

GNSO new TLDs Committee

Draft Final Report

Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	2
PRINCIPLES & RECOMMENDATIONS	2
TERM OF REFERENCE ONE: DISCUSSION.....	2
TERM OF REFERENCE TWO: DISCUSSION.....	2
TERM OF REFERENCE THREE: DISCUSSION	2
TERM OF REFERENCE FOUR: DISCUSSION	2
CONSULTATION & PARTICIPATION	2
ANNEX ONE – PARTICIPATION TABLE.....	2
REFERENCE MATERIALS.....	2

INTRODUCTION

1. This is the draft *Final Report* of the Generic Names Supporting Organisation's Policy Development Process (GNSO PDP) on the introduction of new top-level domains (new TLDs). The *Report* sets out the key findings that have emerged from a multi-phase, multi-stakeholder policy development process that has taken place during 2006.
2. In each of the sections below the Committee's Recommendations are discussed in more detail with an explanation of the rationale for the decisions and the method by which those decisions have been reached. The Recommendations have been the subject of numerous public comment periods and intensive discussion across a range of stakeholders including ICANN's GNSO Constituencies, ICANN Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees and members of the broader Internet-using public that is interested in ICANN's work.
3. The key elements of the PDP have been formal Constituency Statements submitted by each of the GNSO's constituencies, a *Call for Expert Papers* and a Public Comment Period about the *Initial Report*. In addition, all the comments made to the various public forums, discussion lists and directly to ICANN have been taken into account. Those views and ideas have been balanced with positions and discussions that have taken place over a year-long process. The range of opinions reflects the diversity of the stakeholders within the ICANN community. The decisions reached show that, through detailed discussion and analysis, it is possible to arrive at recommendations that balance the interests of all stakeholders.
4. The GNSO Committee conducted four separate face-to-face consultations, in Washington DC, Wellington, Brussels and Amsterdam, to discuss each of the

Terms of Reference. Many of the Recommendations that have emerged from those discussions received majority Committee support. It is expected that those Recommendations with limited support will be included in the GNSO Committee's *Board Report* as minority recommendations.

5. In addressing the Terms of Reference, very close attention has been paid to mapping the discussion and the resulting recommendations to ICANN's Bylaws, Mission and Core Values. A full list of all the Constituency Statements, copies of the responses to Calls for Expert Papers and the Public Comment archives can be found in the GNSO's section of the ICANN website at <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/new-gtld-pdp-input.htm>.
6. This *Report* will be discussed with other Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees at ICANN's December 2006 Sao Paulo, Brazil meeting. The results of these discussions and further public comments, along with additional input from ICANN's operational staff, will be taken into account as the Committee works towards achieving supermajority support for its Recommendations. That support will be reflected in the GNSO Council's *Board Report*. In particular, the Committee expects to consider public policy principles from the Governmental Advisory Committee. As part of the PDP process, the Committee may choose to consult expert advisors to comment on the Recommendations to enhance the content of the Board Report.
7. This *Report* reflects another stage in the ICANN's progress towards introducing new top-level domains. The series of changes and approach to the introduction of new TLDs, most notably during 2000 and then again in 2003-2004, is found on ICANN's background information section on the top-level domains (<http://www.icann.org/topics/gtld-strategy-areaa.html>).

8. The following sections set out the Committee's draft Recommendations and the discussion that the Committee undertook to reach the findings contained in the *Report*.

PRINCIPLES & RECOMMENDATIONS

Principles

The following Recommendations have been derived from the work of the GNSO Committee on the introduction of new top-level domains in accordance with the Terms of Reference set by the GNSO, with reference to ICANN's Mission and Core Values.

- a) That new generic top-level domains (gTLDs) should be introduced in an orderly, timely and predictable way.
- b) That some new generic top-level domains will be internationalised domain names (IDNs).
- c) That the principal objectives of the introduction of new top-level domains are to permit market mechanisms to support useful online identities that permeate international markets as well as to support competition, innovation and consumer choice.
- d) That a set of technical criteria for a new gTLD registry applicant be used to minimise the risk of harming the operational stability, security and global interoperability of the Internet.
- e) That a set of business capability criteria for a new gTLD registry applicant be used to provide an assurance that an applicant has the capability to meet its business ambitions.

TERM OF REFERENCE ONE: DISCUSSION

Whether to introduce new top-level domains

Additional new generic top-level domains should be introduced and work should proceed to enable the introduction of new generic top-level domains, taking into account the recommendations found in the following sections.

1. This section sets out the way in which the Committee arrived at their Recommendation to proceed with the introduction new top-level domains.
2. ICANN's policy development process is a multi-stage process that includes the production of an *Issues Report* (found at <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/gnso-issues-rpt-gtlds-05dec05.pdf>). The *Report* included comprehensive information about the main documents and decisions on new top-level domains since the 2000 round of new top-levels domains which included, for example, .biz, .info, and the 2004 round of sponsored top-level domains which included, for example, .cat and .asia. In addition, the process for the re-bids of the .net and .org agreements was used to inform the *Report*.
3. A full compilation of all the materials the Committee used is found in the Reference Materials section at the end of the document. In particular, the Committee used the *New TLD Evaluation Process Planning Task Force*. The Report (<http://www.icann.org/committees/ntepptf/final-report-31jul02.htm>) described four aspects to evaluate including technical, business, legal and process that have, subsequently, informed the development of all the Recommendations within the *Report*.

