff drafted edit on page 55
29-10-8	Systems	29 October	<p>Row 13: Dotzon re: certain character combinations not allowed</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Check on what are the problematic character combinations.</p>	Staff drafted edit on page 59. Added to existing Implementation Guidance 14.6: "The system needs to be able to accept standard terminology and nomenclature for the services being proposed."
2-11-1	Application Change Requests	2 November	<p>Row 10 -- IPC/ Row 11 -- INTA/Row 12 -- GBOC/Row 19 -- Brand Registry Group, Inc</p> <p>Re: .Brand TLD meeting criteria qualifies as .Brand TLD</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Make it clear in the recommendation that changing the string to a descriptor word that is not in the trademark could qualify for Spec 13.</p>	Staff drafted edit on page 89
2-11-2	Application Change Requests	2 November	<p>Row 21 -- ICANN Org</p> <p>Re: Terminology of Public Comment period; scope for changes; processing delays; other questions</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Revise the term "comment period" to a term that is not associated with a public policy comment period.</p>	Staff drafted edits on pages 39, 45, 88-89, 139, 146, 169, 172

2-11-3	Application Change Requests	2 November	<p>Re: The .Brand evaluation would need to occur during the application phase in order to allow .brands to change their strings. (a) Should ICANN just do them for the .brands that want to change their strings or (b) should there be a check box on the application to be considered to be a .brand during the actual initial evaluation? If (b), we would need to work in.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Clarify that .brands that want to change their strings will need to be evaluated.</p>	Staff drafted edits on page 89.
5-11-1	Application Fees	5 November	<p>Row 13 -- Dotzon GmbH re: IG 15.8 modification: excess fees must be returned to applicants</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Add that ICANN may want to spread out the cost. Not as Implementation Guidance.</p>	Staff drafted edits on page 65.
5-11-2	Application Fees	5 November	<p>Row 24 -- Christa Taylor (Individual) re: Fee floor evaluation; excess fee uses; periodic review; timely return of excess fees; determining fees</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Revise the language of the recommendation along the lines that Christa is suggesting: From Christa: "15.8 In the event, the excess fees are less than an agreed-upon amount for example, \$1k then those funds should be used for the purpose as outlined in recommendation 15.9."</p>	Staff drafted edits on page 63-64 & 66.
5-11-3	Application Fees	5 November	<p>Row 23 – RySG re: Fee floor evaluation; excess fee uses; periodic review; timely return of excess fees; determining fees</p> <p>ACTION ITEMS: Revise the Recommendation: 1) Change the refund to be refund or credit towards future fees where applicable; 2) If you can't find that entity or there's no entity to claim that refund, then it would go towards one of the purposes set forth in 15.9.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Staff to check to see how the US47k was derived in the 2012 round re: Applicant Support.</p>	<p>Staff drafted edits on pages 63-64 &amp; 66.</p> <p>staff sent follow up email to WG on ASP fee amount.</p>
5-11-5	Application Fees	5 November	<p>Row 27 – ICANN Org re: multiple comments</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Revise the Recommendation and Implementation Guidance to put 15.5, 15.6, and 15.7 directly into Recommendation 15.4. Leave 15.8 as the only Implementation Guidance for Recommendation 15.4.</p>	Staff drafted edits on pages 63-66

5-11-6	Base Registry Agreement	5 November	<p>Row 12 -- Intellectual Property Constituency (IPC) and PETILLION Law Firm re: "Accordingly, the IPC advocates for strict limitations on exemptions from the base RA, if any, which must not weaken existing rights protection mechanisms or public interest commitments otherwise present in the RA."</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Revise the recommendation to make it clear that consensus policy should not be the subject of individual RA negotiations.</p>	Staff drafted edit on page 179.
5-11-8	Base Registry Agreement	5 November	<p>Row 18 – ICANN Org re: Concern about custom RAs; clear rationale for exemptions; request clarity from WG on recommendation 36.3 and provisions; lack of clarity concerning aspects of recommendation 36.4.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Add language to Recommendation 36.3 that a clear rationale must accompany any exemption request.</p>	Staff drafted edit on page 178.
9-11-2	GAC Early Warning / GAC Consensus Advice	9 November	<p>Row 21 – ICANN Org re: Clarification on whether amendments permitted in response to "non-consensus advice"; need clear process and deadlines to change an application.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Clarify with Leadership the terminology to use be consistent re: "GAC Advice" and "GAC Consensus Advice".</p>	Staff drafted edits on pgs 14, 25, 26, 47, 48, 140,166
9-11-4	Role of Application Comment	9 November	<p>Row 10 – Jamie Baxter re: Same application comment period for Standard and Community applications, for a predetermined period.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Add a recommendation along the lines suggested by Jamie Baxter/ALAC: "the Applicant Comment Period should only run for the predetermined period outlined in the AGB. Any comments received during the period would be the only comments considered during evaluations."</p>	Staff drafted edits on pgs 128 and 129.

9-11-5	Role of Application Comment	9 November	<p>Row 14 -- PETILLION Law Firm re: Inform applicant if information is submitted on confidential portions of an application.</p> <p>ACTION ITEM: Revise Recommendation 28.13 that if such information is submitted, the applicant should be fully informed of the submitted information and be able to respond through the same mechanism.</p>	Staff drafted edits on pg 127.
9-11-6	Objections	9 November	<p>Row 21 – ICANN Org re: Questions about "arbitration forum".</p> <p>Leadership Comments: These are all clarifications - we should check the language to make sure it is clear. #1 and #2: Arbitration forum is the same thing as the panel. Switch the terminology to make it clear -- use "panel" not "arbitration forum" or "arbitration" or be consistent. #4 - The answer is to determine whether they are reasonable.</p>	Staff drafted edits on pg 144