Affiliation: <enter the group you most represent>
Stakeholder Name: <enter name>

On the next page, for each proposed recommendation (column 1) reviewed, you will see a corresponding Chair's assessment on levels of consensus within column 2. If you haven't been able to support one or more of the recommendations on as is basis, please provide us with alternatives that would allow you to support it or any other comments you might have in column 3.

** Note consensus level assignments are subject to change based on stakeholder responses to the proposal

Next Page



Column 2 Consensus Levels:

Full consensus - when no one in the group speaks against the recommendation in its last readings. This is also sometimes referred to as Unanimous Consensus.

Consensus - a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree.

Strong support but significant opposition - a position where, while most of the group supports a recommendation, there are a significant number of those who do not support it.

Divergence (also referred to as No Consensus) - a position where there isn't strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view. Sometimes this is due to irreconcilable differences of opinion and sometimes it is due to the fact that no one has a particularly strong or convincing viewpoint, but the members of the group agree that it is worth listing the issue in the report nonetheless.

Minority View - refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a Consensus, Strong support but significant opposition, and No Consensus; or, it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.

	Affiliation: Stakeholder Name:	NCSG avri doria - 10May2013	Registry Stakeholder Group David Maher - 13May2013	Intellectual Property Constituency International Olympic Committee 14May2013	ISPCP Osvaldo Novoa 15May2013	ALAC (but personal views) Alan Greenberg
Proposed Recommendations	**Chair's Assessment of Conensus Level**	**Comment/Suggestion**	**Comment/Suggestion**	**Comment/Suggestion**	**Comment/Suggestion**	**Comment/Suggestion**
Top-Level Protections						
Full Name, Exact Match Identifiers (**no acronyms**) added to the Applicant Guide Book, section 2.2.1.2.3 "Ineligible for Delegation" for all future gTLD rounds Scope of Identifiers: IOC - outlined in 2.2.1.2.3 RCRC - outlined in 2.2.1.2.3 IGO - GAC List (**full name**) pending	Consensus	consensus for RCRC; rough consensus for IOC, split on IGO/INGO	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	We agree	I could live with that but do not see any such need.
2nd-Level Protections						
Full Name, Exact Match Identifiers (**no acronyms**) added to the Registry Agreement, Specification 5 Scope of Identifiers: IOC - outlined in Specification 5, Section 5 RCRC - outlined in Specification 5, Section 5 IGO - GAC List (**full name**) pending [Spec 5, Sect. 6]	Consensus	consensus for RCRC; rough consensus for IOC, split on IGO/INGO	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	We agree	I support RCRC. I can live with IGO. I do not support absolute blocking for IOC names without a viable, non-IOC-approval-based exception process.
Eligible orgnaizations are entitiled to apply for having their **acronyms** added to Clearinghouse Model ** (note: IOC, for the scope of names, are not seeking acronym protections and therefore not listed in this, Sunrise, and Claims recommendations to follow) Scope of Identifiers: RCRC - outlined in Specification 5, Section 5 IGO - GAC List (**acronym**) pending	Strong Support, but Significant Opposition	Splt support but no consensus	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	We don't support this option. Not all the eligible organizations have exclusive rights to their acronyms.	I support this.
Eligible organizations are entitled to Clearinghouse Model for Sunrise phase of new gTLD launch Scope of Identifiers: RCRC - outlined in Specification 5, Section 5 IGO - GAC List (**acronym**) pending	Strong Support, but Significant Opposition	ok	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	We can support this option	I support this.
Eligible organizations are entitled to Clearinghouse Model for Claims Notification phase (90 days) of new gTLD launch Scope of Identifiers: RCRC - outlined in Specification 5, Section 5 IGO - GAC List (**acronym**) pending	Consensus	ok	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	We can support this position, but not all the organizations have legal rights to support their claims. We don't support waiving of the fees.	I support this.
Modify policy, rules, or procedures that allow IGO, IOC, and RCRC organizations access to the URS and UDRP RPMs Scope of Identifiers: IOC - outlined in Specification 5, Section 5 RCRC - outlined in Specification 5, Section 5 IGO - GAC List (**full name & acronym**) pending [Spec 5, Sect. 6]	Consensus	"+ INGO - personal view, no IGO without equivalent INGO support	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	Limited to eligible IGO's (.INT list) & the IOC & RCRC list	We can support this position, the same comment as for the previous point.	Please enter your comments here
INGO - Recommendations						
Protection of INGO identifiers (at present, if support is found for protection of INGOs, not including IOC, RCRC the protection framework could model the proposal above)	Divergence	split but not consensus = personal view, no IGO witout equivalent INGO support	Strongly opposed	No Position	We can support the protection of IGO identifiers that have legal protection in several countries. (There was a proposal on the number of countries and regions)	I support Claudia's proposal, with some changes.
Qualification Criteria for INGO Protections: i. The INGO benefits from some privileges, immunities or other protections in law on the basis of the INGO's proven (quasi-governmental) international status*; ii. The INGO enjoys existing legal protection (including trademark protection) for its name/acronym in over 50+ countries or in three (of six) ICANN regions; iii. The INGO engages in recognized global public work shown by; a. inclusion on the General Consultative Status of the UN ECOSOC list, or b. membership of 50+ national representative entities, which themselves are governmental/ public agencies or non-governmental organizations that each fully and solely represent their respective national interests in the INGO's work and governance.	Divergence	Split but not consensus - personal view, no IGO without equivalent INGO support	Strongly opposed	No Position	We can support the qualification criteria i. and ii. Simultaneously.	I generally support this (possibly with some tweeking).