4. In its request to the ICANN staff to produce an *Issues Report*, the Committee also made a request to produce a background report on internationalised domain names (IDNs). This work is now reflected in the current draft of the proposed Terms of Reference to discuss internationalised domain names in the context of the introduction of new top-level domains (http://gnso.icann.org/issues/idn-tlds/idn_tor_draft-12oct06.htm). The broad body of work on internationalised domain names taking place within, for example, the President's Committee on IDNs (<http://www.icann.org/committees/idnpac/>), the IETF (<http://www.ietf.org/>) and other technical organisations has been taken into account when developing the *Recommendations* contained here.
5. For the purposes of this *Report*, the discussion at and outcomes of the February 2006 Washington DC are the key determinants of the recommendation to proceed with establishing a permanent policy for and method of accepting applications for new TLDs.
6. There were some strong themes to support a decision to enable the introduction of new TLDs. These included the facilitation of a competitive environment for registry services; a "public choice" benefit for end users and the potential for expansion of innovative Internet use in a wide variety of markets that have may have been underserved in the past. A summary of the discussion on whether to introduce new top-level domains can be found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00026.html>. In addition, the respondents to the *Call for Papers* set out a variety of arguments to support the introduction of new TLDs. These ideas were consistent with those found in, for example, the Summit Strategies sponsored top level domain name round and earlier work that resulted from the 2000 round of new gTLDs.

7. After a day of detailed discussions and presentations from eight external stakeholders and in considering Constituency Statements and Public Comments, there was rough consensus that the Committee should proceed with consideration of the other three Terms of Reference. The online summary can be found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00027.html>.
8. At the 31 March 2006 ICANN Board meeting in Wellington, the Board made clear its intention to proceed with the introduction of new top-level domains¹. The Board reaffirmed its commitment to introducing new top-level domain registries at its 30 June 2006 meeting in Marrakech².
9. The general principle underpinning the wide ranging discussions was that, whatever consensus policy was developed, it must be consistent with ICANN's limited technical co-ordination mission and be in line with ICANN's Mission and Core Values
(<http://www.icann.org/general/archive-bylaws/bylaws-28feb06.htm#l>)

¹ See Board resolution at <http://www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-31mar06.html>.

² See Board resolution at found at <http://www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-30jun06.htm>.

TERM OF REFERENCE TWO: DISCUSSION

Selection Criteria

- 2.1 The process for introducing new top-level domains will follow a pre-published application system including the levying of an application fee to recover the costs of the application process. The application process will also include probity rules and clear timelines for applicants that will be published prior to the beginning of any application cycle.
- 2.2 Application fees will be set at the start of the process and application materials will be available prior to any application cycle. The cost to evaluate individual applications may differ. Therefore, different fees may be levied depending on what stage in the process the application reaches. It should also be noted that the possible extra costs that might result from the differences in the applicant's working language as well as legal systems should not be held against the applicant.

In order to reduce the effect of the application fee becoming a barrier to entry, ICANN could have a system of grants to assist applicants. This grant would only allow the applicant to apply, without any presumption that the application would be successful. Grant applications would go through an evaluation process. ICANN should evaluate options for funding the grants.

In addition to considering grant options, other options for ICANN to address should be organizing periodic awareness and training workshops for interested stakeholders on new top-level domains; reducing avoidable indirect costs for the applicant (including shortening and improving the approval process with fixed timelines, standardized contracts and public pre-evaluation hearings).

- 2.3 Technical criteria will include compliance with a minimum set of technical standards such as IETF *Request for Comments* related to the operation of the DNS and other technical standards. Standards may include RFC3730-3735, RFC2246, RFC1035, RFC2181, RFC2182, and the ICANN *Guidelines for the Implementation of Internationalized Domain Names*.

- 2.4 Applicants must comply with all current ICANN Consensus Policies and new Consensus Policies that are approved by the ICANN Board. [move this to contractual conditions section]
- 2.5 The character strings of new top-level domains must comply with the string requirements listed below.
- 2.5.1 ICANN will use the following process for TLD string checks.
- 2.5.1.1 ICANN Staff may make a preliminary determination on whether the application complies with the string requirements and may engage appropriate expert advice in order to make a preliminary determination.
- 2.5.1.2 ICANN will establish public comment processes (which may include input from governments or the Governmental Advisory Committee) that are specific to the criteria for the proposed string.
- 2.5.1.3 In the event that ICANN reasonably believes that the application for a particular string is not compliant with the string requirements, ICANN will notify the applicant immediately and the application will be eliminated from consideration pending any reconsideration process that might apply. If ICANN is unable to make a definitive determination whether or not a string is compliant with the string requirements, then ICANN will refer the issue to a panel of experts with appropriate backgrounds.
- 2.5.2 String Criteria
- 2.5.2.1 The gTLD string should not be visually or [phonetically] confusingly similar to an existing TLD string.
- 2.5.2.2 The applicant must warrant that the proposed string does not infringe the legal rights of any third party (consistent with the current requirements of Registered Name Holders – see Clause 3.7.7.9 of the gTLD Registrar Accreditation Agreement).
- 2.5.2.3 The string should not cause any technical issues that have an impact on the stability and security of the Internet.
- 2.5.2.4 The string should not be contrary to public policy or accepted principles of morality or be of such a nature as to deceive the public. [The Committee expects to receive advice from the GAC on this draft recommendation and the policy recommendation should be consistent with GAC principles.]

