IGO-INGO PDP WG Recommendations RySG Support Summary

INGO Recommendations

Scope 1 Identifiers: ECOSOC List (General Consultative Status) (Language: English only)

Scope 2 Identifiers: ECOSOC List (Special Consultative Status) (Language: English only)

***Note, this list of Identifiers are INGOs other than the RCRC and IOC

http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2011INF4.pdf

	Recommendation	WG Level of Support	RySG Support?	Total # Voting Members	# of Voting Members That Voted	# in Favor	% of Member Support	% of Voter Support
1	Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the *International Non-Governmental Organizations* are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"	Concensus	Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
2	Top-Level protections of Exact Match, Full Name Scope 2 identifiers of the International Non-Governmental Organizations are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"	Divergence	No	16	<u>13</u>	1	6.25%	7.69%
3	For International Non-Governmental Organizations Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation at the Top-Level, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level	Concensus	Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
4	Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the *International Non-Governmental Organizations* are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	Divergence	No	16	<u>14</u>	1	6.25%	7.14%
5	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Full Name Scope 2 identifiers of the International Non-Governmental Organizations are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	Divergence	No	16	<u>13</u>	1	6.25%	7.69%
6	For INGO identifiers, if placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Second-Level	Concensus	Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
7	Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 (unless otherwise protected) & Scope 2 identifiers of the *International Non-Governmental Organizations* are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH)	Concensus	Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
8	Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> Scope 1 (unless otherwise protected) & Scope 2 identifiers of the *International Non-Governmental Organizations* are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse	Divergence	No	16	<u>14</u>	8	50.00%	57.14%
9	International Non-Governmental Organizations Scope 1 (unless otherwise protected) & Scope 2 identifiers, if added to the TMCH, allowed to participate in 90 Day Claims Notification phase of each new gTLD launch for Second-Level registrations	Concensus	Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%

RCRC Recommendations

Scope 1 Identifiers: "Red Cross", "Red Crescent", "Red Lion and Sun" and "Red Crystal" (Language: UN6)

Scope 2 Identifiers: 189 recognized National Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; International Committee of the Red Cross; In

	Recommendation	WG Level of Support	RySG Support?	Total # Voting Members
1	Top-Level protections of Exact Match, Full Name Scope 1 identifiers of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"	Consensus	Yes	16
2	Top-Level protections of Exact Match, Full Name Scope 2 identifiers of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"	Divergence	No	16
3	Top-Level protections of Exact Match, Acronym Scope 2 identifiers of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"	Divergence	No	16
4	For Red Cross Red Crescent Movement identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation at the Top-Level, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level	Consensus	Yes	16

5	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Full Name Scope 1 identifiers of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	Consensus	Yes	16
6	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Full Name Scope 2 identifiers of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	Divergence	No	16
7	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Acronym Scope 2 identifiers of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	Divergence	No	16
8	For Red Cross Red Crescent Movement identifiers, if placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Second-Level	Consensus	Yes	16
9	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Full Name Scope 2 identifiers of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH)**	Consensus	Yes	16
10	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Acronym Scope 2 identifiers of the Red Cross Red Crescent Movement are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse**	Consensus	Yes	16

| 11 | Red Cross Red Crescent Movement Scope 2 identifiers, if added to the TMCH, allowed to participate in 90 Day Claims Notification phase of each new gTLD launch for Second-Level registrations | Consensus | Yes | 16 |

ternational Federation of Red Cross and Red Cr

# of Voting Members That Voted	# in Favor	% of Member Support	% of Voter Support
14	12	75.00%	85.71%
14	1	6.25%	7.14%
14	1	6.25%	7.14%
14	12	75.00%	85.71%

<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
<u>14</u>	1	6.25%	7.14%
<u>13</u>	1	6.25%	7.69%
<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%

<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%

escent Societies; ICRC, CICR, CICV, MKKK, IFRC, FICR (Language: in English, as well as in their respective national languages; ICRC & IFRC protected in UN

	Comments
	One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
	Two non-voting members opposed this.
	Two non-voting members opposed this.
	Two non-voting members supported this.

One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
Two non-voting members opposed this.
Two non-voting members opposed this.
Two non-voting members supported this.
Two non-voting members supported this.
Two non-voting members supported this.

Two non-voting members supported this.

