

[gtld-council] Copy of Letter from GNSO Council to GAC regarding the new gTLD principles

- *To:* "GNSO Council" <council@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Subject:* [gtld-council] Copy of Letter from GNSO Council to GAC regarding the new gTLD principles
- *From:* "Bruce Tonkin" <Bruce.Tonkin@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date:* Fri, 30 Mar 2007 20:22:17 +1000

To: Chair, Government Advisory Committee to ICANN

From: Chair, Generic Names Supporting Organisation (GNSO) of ICANN

Cc: GAC Liaison to the GNSO

Dear Janis,

Thank you very much for transmitting the 28 March 2007 GAC Principles Regarding New gTLDs.

The GNSO Committee on new gTLDs discussed the principles in some detail on 29 March as part of our ongoing Committee work, and the New gTLDs Committee would like to take advantage of the GAC advice of section 3.2 that states:

"ICANN should consult the GAC, as appropriate, regarding any questions pertaining to the interpretation of these principles."

The New gTLDs Committee had some further questions about the interpretation of some of the principles. Here are some examples of where we are seeking clarification:

Section 2.2 - "ICANN should avoid country, territory or place names, and country, territory or regional language or people descriptions, unless in agreement with the relevant governments or public authorities. "

It would help to have some examples of some of these terms - e.g example of "people descriptions", along with examples of relevant governments or public authorities associated with each term.

Section 2.4 -- in particular, "to avoid confusion with country code Top Level Domains no two letter gTLDs should be introduced."

It would help to have more clarity on what was meant by "letter". Does this refer to two ASCII letters such as ".aa", or does it also incorporate IDN names such as ".xn--mxa" in the DNS (which could be displayed as ".α" via software running on a user's computer)?

2.12 ICANN should continue to ensure that registrants and registrars in new gTLDs have access to an independent appeals process in relation to registry decisions related to pricing changes, renewal procedures, service levels, or the unilateral and significant change of contract conditions.

The words above say "should continue". Presently we are not aware of an existing independent appeals process for "registry decisions" for gTLDs. It would help to have some clarity on the intent of this clause.

The New gTLD Committee believes that it would be helpful to have a teleconference between the New gTLD Committee and members of the GAC involved in drafting the principles to allow the Committee to gain more clarity. Please let me know if the GAC would support holding such a teleconference, or whether the GAC would suggest other mechanisms for seeking further interpretation of the principles.

Regards,
Bruce Tonkin