2.5.2.5 The string should not be a reserved word (for example, as set out in RFC2606).

2.5.3 Dispute resolution with respect to ICANN accepting a new string.

2.5.3.1 ICANN must establish a dispute resolution process, using independent arbitrators, where existing registry operators could challenge a decision made by ICANN regarding whether a new gTLD string is confusingly similar to an existing gTLD string. If a string application is successfully challenged as being confusingly similar, then no other operator may subsequently apply for it except in cases where affected parties mutually agree to terms allowing such registration.

2.5.3.2 ICANN may establish a new dispute resolution process, using independent arbitrators, where existing trademark holders could challenge an ICANN decision regarding a string. This new dispute resolution process could be modelled on the existing Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Processes (UDRP).

2.6 An applicant for a new gTLD must use ICANN accredited registrars to provide registration services to Registered Name Holders (registrants).
[move to contractual conditions section]

2.7 An applicant must demonstrate that they have the capability to operate a new gTLD that meets the minimum technical criteria to preserve the operational stability, reliability, security, and global interoperability of the Internet.

2.8 The applicant must provide a financial and business plan demonstrating that the applicant has the capability to meet its business ambitions.

1. The development of selection criteria for new top-level domains has been the subject of intense discussion throughout the Committee's work. That work is an iterative process and, in the coming months, will benefit from consultation with ICANN's other Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees. The Committee relied heavily on ICANN's Mission and Core Values to guide its

work and, in tandem, referred frequently to the Consensus Policy guidelines (found at <http://www.icann.org/general/consensus-policies.htm>) with which ICANN registries are required to comply. The Committee used, for example, at the Amsterdam meetings a mixture of Constituency Statements and responses to a request for further comments on the *Initial Report*. A full set of public comments were provided to Committee members by ICANN Staff to assist them in balancing the views of the group with those interested stakeholders. The full comment archive can be found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/newgtlds-comments/>.

2. The first part of the discussion took place at the Washington DC meetings; the second review of the proposed selection criteria took place at the March 2006 Wellington meetings; the findings were reviewed and refined again in Brussels and, finally, at the Amsterdam meeting. These meetings were augmented by intensive teleconference discussions, email exchanges and inputs from a wide variety of external stakeholders including potential new TLD applicants and the Governmental Advisory Committee.
3. During the preparation of the selection criteria the Committee focused particularly on ensuring consistency with previous new TLD application rounds and with developing selection criteria that reflected industry best practice for services procurement.
4. Committee members are urged to read the ICANN Feedback section at the beginning of the document. That section sets out the questions ICANN has posed in relation to the draft Recommendations. Each section has been marked ** where further discussion would be beneficial.
5. ***Recommendation 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3*. These three Recommendations deal with the application process. The intention of the Recommendations is to

make explicit expectations about how any future TLD application process would be conducted. These Recommendations are consistent with ICANN's openness and transparency requirements (and most particularly with ICANN's initiatives to improve its operations

<http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-16oct06.htm> consistent with the new *Affirmation of Responsibilities*). In addition, Recommendation 2.3 recognises the fundamental requirement to ensure the stable and secure operation of the domain name system.

6. ***Recommendation 2.4:* It was clear from the discussions throughout the policy development process that compliance with ICANN's Consensus Policies was important to Committee members. This is consistent with discussions that are taking place in the context of another policy development process on *Policies for Contractual Conditions for Existing Registries* (PDP Feb06).
7. ***Recommendation 2.5:* All the Recommendations in contained in 2.5 refer to the ways in which applications for new TLDS may be checked. *Recommendations 2.5.1, 2.5.1.1, 2.5.1.2 and 2.5.1.3* have been subjected to detailed analysis to ensure consistency with previous applications rounds; understanding the potential for applications for new TLDs and recognizing that ICANN will set up an appropriate process for dealing with the policy recommendations the Committee has developed. Several Constituencies³

³ For example, the IPC submitted comments on 20 October 2006, in response to the 18 October Draft Recommendations Summary document. Those comments (on selection criteria, new dispute resolution processes, pre-registration mechanisms and contractual conditions in relation to WHOIS) need to be discussed in more detail with the full Committee to determine whether the IPC's views have the support of other Constituencies.

BC Rapporteur Philip Shepherd submitted comments on 23 October 2006 to the full Committee on the notion of "pre-evaluation hearings" in response to comments from Committee observers

submitted comments directly to ICANN Staff for consideration in the preparation of the recommendations. In addition, the ALAC representative⁴ suggested, in his posting to the gtld-council listing, that “we ought to be able to create a ...turnkey “registry-in-a-box” that would speed the evaluation and reduce the cost to applicants. ...I wonder whether we can make the new gTLD evaluation process faster and less costly by providing some pre-approved choices for applicants. For example, we might say that if you pledge to implement a certain pre-approved technical model...[and] an applicant chooses the pre-approved model, the only questions for evaluation become whether the string is appropriate and the applicant competent...”.

8. The Committee has focused strongly on engaging with other Supporting Organisations, especially with the GAC, which will contribute input on the public policy aspects of new top-level domains. The Committee Chair submitted formal correspondence to the GAC Chair and to the Chair of the GAC GNSO Working Group, explicitly requesting the GAC share its draft Public Policy Principles as quickly as possible, and inviting the GAC to actively participate in any public comment processes about new TLD applications. This approach is consistent with the GAC’s June 2006 Marrakech communiqué which said “...The GAC endorses the Communications Timeline document (attached), which should improve the GAC’s participation in ICANN’s policy development processes by earlier

Ray Fassett and Werner Staub. Further discussion about the impact of pre-evaluation hearings continued and Committee Chair Dr Bruce Tonkin suggested the removal of that text.