16)***

IOC Recommendations

Scope 1 Identifiers: olympic, olympiad (Language: UN6, + German, Greek, and Korean)**

	Recommendation	WG Level of Support
1	Top-Level protections of Exact Match, Full Name Scope 1 identifiers of the International Olympic Committee are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"	Consensus
2	For International Olympic Committee Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation at the Top-Level, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level	Consensus
3	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Full Name Scope 1 identifiers of the International Olympic Committee are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	Consensus
4	For International Olympic Committee identifiers, if placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Second-Level	Consensus

RySG Support?	Total # Voting Members	# of Voting Members That Voted	# in Favor	% of Member Support	% of Voter Support
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%

Comments
One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
Two non-voting members supported this.
One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
Two non-voting members supported this.

IGO Recommendations

Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List (22 March 2013) - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages)

Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List (22 March 2013) - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages)

	Recommendation	WG Level of Support
1	Top-Level protections of Exact Match, Full Name Scope 1 identifiers of the International Governmental Organizations are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"	Consensus
2	Top-Level protections of Exact Match, Acronym Scope 2 identifiers of the International Governmental Organizations are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"	Divergence
3	For International Governmental Organizations Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation at the Top-Level, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level	Consensus
4	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Full Name Scope 1 identifiers of the International Governmental Organizations are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	Consensus
5	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Acronym Scope 2 identifiers of the International Governmental Organizations are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	Divergence
6	For International Governmental Organizations identifiers, if placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Second-Level	Consensus
7	Second-Level protections of only Exact Match, Acronym Scope 2 identifiers of the International Governmental Organizations are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse**	Strong Support but Significant Opposition

8	International Governmental Organizations Scope 2 identifiers, if added to the TMCH, allowed to participate in 90 Day Claims Notification phase of each new gTLD launch for Second-Level registrations**	Consensus

** Because of support to reserve Scope 1 names at the top and second levels, it is not necessary to list Scope 1

RySG Support?	Total # Voting Members	# of Voting Members That Voted	# in Favor	% of Member Support	% of Voter Support
Yes	16	14	13	81.25%	92.86%
No	16	14	2	12.50%	14.29%
Yes	16	14	13	81.25%	92.86%
Yes	16	14	13	81.25%	92.86%
No	16	14	2	12.50%	14.29%
Yes	16	14	13	81.25%	92.86%
Yes	16	14	11	68.75%	78.57%

Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%

. names for any of the TMCH recommendations for second level protections.

Comments
One voting member stated the following: Support protection for full name, but the same protection should also be afforded to the acronyms, which, for the majority of IGOs, is the more relevant identifier, particularly in the DNS context. Protection provided to full name only will be viewed by most IGOs as equivalent to no protection at all. This would also be in clear disregard of repeated GAC advice. One non-voting member supported this recommendation and one opposed it.
One voting member stated the following: Support protection for full name, but the same protection should also be afforded to the acronyms, which, for the majority of IGOs, is the more relevant identifier, particularly in the DNS context. Protection provided to full name only will be viewed by most IGOs as equivalent to no protection at all. This would also be in clear disregard of repeated GAC advice. One non-voting member supported this recommendation and one opposed it.
One non-voting member supported this recommendation and one opposed it.
One voting member said this: Support protection for full name, but the same protection should also be afforded to the acronyms, which, for the majority of IGOs, is the more relevant identifier, particularly in the DNS context. Protection provided to full name only will be viewed by most IGOs as equivalent to no protection at all. This would also be in clear disregard of repeated GAC advice. One non-voting member supported this recommendation and one opposed it.
One voting member said this: Support protection for full name, but the same protection should also be afforded to the acronyms, which, for the majority of IGOs, is the more relevant identifier, particularly in the DNS context. Protection provided to full name only will be viewed by most IGOs as equivalent to no protection at all. This would also be in clear disregard of repeated GAC advice. One non-voting member supported this recommendation and one opposed it.
Two non-voting members supported this.
One voting member voted 'no' and stated: Support second-level protections of exact-match acronyms, but do not support doing this via TMCH. While a model similar to the Clearinghouse is possible for notification purposes, using the actual TMCH itself is insufficient protection. The TMCH is temporary and incites defensive registration at cost to governments and public -- which is one of the main policy reasons to provide preventative protections in the first place. One non-voting member supported this.

