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| §4.2.5 | Applicant Guidebook (AGB) | Since 1930 applications were successfully made during the previous round, it seems like this document represents a bottom up, multi stakeholder compromise. As such, it is unlikely that all stakeholders will ever consider such a document perfect. However, the AGB is in our opinion a document that can be used in subsequent rounds. Many thousand hours and many years were spent to reach this compromise. Updates to the AGB should only be as a result of policy development. What changes to be made should be considered thoroughly bringing the whole community in on the way to avoid the tedious process we had last time. |
| §4.3.1 | Reserved names | We strongly agree with the recommendation that the GNSO, the GAC and the ccNSO work collaboratively to come to an agreement on the use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs in their deliberations. A potential PDP-WG on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures should collaborate with the other parts of the ICANN community to determine if these strings should be allowed and if so, what requirements would be needed to govern that process. In addition the PDP-WG should listen to the result of the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs before reaching any conclusion. The view of the GAC should be looked at very thoroughly before going against it.As the Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs are open for all stakeholders, including the GAC, and is analysing the current status of these names in the ICANN ecosystem and determining the feasibility of creating a framework that could be applied across SOs and ACs, it is in our view of great importance that a PDP-WG should leave this to them and follow the recommendations. |