Observer Chuck Gomes contributed many comments to the Committee’s list which can be found in part at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00219.html> and in full through using the thread index for comments.

⁴ <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/p7mnLhxBpKcGl.p7m>

engagement with the relevant ICANN constituencies, as well as secure timely and precise routine communication.”⁵

9. The use of appropriately qualified expert panels to resolve differences throughout the application process is consistent with ICANN's practice in previous rounds. The Committee suggested that using expert panels would ensure that resolving disputes throughout the application process would be as objective, predictable and timely as possible.
10. ***Recommendations 2.5.2, 2.5.2.1, 2.5.2.2, 2.5.2.3, 2.5.2.4 and 2.5.2.5:* All these draft Recommendations are designed to be objective, contribute to the stability and security of the Internet and be consistent with existing international law. These draft Recommendations would benefit from further detailed discussion between ICANN's legal and operational staff to ensure that the Committee's intentions are implementable and do not impose undue risks on the organisation.
11. The reasoning behind *Recommendation 2.5.2.1* stems from the recognition that, in the first instance, a judgment should be made by the ICANN staff department responsible for processing applications. Where the department has a doubt they will refer the application to an expert standing three-person tribunal established by the GNSO Chair for this purpose. The tribunal should be established prior to the application cycle commencing, with clear guidelines and criteria that constrain its activities and remit. An applicant refused by the staff department may insist on referral to the panel upon payment of the appropriate cost-recovery fee.

⁵ All of the GAC's Communiqués are found at <http://gac.icann.org/web/communiqués/index.shtml>.

12. The concept of “confusingly similar” is used to mean that there is a likelihood of confusion on the part of the relevant public. The prospect of IDN new TLD applications makes this criterion vital. There is broad agreement in international and national law the concept of “confusingly similar”. In international trade mark law, confusion may be visual, phonetic or conceptual. A small Committee working group developed the following explanations for the approach to resolve confusingly similar string conflicts. The Committee needs to consider further how to manage this area of Recommendations, especially where there is a wide variety of potential interpretations, many of which are subjective and open to legal challenge.
13. In broader international law, the concept of creating confusion is contained in the 1883 Paris Convention and says “to create confusion by any means whatever” {Article 10bis (3) (1)} and, further, being “liable to mislead the public” {Article 10bis (3) (3)}. The treatment of confusingly similar is also contained in European Union law and is structured as follows -- “because of its identity with or similarity to...there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public...; the likelihood of confusion includes the likelihood of association..” {Article 4 (1) (b) of the 1988 EU Trade Mark directive 89/104/EEC}. Article 8 (1) (b) of the 1993 European Union Trade Mark regulation 40/94 is also relevant.
14. In the United States, existing trade mark law states that “...to the best of the verifier's knowledge and belief, no other person has the right to use such mark in commerce either in the identical form thereof or in such near resemblance thereto as to be likely, when used on or in connection with the goods of such other person, to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive...” which is contained in Section 1051 (3) (d) of the US Trademark Act 2005 (found at <http://www.bitlaw.com/source/15usc/1051.html>.)

15. In Australia, the Australian Trade Marks Act 1995 Section 119 says that
“...For the purposes of this Act, a trade mark is taken to be deceptively similar to another trade mark if it so nearly resembles that other trade mark that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion” (found at http://www.ipaustralia.gov.au/resources/legislation_index.shtml)
16. The European Union Trade Mark Office provides guidance on how to interpret confusion. *“...confusion may be visual, phonetic or conceptual. A mere aural similarity may create a likelihood of confusion. A mere visual similarity may create a likelihood of confusion. Confusion is based on the fact that the relevant public does not tend to analyse a word in detail but pays more attention to the distinctive and dominant components. Similarities are more significant than dissimilarities. The visual comparison is based on an analysis of the number and sequence of the letters, the number of words and the structure of the signs. Further particularities may be of relevance, such as the existence of special letters or accents that may be perceived as an indication of a specific language. For words, the visual comparison coincides with the phonetic comparison unless in the relevant language the word is not pronounced as it is written. It should be assumed that the relevant public is either unfamiliar with that foreign language, or even if it understands the meaning in that foreign language, will still tend to pronounce it in accordance with the phonetic rules of their native language. The length of a name may influence the effect of differences. The shorter a name, the more easily the public is able to perceive all its single elements. Thus, small differences may frequently lead in short words to a different overall impression. In contrast, the public is less aware of differences between long names. The overall phonetic impression is particularly influenced by the number and sequence of syllables.”* (found at <http://oami.europa.eu/en/mark/marque/direc.htm>).

