

SCOPE OF IDENTIFIERS:

Identifier - The full name or acronym used by the organization seeking protection; its eligibility is established by an approved list or a set of eligibility criteria.

Scope – the limited list of eligible identifiers used to distinguish an identifier by its type (name or acronym) or by additional designations as agreed upon and indicated in the text below; may also include lists approved by the GAC (where this is the case it is expressly indicated as such in the text below).

Consensus Call Submissions:

PI (individual): Submitted by Poncelet Ileleji – 27 Aug 2013

ISO,IEC: Submitted by Claudia MacMaster Tamarit – 28 Aug 2013

IGOs: Submitted by Sam Paltridge – 3 Sep 2013

RCRC: Submitted by Stephane Hankins – 3 Sep 2013

IOC: Submitted by James Bikoff – 3 Sep 2013

RL (individual): Submitted by Mike Rodenbaugh – 3 Sep 2013

ALAC: Submitted by Alan Greenberg – 3 Sep 2013

RySG: Submitted by David Maher – 3 Sep 2013

NCSG: Submitted by Avri Doria – 3 Sep 2013

IPC: Submitted by Greg Shatan – 4 Sep 2013

ISPCP: Submitted by Osvaldo Novoa – 11 Sep 2013

RrSG: Did not submit

CBUC: Submitted 2 Nov 2013 as part of public comment

RED CROSS RED CRESENT MOVEMENT (RCRC) RECOMMENDATIONS:

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; ICRC, CICR, CICV, MKKK, IFRC, FICR (Language: in English, as well as in their respective national languages; ICRC & IFRC protected in UN6) 	
1	<p>Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>RCRC: We support these recommendations, as they make permanent the temporary reservations of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations at the top and second levels, as previously confirmed by ICANN's Board, and as set out in the Applicant Guidebook and in Annex 5 to the revised Registry Agreement.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Can Live With; This can be treated as "Support", but we felt it was necessary to reiterate that we either feel that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the protection is not needed or • we do not actively support this but it will do little actual harm and we will not object. <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: NCSG remains against any blocking of strings in the AGB. Objection procedures should be used for this purpose.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; ICRC, CICR, CICV, MKKK, IFRC, FICR (Language: in English, as well as in their respective national languages; ICRC & IFRC protected in UN6) 	
2	<p>For RCRC Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>RCRC: We support these recommendations, as we believe they would effectively place the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations that are covered in Recommendations 1 and 3 on a “Modified Reserved Names List”. This would preserve the entitlement of Movement components to register relevant domain names should they require to do so in the future.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Can Live With</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: NCSG believes that if strings are included in AGB, they should be reserved in the same sense as all other strings – not for anyone’s usage.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; ICRC, CICR, CICV, MKKK, IFRC, FICR (Language: in English, as well as in their respective national languages; ICRC & IFRC protected in UN6) 	
3	<p>Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>RCRC: We support these recommendations, as they make permanent the temporary reservations of the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations at the top and second levels, as previously confirmed by ICANN's Board, and as set out in the Applicant Guidebook and in Annex 5 to the revised Registry Agreement.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: NCSG remains against any blocking of strings in the AGB. Objection procedures should be used for this purpose.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; ICRC, CICR, CICV, MKKK, IFRC, FICR (Language: in English, as well as in their respective national languages; ICRC & IFRC protected in UN6) 	
4	<p>For RCRC 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</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>RCRC: We support these recommendations, as we believe they would effectively place the Red Cross and Red Crescent designations that are covered in Recommendations 1 and 3 on a “Modified Reserved Names List”. This would preserve the entitlement of Movement components to register relevant domain names should they require to do so in the future.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: NCSG believes that if strings are included in AGB, they should be reserved in the same sense as all other strings – not for anyone’s usage.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; ICRC, CICR, CICV, MKKK, IFRC, FICR (Language: in English, as well as in their respective national languages; ICRC & IFRC protected in UN6) 	
5	<p>Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH)</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>RCRC: These recommendations ensure that the Movement will enjoy the necessary standing under the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) (if there is any doubt that it did not already have such standing). The recommendations, however, do not address or foresee a waiver of fees for its activation. Consequently, in our view, the recommendations stop short of offering effective and cost neutral relief for the "Scope 2 (Red Cross and Red Crescent) identifiers". In addition, we remain concerned that the TMCH does not provide sufficient relief to the Movement, and thus, in offering only a time-bound early warning.</p> <p>RL: Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 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; International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies; ICRC, CICR, CICV, MKKK, IFRC, FICR (Language: in English, as well as in their respective national languages; ICRC & IFRC protected in UN6) 		
6	<p>Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>RCRC: Same as #5</p> <p>IOC: Support to the extent recommended in the GAC Durban Communique: protect the acronyms of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR).</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>
7	<p>RCRC Scope 2 identifiers, if added to the TMCH, allowed to participate in <u>90 Day Claims Notification</u> phase of each new gTLD launch</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>RCRC: Same as #5</p> <p>RL: Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE (IOC) RECOMMENDATIONS:

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
o Scope 1 Identifiers: olympic, olympiad (Language: UN6, + German, Greek, and Korean)		
1	<p>Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>International Olympic Committee</i> are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: No</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG remains against any blocking of strings in the AGB. Objection procedures should be used for this purpose.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>
2	<p>For IOC Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: No</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG believes that if strings are included in AGB, they should be reserved in the same sense as all other strings – not for anyone’s usage.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
o Scope 1 Identifiers: olympic, olympiad (Language: UN6, + German, Greek, and Korean)		
3	Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>International Olympic Committee</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: No (since exceptions for other orgs not mentioned)</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG remains against any blocking of strings in the AGB. RPMs should be used for this purpose</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>
4	For IOC 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	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: No</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG believes that if strings are included in AGB, they should be reserved in the same sense as all other strings – not for anyone’s usage.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (IGO) RECOMMENDATIONS:

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages) 	
1	<p>Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IGO: 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.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Can Live With</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG remains against any blocking of strings in the AGB. Objection procedures should be used for this purpose. Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages) 	
2	<p>For IGO Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IGO: Support</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: No (since exceptions for other orgs not mentioned)</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG believes that if strings are included in AGB, they should be reserved in the same sense as all other strings – not for anyone’s usage. Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support, only if these identifiers are designated “ineligible for delegation”</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages) 	
3	<p>Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IGO: 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.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Can Live With</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG remains against any blocking of strings in the AGB. RPMs should be used for this purpose. Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages) 	
4	<p>For IGO 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</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IGO: Support</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Can Live With</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG believes that if strings are included in AGB, they should be reserved in the same sense as all other strings – not for anyone’s usage. Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support, only if these identifiers are placed Specification 5.</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages) 	
5	<p>Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IGO: Support second-level protections of exact-match acronym, 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.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition; Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Do Not Support (except in cases when it can be objectively demonstrated that such acronym is used as the primary identifier for the entity)</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages) 	
6	<p>IGO Scope 2 identifiers, if added to the TMCH, allowed to participate in <u>90 Day Claims Notification</u> phase of each new gTLD launch</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>IGO: Support second-level protections of exact-match acronym, 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.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition; Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (INGO) RECOMMENDATIONS:

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (General Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (Special Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) <p>***Note, this list of Identifiers are INGOs other than the RCRC and IOC</p> <p>SEE http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2011INF4.pdf</p>	
1	<p>Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation"</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Can live with</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG remains against any blocking of strings in the AGB. Objection procedures should be used for this purpose. Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Divergence of Views</p> <p>ISPCP: Can live with. We are against protection for INGOs, but if it is needed to reach some level of consensus we can accept it.</p> <p>CBUC: Does not support, since existing mechanisms for Rights Objection and GAC Advice are adequate to block undesired delegations at the top-level.</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (General Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (Special Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) <p>***Note, this list of Identifiers are INGOs other than the RCRC and IOC</p> <p>SEE http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2011INF4.pdf</p>	
2	<p>For INGO Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation, an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Can live with</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG believes that if strings are included in AGB, they should be reserved in the same sense as all other strings – not for anyone’s usage. Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Can live with</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (General Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (Special Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) <p>***Note, this list of Identifiers are INGOs other than the RCRC and IOC</p> <p>SEE http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2011INF4.pdf</p>	
3	<p>Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: No</p> <p>NCSG remains against any blocking of strings in the AGB. RPMs should be used for this purpose. Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: Divergence of Views</p> <p>ISPCP: Can live with</p> <p>CBUC: Does not Support [Scope1]. Recommend use of Permanent Claims Notices instead of reserved names, since the Ecosoc list includes full names that are common words, such as madre and care.</p> <p>CBUC: Does not support [Scope2], since existing Rights Protection Mechanisms are adequate to protect these full names at the second--level.</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (General Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (Special Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) <p>***Note, this list of Identifiers are INGOs other than the RCRC and IOC</p> <p>SEE http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2011INF4.pdf</p>	
4	<p>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</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG believes that if strings are included in AGB, they should be reserved in the same sense as all other strings – not for anyone’s usage. Further we think that IGO and INGO should have the same level of protections in all cases and do not support protection for the IGO category if the INGO category is not also protected.</p> <p>IPC: [Support]</p> <p>ISPCP: Can live with</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>
5	<p>Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 (unless otherwise protected) & Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH)</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support only for Scope 1, not for Scope 2.</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (General Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: Ecosoc List (Special Consultative Status) (Language: TBD) <p>***Note, this list of Identifiers are INGOs other than the RCRC and IOC</p> <p>SEE http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2011INF4.pdf</p>	
6	<p>Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> Scope 1 (unless otherwise protected) & Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: No</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Divergence of Views</p> <p>ISPCP: No</p> <p>BC: Supports TM Claim Notices for INGO acronyms in the TMCH. However, we are unable to assess those acronyms since they do not appear in the referenced Ecosoc list for General or Special Consultative Status organizations.</p>
7	<p>INGO Scope 1 (unless otherwise protected) & Scope 2 identifiers, if added to the TMCH, allowed to participate in <u>90 Day Claims Notification</u> phase of each new gTLD launch</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support only for Scope 1.</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALL ORGANIZATIONS:

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
1	<p>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.</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>IGOs: N/A, please refer to responses to other recommendations.</p> <p>IOC: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: Yes</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
2	<p>Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> identifiers are placed in Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, of the Applicant Guidebook, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation" (see option #4 for a variation of this)</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Oppose</p> <p>IGOs: 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.</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: No</p> <p>RySG: We did not support this and agree with excluding it.</p> <p>NCSG does not support the blocking of any names to the AGB.</p> <p>IPC: Divergence of Views</p> <p>ISPCP: No</p> <p>CBUC: Supports Top Level for Reservations for RCRC; CBUC does not support Top Level reservations of IGO acronyms</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
3	IGO-INGO organizations be granted a fee waiver (or funding) for objections filed to applied-for gTLDs at the Top-Level	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>IGOs: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: We did not support this and agree with excluding it.</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Do Not Support</p> <p>ISPCP: No</p> <p>CBUC: Do not Support</p>
4	Second-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> identifiers are placed in Specification 5 of Registry Agreement	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Oppose</p> <p>IGOs: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: No</p> <p>RySG: We did not support this and agree with excluding it.</p> <p>NCSG does not support the blocking of any names to the AGB.</p> <p>IPC: Divergence of Views</p> <p>ISPCP: No</p> <p>CBUC: Supports Second Level for Reservations for RCRC; CBUC does not support Second Level reservations of IGO acronyms</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
5	IGO-INGOs allowed to participate in <u>Sunrise</u> phase of each new gTLD launch	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>IGOs: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support (they already can do this to the extent they have TM rts)</p> <p>ALAC: Support</p> <p>RySG: We did not support this and agree with excluding it.</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Support for IGOs, and Scope 1 INGOs</p> <p>CBUC: Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
6	<p>Fee waivers or reduced pricing (or limited subsidies) for registering into the Trademark Clearinghouse the identifiers of IGO-INGO organizations</p>	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>IGOs: 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.</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Do Not Support, WOULD SUPPORT BUT ONLY IF OTHER TMCH USERS DO NOT PAY FOR THIS SUBSIDY; Subsidy by ICANN, the only expected alternative, is acceptable.</p> <p>RySG: We did not support this and agree with excluding it.</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Do Not Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Do not support</p> <p>CBUC: Do not Support</p>

#	Recommendation	Level of Support
7	IGO-INGOs allowed to participate in <u>permanent Claims Notification</u> of each gTLD launch	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>IGOs: N/A, UDRP and URS currently not open to IGOs.</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: Do Not Support, WOULD ONLY SUPPORT but only if applicable to Trademarks as well</p> <p>RySG: We did not support this and agree with excluding it.</p> <p>NCSG does not support permanent claims notification</p> <p>IPC: Do Not Support (unless extended to all TMCH registrants)</p> <p>ISPCP: Do not support</p> <p>CBUC: Support, as long as claims notification is made permanent for all TMCH strings, not just for IGO-INGOs.</p>
8	Fee waivers or reduced pricing for IGO-INGOs filing a URS or UDRP action	<p>PI: I support fully the draft recommendations in the document</p> <p>ISO,IEC: Support</p> <p>IGOs: Support</p> <p>RL: Do Not Support</p> <p>ALAC: No</p> <p>RySG: We did not support this and agree with excluding it.</p> <p>NCSG: Support with opposition</p> <p>IPC: Do Not Support</p> <p>ISPCP: Do not support</p> <p>CBUC: Do not Support</p>

Consideration of Recommendations on Incumbent gTLDs

From Charter:

“...determine how incumbent registries should meet the new policy recommendations, if any.”

Scope and Assumptions:

- Existing gTLDs Only (Delegation pre-2012)
- Only second-level proposed protection recommendations apply
- Assumes that the present WG recommendation proposals are supported and adopted for new gTLDs

Principles of Implementation:

- 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).
- 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. Further, any proposed recommendation for reserving these names will require several months before any consensus policy is approved, implemented and could have an inherit risk for front-running. Thus, some names could be registered before the policy is in effect. A mechanism to guard against this should be defined, such as the date these recommendations were adopted by the Working Group or GNSO Council.
- Where 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 reserved protections, shall be handled like any existing registered name within the incumbent gTLD (such as renewals, transfers, for sale, change of registrant, etc.).
- 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 as presently defined in the RAA.
- At the time the name becomes deleted, the name shall not be reallocated by the Registry and subsequently deemed ineligible for registration per the defined policy.
- Where policy changes to recover protected identifiers of registered second-level names within an existing gTLD deviate from current policy, indemnification should be considered.
- 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 is suspected, the protected organization may have access to RPMs like the UDRP, pending a PDP to address policies in how the IGO-INGO organizations may access them.