

GNSO gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group Statement

Issue: Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in all gTLDs PDP
Recommendations for Board Consideration

Date: 8 January 2014

Issues Report URL: <http://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/igo-ingo-recommendations-27nov13-en.htm>

“The RySG participated very actively throughout the entire PDP process and we believe that the WG made a very diligent effort to take into consideration all input provided and worked very hard to come up with recommendations that most WG participants could support even where there were very different points of view. We also believe that for the Board to fail to adopt the consensus recommendations would be a serious blow to the bottom-up, multi-stakeholder policy development process. Therefore, we fully support the recommendations in the Final Report.

“Finally, we think it is important to note that in the WG the only parties seeking broad protection of acronyms were IGO representatives, including one member of the RySG that is an IGO. In addition, the RCRC supported acronym protection for its own identifiers and the IPC supported protection where the acronym was the primary identifier of the IGO (e.g., UNICEF or UNESCO). All other parties in the WG saw tremendous difficulty in fairly implementing acronym protection without effectively giving IGOs and INGOs greater rights than that of trademark owners. Finally, there appear to be very few examples of actual harm experienced by any IGO and INGOs from the current and longstanding practice of allowing registration of purported acronyms as domain names without restriction.”

RySG Level of Support

1. Level of Support of Active Members:

- 1.1 # of Members in Favor: 20
- 1.2 # of Members Opposed: 1
- 1.3 # of Members that Abstained: 0
- 1.4 # of Members that did not vote 5

2. **Minority Position(s):** None