17. An extract from the United Kingdom's Trade Mark Office's Examiner's Guidance Manual is useful in explaining further the Committee's approach to developing its Recommendation. *"For likelihood of confusion to exist, it must be probable, not merely possible that confusion will arise in the mind of the average consumer. Likelihood of association is not an alternative to likelihood of confusion, "but serves to define its scope". Mere association, in the sense that the later mark brings the earlier mark to mind is insufficient to find a likelihood of confusion, unless the average consumer, in bringing the earlier mark to mind, is led to expect the goods or services of both marks to be under the control of one single trade source. "The risk that the public might believe that the goods/services in question come from the same undertaking or, as the case may be, from economically-linked undertakings, constitutes a likelihood of confusion..."*. (found at <http://www.patent.gov.uk/tm/t-decisionmaking/t-law/t-law-manual.htm>)
18. ****Recommendation 2.5.1.2:** The Committee recommended that, in the first instance, a judgment should be made by the ICANN staff responsible for assessing applications. Where there is doubt, the assessors may refer the application to a standing three-person tribunal established for that purpose by the GAC Chairman. The tribunal should be established before the application cycle begins and maintained by rotation. An applicant refused on these grounds by the staff department may insist on referral to the panel upon payment of the appropriate cost-recovery fee. This particular section needs further consideration, as set out in the ICANN Feedback document.
19. The Committee spent considerable time considering the public policy aspects of new top-level domains. In particular, concerns about "public policy and morality" were raised. The small working group mentioned above conducted more detailed research on the phrase "contrary to public policy or accepted

principles of morality”. This phrasing is consistent with international laws including Article 3 (1) (f) of the 1988 European Union Trade Mark Directive 89/104/EEC and within Article 7 (1) (f) of the 1993 European Union Trade Mark Regulation 40/94. In addition, the phrasing “contrary to morality or public order and in particular of such a nature as to deceive the public” comes from Article 6quinques (B)(3) of the 1883 Paris Convention. The reference to the Paris Convention remains relevant to domain names even though, when it was drafted, domain names were completely unheard of.

20. The concept of “morality” is captured in Article 19 United Nations Convention on Human Rights (<http://www.unhchr.ch/udhr/lang/eng.htm>) says “...Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.” Article 29 continues by saying that “...In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society”.
21. The EU Trade Mark Office’s Examiner’s guidelines provides assistance on how to interpret morality and deceit. “...Contrary to morality or public order. Words or images which are offensive, such as swear words or racially derogatory images, or which are blasphemous are not acceptable. There is a dividing line between this and words which might be considered in poor taste. The latter do not offend against this provision.” The further element is deception of the public which is treated in the following way. “...Deceive the public. To deceive the public, is for instance as to the nature, quality or

geographical origin. For example, a word may give rise to a real expectation of a particular locality which is untrue.” For more information, see Sections 8.7 and 8.8 at <http://oami.europa.eu/en/mark/marque/direc.htm>

22. The UK Trade Mark office provides similar guidance in its Examiner’s Guidance Manual. “Marks which offend fall broadly into three types: those with criminal connotations, those with religious connotations and explicit/taboo signs. Marks offending public policy are likely to offend accepted principles of morality, e.g. illegal drug terminology, although the question of public policy may not arise against marks offending accepted principles of morality, e.g. taboo swear words. If a mark is merely distasteful, an objection is unlikely to be justified, whereas if it would cause outrage or would be likely significantly to undermine religious, family or social values, then an objection will be appropriate. Offence may be caused on matters of race, sex, religious belief or general matters of taste and decency. Care should be taken when words have a religious significance and which may provoke greater offence than mere distaste, or even outrage, if used to parody a religion or its values. Where a sign has a very sacred status to members of a religion, mere use may be enough to cause outrage.” For more information, see <http://www.patent.gov.uk/tm/t-decisionmaking/t-law/t-law-manual.htm>)

23. *Recommendation 2.5.2.3*: This Recommendation is consistent with existing provisions regarding reserved names that may cause technical problems within the domain name system. The reserved name list is found in existing registry agreements at, for example, <http://www.icann.org/tlds/agreements/mobi/mobi-appendix6-23nov05.htm>. Applicants for new TLDs would be advised immediately if their application featured one of these names.

24. *Recommendation 2.5.2.5*: Similar to Recommendation 2.5.2.3, this Recommendation is consistent with technical standards as set out by the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF) and with other technical standards such as ICANN's IDN Guidelines (found at <http://www.icann.org/topics/idn/implementation-guidelines.htm>).
25. *Recommendation 2.5.3*: Dispute resolution processes modelled on the existing Uniform Dispute Resolution Process (UDRP) were used by the Committee to analyse whether new dispute resolution processes should be developed for the new TLDs application process for two separate purposes. The first was to resolve contention between competing applications vying for the same string; the second was to resolve contention between existing registry operators or trademark owners with applicants proposing a string similar to either an existing registry or to an existing trademark.
26. *Recommendation 2.6*: The Recommendation to continue to mandate the use of ICANN accredited registrars is not only consistent with current policy but also addresses the stability and security questions which the Committee considered. The Committee Chair clarified further this draft Recommendation in his posting to the gtld-council list⁶ which said in part "...The outcome of the discussion on this topic was to treat the requirement to provide an operational plan as part of the application demonstrating that they have the resources required to meet the other selection requirements. The process for accrediting registrars is an example of such a process, where ICANN staff require a plan to determine whether a registrar is capable of

⁶ <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00191.html>

meeting the requirements of a registrar. See for example:
<http://www.icann.org/registrars/accreditation-application.htm...>⁷

27. *Recommendation 2.7 and 2.8:* The Committee discussed the necessity for applicants to provide technical and operational plans that would be used during the application process to assess the capacity of an applicant to successfully provide registry services. There was consistent disagreement whether this information was either relevant or necessary and how that information would be assessed, using objective measures. On balance, the Committee decided that, as has been the case in previous rounds to introduce new TLDs, it would remain a requirement that an applicant's business ambitions be substantiated by the provision of technical and operational plans that could be verified by ICANN or by a panel of appropriately qualified experts.