One voting member voted 'no' and said: Support second-level protections of exact-match acronyms, but do not support doing this via TMCH. While a model similar to the Clearinghouse is possible for notification. One non-voting member supported this.

General Recommendations

	Recommendation	WG Level of Support
1	The WG recommends that the respective policies are amended so that curative rights of the UDRP and URS can be used by those organizations that are granted protections based on their identified designations.	Consensus
2	IGO-INGO organizations be granted a fee waiver (or funding) for objections filed against applied-for gTLDs at the Top-Level	Divergence
3	IGO-INGOs allowed to participate in Sunrise phase of each new gTLD launch	Strong Support but Significant Opposition
4	Fee waivers or reduced pricing (or limited subsidies) for registering into the Trademark Clearinghouse the identifiers of IGO-INGO organizations	Divergence
5	IGO-INGOs allowed to participate in permanent Claims Notification33 of each gTLD launch	Divergence
6	Fee waivers or reduced pricing for IGO-INGOs filing a URS or UDRP action	Divergence

RySG Support?	Total # Voting Members	# of Voting Members That Voted	# in Favor	% of Member Support	% of Voter Support
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
No	16	<u>14</u>	2	12.50%	14.29%
No	16	<u>14</u>	2	12.50%	14.29%
No	16	<u>14</u>	1	6.25%	7.14%
No	16	<u>14</u>	2	12.50%	14.29%
No	16	<u>14</u>	2	12.50%	14.29%

Comments
One voting member voted no and stated that is is not applicable; please refer to the responses to other recommendations. One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
Two non-voting members opposed this.
One non-voting member said: if in the TMCH, yes, otherwise no. One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
Do not support using the TMCH. While a model similar to the Clearinghouse is possible for notification purposes, using the actual TMCH itself is insufficient protection. The TMCH is temporary and incites defensive registration at cost to governments and public -- which is one of the main policy reasons to provide preventative protections in the first place. One non-voting member said: this is up to the TMCH provider; if Registries are expected to subsidize, then no. One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
One voting member said that this is not applicable for IGOs (UDRP and URS currently not open to them) - see also the related responses to other recommendations. One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.

Recommendations for Existing gTLDs

	Recommendation	WG Level of Support
1	Any policies adopted for new gTLDs shall apply equally to existing gTLDs to the extent they are relevant (for example second-level IGO-INGO protections utilizing TMCH, sunrise, claims will not apply).	See Below
2	For clarification purposes, second-level names matching a protected identifier, as identified via any consensus policies defined here, and that are not registered within an existing gTLD, shall be immediately reserved from registration in the same manner as for new gTLDs. Due to the time lag between the date the Working Group and GNSO Council adopts	See Below
3	A second-level registration within an existing gTLD matches a protected identifier, as identified via any consensus policies defined here, and the registration of said name, if registered prior to implementation of protections or any such cutoff date as may be determined, shall be handled like any existing registered name within the incumbent gTLD regarding renewals,	See Below
4	If a second-level name that matches a protected identifier, as identified via any consensus policies defined here, and becomes eligible for deletion after defined grace-periods, the name shall not be eligible for any drop/add activities by the Registrar. At the time the name is deleted, the name shall not be reallocated by the Registry and shall be deemed ineligible for registration per the defined policy.	See Below
5	Where policy changes to recover protected identifiers of registered second-level names within an existing gTLD deviate from current policy, registry & registrar indemnification should be considered.	See Below
6	For clarification purposes, second-level names matching a protected identifier that are also registered by a party other than the protected organization and bad faith use vis-à-vis the protected organization is suspected, the protected organization may have access to RPMs like the UDRP, pending a PDP to address how the IGO-INGO organizations may access RPMs.	See Below

These recommendations were not part of the WG consensus call but there hasn't been any opposit

RySG Support?	Total # Voting Members	# of Voting Members That Voted	# in Favor	% of Member Support	% of Voter Support
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	13	81.25%	92.86%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	13	81.25%	92.86%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	12	75.00%	85.71%

:ion to them.