⁷ GA list participant and Committee observer Danny Younger expressed reservation about the legality of insisting on the use of ICANN-only accredited registrars and the Registry Constituency suggested, in comments submitted for use at the Amsterdam meeting, that "the requirement to use only ICANN-accredited registrars may be used should be modified to allow some flexibility in cases where registrar support does not meet some mutually agreed-to service level criteria for a given gTLD. The underlying premise of this position is that gTLD registries or sponsors should not be held hostage by registrars who are not willing to or are unqualified to service the applicable registrant community".

TERM OF REFERENCE THREE: DISCUSSION

Allocation Methods

- 3.1 To ensure an orderly introduction of new TLDs, the applications should be assessed in rounds to allow issues of contention to be resolved between applicants for the same string. First come first served (FCFS) is the preferred method of assessing applications within an initial round. Subsequently, processes may be developed that would enable an “apply as you go” system. This could be decided after an evaluation period.
 - 3.1.1 The start date for the round should be at least four months after the ICANN Board has issued the *Request for Proposal*. ICANN must promote the opening time and details of the new round of applications to the broader worldwide Internet community.
 - 3.1.2 Applications will be date stamped as they are received and will form a queue, giving ICANN the ability to work on multiple applications in parallel.
 - 3.1.3 The closing date for the first cycle of new applications should be at least thirty days after the start date.
 - 3.1.4 Applications for strings are not published until after the application cycle closing date.
- 3.2 The following process should be used to resolve contention between multiple applicants for the same new gTLD string.
 - 3.2.1. Establish a timeframe for a mediation process amongst the applicants to identify a solution amongst competing applications. Possible solutions are for the applicants to choose different TLD strings to avoid the conflict, or for the applicants to combine their resources.
 - 3.2.2 If there is no agreement between the applicants, ICANN will evaluate the additional criteria of the level of support of the community of potential registrants within that TLD to resolve contention. Both applicants would have a timeframe (for example, ninety days) to supply this additional material for evaluation. ICANN will determine what evidence is acceptable, and the evidence must be measurable and verifiable. An applicant that is not successful will need to wait until the next application cycle to submit a new application.

3.2.3 If ICANN staff are unable to distinguish between the level of support for each applicant for the gTLD, then the Board will make a choice based on the ICANN Mission and Core Values which include introducing and promoting competition in the registration of domain names where practical and beneficial in the public interest; and supporting the functional, geographic and cultural diversity of the Internet. An applicant that is not successful will need to wait until the next application cycle to submit a new application.

3.3 An applicant who is granted a gTLD string has an obligation to begin using it within an appropriate time-frame. [needs further clarification about what constitutes 'use' and 'appropriate time frames']

1. The development of recommendations for allocation methods was conducted in the same way as that for selection criteria. The comprehensive discussion about allocation methods has taken place through analysis of the formal Constituency Statements; public comments and email discussions which were used to modify and clarify the language of the Recommendations.
2. Early results of the discussion show that the Committee decided that a first come first served principle was fair and practical (discussion found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00058.html>). However, it is necessary to ensure a complete understanding of the FCFS principle as it would be implemented in the application cycle. Further discussion with the Committee and ICANN Staff on the practical implementation of this Recommendation would be useful.
3. Comparative evaluations have been a consistent theme throughout the policy development process with some discussants suggesting that auctions were a more suitable method of resolving conflict between applicants with similar string ideas or similar purposes for their business ideas. These diverging ideas need further discussion, especially in the context of balancing the Committee's expectations for a predictable, objective and timely process and

the impact comparative evaluations have had on the organisation in the recent past.

4. The draft Recommendations recognize past experiences with comparative evaluations in the ICANN environment, particularly those relating to sponsored top-level domains where measures of “community” support need to be determined. The evaluations, for example in the case of the .net and .org rebids and the introduction of new sTLDs like .jobs and .travel, show that the Internet-using community takes a keen interest in ICANN’s decision making process. In addition, ICANN’s Supporting Organisations and Advisory Committees outside the GNSO play a key role in determining the success of potential applications.
5. Further consideration is necessary of the involvement of the ICANN Board in the formal ratification of any new top-level domain. Past experience shows that the Board takes a keen interest in all the decisions of the organisation. This involvement has a direct bearing on any evaluation process.
6. It is clear that the draft Recommendations on allocation methods have a direct relationship to the establishment of robust selection criteria. The Recommendations on allocation methods focus, in the main, on establishing a pre-published application process and on implementing practical solutions for resolving contention between applicants with similar ideas about new TLDs.
7. The Committee was clear in its intention to ensure that any new TLD application opportunity was widely advertised prior to the application cycle commencing. This was intended to encourage applications from geographic areas or communities who had previously not had the opportunity to participate in ICANN’s TLD opportunities.

8. Discussion about more widespread notification of new top-level domain applications to resolve string contention may also be useful. More detailed ideas about this proposal are contained in the ICANN Staff Memorandum released with this document.

TERM OF REFERENCE FOUR: DISCUSSION

Policies for Contractual Conditions

- 4.1 There should be a base contract to provide some level of consistency (for example, as for the Registrars' Accreditation Agreement) amongst gTLD agreements, with the ability for staff to have delegated authority to approve. Any material alterations to the base contract, will be subject to public comments before approval by the ICANN Board.
- 4.2 The contract should strike the right balance between ensuring certainty for market players and preserving flexibility of ICANN to accommodate the rapidly changing market, technological and policy conditions.
- 4.3 The initial term of the new gTLD agreement should be of commercially reasonable length (for example, default ten years, although that may be changed on a case-by-case basis).
- 4.4 There should be renewal expectancy. A contract would be renewed provided that the contracted party is not in material breach of the contract or has not been found in repeated non-performance of the contract, and provided the registry or sponsor agrees to any new base contract conditions that are reasonably acceptable. Any new base contract would take into account the Consensus Policies in place at that time.
- 4.5 There should be a clear sanctions process outlined within the base contract to terminate a contract if the new gTLD operator has been found in repeated non-performance of the contract.
- 4.6 During the term of the agreement, the registry must comply with [existing] new or changed consensus policies to one or more of the following areas:
 - (1) issues for which uniform or coordinated resolution is reasonably necessary to facilitate interoperability, security and/or stability of the Internet or DNS;
 - (2) functional and performance specifications for the provision of Registry Services
 - (3) security and stability of the registry database for the TLD;
 - (4) registry policies reasonably necessary to implement Consensus Policies relating to registry operations or registrars, or

(5) resolution of disputes regarding the registration of domain names (as opposed to the use of such domain names)

- 4.7 Any deviation from consensus policies should be explicitly stated in the agreement.
- 4.8 Where a registry provides IDNs, the contract should require that the registry adhere to IDN standards, and ICANN guidelines for IDNs.
- 4.9 ICANN may rely on the appropriate external competition and anti-trust authorities to ensure compliance with applicable competition law in particular, laws relating to market power or pricing power.
- 4.10 ICANN should take a consistent approach with respect to registry fees, taking into account differences in regional, economic and business models.
- 4.11 Use of personal data is limited to the purpose for which it is collected, and the registry operator must define the extent to which it is made available to third parties.

1. This section sets out discussion of the policies for contractual conditions for new top-level domains. This discussion has taken place in the context of the negotiation of the new .com agreement and the related Verisign settlement (<http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-28feb06.htm>; the renewal of the arrangements between ICANN and the US Department of Commerce (<http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-29sep06.htm>) and the conduct of an associated ICANN PDP (PDP Feb 06) on Policies for Contractual Conditions for Existing Registries (<http://gns0.icann.org/issues/gtld-policies/>).
2. The Recommendations found in this section were developed through the Brussels face-to-face consultations and the meetings held in Amsterdam to confirm the draft Recommendations.

3. The Committee in its work on policies for contractual conditions has focused on the key principles of consistency, openness and transparency. It has also determined that a scalable and predictable process is consistent with industry best practice standards for services procurement. The Committee referred, in particular, to standards within the broadcasting, telecommunications and Internet services industries to examine how regulatory agencies in those environments conducted, for example, spectrum allocations, broadcasting licenses and media ownership frameworks⁸.
4. The GNSO Constituencies provided input to the discussions through the formal Constituency Statements and again at the Brussels meeting, a summary of which can be found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00131.html>.
5. The Business Constituency has focused on process transparency and public comment processes throughout contractual negotiations. In addition, it has advocated consistency amongst new TLD contracts with equitable treatment of registries, proportional to the obligations imposed by ICANN with respect to the payment of fees to the organization. The Business Constituency did not support a presumption of contract renewal.
6. The Registry Constituency suggested that policies for contractual conditions should recognize that predictable terms and conditions for new top-level registries would enable greater investor certainty and provide an optimal opportunity for innovation and creativity. Any applicable consensus policy should be constrained to the five relevant elements of

⁸ See also principles articulated in the World Bank report on licensing guidelines in the References section.

- the GNSO's policy development processes. The Registry Constituency argued that a base contract should be provided before the start of the application process that could be customized to suit the specific commercial conditions of each new registry.
7. At the Brussels meeting, the ISP Constituency were undecided about the presumption of renewal discussion and were concerned about the requirement for registries to use only ICANN-accredited registrars.
 8. Like the Registry Constituency, the Non-Commercial Users Constituency argued that renewal expectancy provided longer term investment views, stable business environments and predictability of registry operation. The NCUC supported three other key elements of this area of discussion including the facilitation of competition at the registrar level; compliance with ICANN Consensus Policies and the reliance by ICANN on the appropriate competition authorities for advice on, for example, market pricing and market power issues. The NCUC consistently opposed access by third parties to personally identifiable information.
 9. The Intellectual Property Constituency supported compliance with Consensus Policies and the development of a registry compliance program that enabled the implementation of graduated sanctions for non-performing registries.
 10. The Committee found a number of expert reports⁹ beneficial. In particular, the World Bank report on mobile licensing conditions provides some guidance on best practice principles for considering broader market investment conditions. "...A major challenge facing regulators in

⁹ The full list of reports are found in the Reference section at the end of the document.

developed and developing countries alike is the need to strike the right balance between ensuring certainty for market players and preserving flexibility of the regulatory process to accommodate the rapidly changing market, technological and policy conditions. As much as possible, policy makers and regulators should strive to promote investors' confidence and give incentives for long-term investment. They can do this by favoring the principle of 'renewal expectancy', but also by promoting regulatory certainty and predictability through a fair, transparent and participatory renewal process. For example, by providing details for license renewal or reissue, clearly establishing what is the discretion offered to the licensing body, or ensuring sufficient lead-times and transitional arrangements in the event of non-renewal or changes in licensing conditions. Public consultation procedures and guaranteeing the right to appeal regulatory decisions maximizes the prospects for a successful renewal process. As technological changes and convergence and technologically neutral approaches gain importance, regulators and policy makers need to be ready to adapt and evolve licensing procedures and practices to the new environment."