Comments
One voting member voted yes to this principle, to the extent that it applies/is relevant to existing gTLDs. A small registry member noted the following: since all of these "will immediately be reserved", it will require significant manual effort to implement and they object to those requirements. One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
A small voting registry member noted the following: since all of these "will immediately be reserved", it will require significant manual effort to implement and they object to those requirements.   One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
A small voting registry member noted the following: since all of these "will immediately be reserved", it will require significant manual effort to implement and they object to those requirements.   One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
A small registry voting member noted the following: since all of these "will immediately be reserved", it will require significant manual effort to implement and they object to those requirements. One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.
One member voted no and added that this still deserves further analysis before a position can be taken. A small registry member noted the following: since all of these "will immediately be reserved", it will require significant manual effort to implement and they object to those requirements. A small registry voting member noted the following: since all of these "will immediately be reserved", it will require significant manual effort to implement and they object to those requirements.   Two non-voting members supported this.
One member voted no and added: it is not applicable for IGOs (UDRP and URS currently not open to them) - see also the related responses to other recommendations. A small registry voting member noted the following: since all of these "will immediately be reserved", it will require significant manual effort to implement and they object to those requirements.   Two non-voting members supported this.

1

2

3

Options for Exception Procedures

Option
Goal: Where a potential registrant claims a legitimate interest in a second-level domain name that is reserved from registration in the Registry Agreement, the goal is to provide a procedure for determining whether the application should proceed to registration34.   General Principles - The procedure must: • Provide immediate notification to the applicant and the protected organization when a registration request is refused registration because an identifier is protected;   • Provide a channel of communication between the applicant and the protected organization, including for purposes of any assessment an agreement which may be forthcoming from the protected organization itself at first instance;   • Provide an objective, expeditious, and inexpensive process for determining if the applicant has a legitimate interest so that its registration request can proceed to registration;   • Use existing dispute resolution procedures where possible.   Outline of Proposed Procedure: 1. Notification of Conditional Refusal Based on Protected Name.   The potential registrant and protected organization will receive immediate electronic notification if an applied-for second level domain is conditionally refused registration because of a Protected Name on a Modified Reserved list or in the Clearinghouse if applicable.   2. Declaration of Legitimate Use.   Each protected organization must record and maintain accurate contact information with the Clearinghouse (or other coordinating body) designating a recipient and email address to be notified electronically.   • Within ten (10) days of receiving a conditional refusal, an applicant may file a declaration with the Registry. The declaration must identify the potential registrant accurately, provide accurate contact information, and state that the potential registrant has a good faith, legitimate interest in using the domain name that does not violate any treaties, national laws or other legal entitlement of the protected organization. A standard form will be provided (likely an ICANN function, but to be determined). The protected organization will receive a copy of the declaration electronically at its given address when the declaration is filed with the Registry.   • If, within ten (10) days after receipt of the above declaration, the protected organization does not file an
Goal: Where a potential registrant claims a legitimate interest in a second-level domain name that is reserved from registration in the Registry Agreement, the goal is to provide a procedure for determining whether the application should proceed to registration.   General Principles: The procedure must: • Provide immediate notification to the potential registrant and the protected organization when a registration request is refused registration because a name is protected;   • Provide a channel of communication between the potential registrant and the protected organization, including for purposes of any assessment an agreement which may be forthcoming from the protected organization itself at first instance;   • Provide an objective, expeditious, and inexpensive process for determining if the applicant has a legitimate

(RySG participants were given to suggest another exception procedure option. The only input received were the comments shown in the comment column to the right.)

RySG Support?	Total # Voting Members	# of Voting Members That Voted	# in Favor	% of Member Support	% of Voter Support
No	16	<u>14</u>	0	0.00%	0.00%
Yes	16	<u>14</u>	11	68.75%	78.57%

See comments at right					

Comments

One member said that this needs further consideration before a firm recommendation can be made. Another was concerned about how the information about the related organization might need to be provided to the potential registrant; if it is simply pointing to a URL of all contacts then the vote would be a yes; if that was not discussed, then it would be a 'no' as it is an additional burden (if we are accepting all processes for existing TLDs.) Two non-voting members opposed this.

One member said that this needs further consideration before a firm recommendation can be made. Another was concerned about how the information about the related organization might need to be provided to the potential registrant; if it is simply pointing to a URL of all contacts then the vote would be a yes; if that was not discussed, then it would be a 'no' as it is an additional burden (if we are accepting all processes for existing TLDs.) One non-voting member supported this and one opposed it.

Examination. The examination procedure must comply with the principles above. It must: be objective; give both parties the opportunity to be heard; be expeditious; and use existing processes whenever possible.