11. The Recommendations which the Committee have developed with respect to the introduction of new TLDs are consistent with the World Bank principles outlined above.
12. The outcome of the Brussels meeting discussion on contractual conditions can be found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00133.html>.

CONSULTATION & PARTICIPATION

1. This section provides an overview of the progress of the policy development process and the documentation produced throughout the series of teleconferences and face-to-face consultations that have taken place during 2006. All of the meetings were open to observers and many different stakeholders attended the meetings taking an active part in the discussion. In addition, all meetings were open to remote participation by teleconference and through the use of the Shinkuro (www.shinkuro.com) file-sharing technology. A full table found at Annex One illustrates participation by GNSO Constituencies and other observers.
2. The *Issues Report* was released on 5 December 2005. The *Report* sets out an early collation of issues that the GNSO wished to take into account in developing the Terms of Reference for future rounds. For example, the selection criteria used in previous application rounds for new top-level domains were used to guide the development of Term of Reference Two in this PDP. An evaluation of the selection criteria and methods used in the re-bidding of the .org and .net registry contracts was also conducted. The *Issues Report* contained Staff Recommendations about potential terms of reference and, in the majority, those Recommendations were adopted by the GNSO Council. The *Report* is found at <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/gns0-issues-rpt-gtlds-05dec05.pdf>.
3. A Public Comment Period was launched on 6 December 2005 to solicit input from the ICANN community about the proposed Terms of Reference (found at <http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-06dec05.htm>). The

Public Comment Period ran until 31 January 2006. For this PDP public comment periods have been used in different ways than in the past. In general, public comment calls have been far more targeted and highly structured to get responses on particular areas of concern to the Committee. This was a successful initiative enabling information to be collected in a consistent way that improved the quality of subsequent *Reports*. The archive of comments can be found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/new-gtlds-pdp-comments/>).

4. In addition to a Public Comment Period, a *Call for Expert Papers* was announced on 3 January 2006 (found at <http://icann.org/announcements/announcement-03jan06.htm>). The request for input was advertised widely in the international press and yielded eleven responses from a diverse range of stakeholders. The authors of the papers were invited to present their papers and participate in a question and answer session at the 23 - 25 February 2006 Washington meeting. A full listing of all the inputs, including the *Expert Papers*, can be found at <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/new-gtld-pdp-input.htm>.
5. The ICANN Board has been regularly updated on the progress of and taken a keen interest in the work of the new TLDs Committee. For example, the Board meeting of 10 January 2006 shows discussion within the Board about its involvement in new TLDs policy development process (found at <http://www.icann.org/minutes/minutes-10jan06.htm>)
6. A draft *Initial Report* was released on 19 February 2006 (found at <http://icann.org/topics/gns0-initial-rpt-new-gtlds-19feb06.pdf>) and a request for

public comments was announced at the same time that was open between 20 February 2006 and 13 March 2006. The archives for those comments are found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/new-gtlds-pdp-initial-report/>. The draft *Initial Report* was used to facilitate discussion at subsequent Committee meetings and to give some guide to the broader community about the Committee's progress in its early stages.

7. The GNSO's new TLDs Committee held a three day meeting in Washington DC between 23 and 25 February 2006. The meeting notes can be found on the GNSO's Committee archive at (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00030.html>). A central element of the discussion focused on re-visiting ICANN's Mission and Core Values to ensure that the deliberations on the Terms of Reference were tightly constrained. The substantive discussion over the three-day meeting also included discussion on whether to introduce new top-level domains (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00027.html>) and potential selection criteria which could be used in a new round of top-level domain applications (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00026.html>).
8. Analysis of the lessons learned from previous TLD rounds was included in the broader discussions held in Washington DC (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00030.html>). In addition to discussing general selection criteria, detailed discussion of technical requirements also took place (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00028.html>). Following the Washington meetings, it was clear that further information about technical criteria was necessary to inform the Committee's work. On 15 March 2006 a formal call was made for additional information on technical criteria (found at

<http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/tech-criteria-15mar06.htm>). No responses were received to that specific call but, in the resulting recommendations, particular attention has been paid to addressing relevant technical standards across the full range of registry operations, including those that relate to Internationalised Domain Names.

9. In response to the Committee's work and to discussions at the March 2006 Wellington meeting, the Board indicated its intention to facilitate the implementation of new top-level domains (found at <http://www.icann.org/minutes/minutes-31mar06.htm>.)
10. The new TLDs Committee met in Brussels between 11 and 13 May 2006 to discuss, in further detail, the work that had been undertaken on refining the selection criteria and allocation methods. In addition, a full day was spent on discussing policies for contractual conditions with a special presentation from ICANN's Deputy General Counsel. The Committee has archived, on 18 May 2006, records of the Brussels discussion and output from the meeting can be found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00133.html>
11. At the Brussels meeting, a revised work plan was devised (found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00130.html>) which include a high level commitment to producing an *Initial Report* in time for discussion at ICANN's June 2006 Marrakech meeting.
12. A draft *Initial Report* was released on 15 June 2006 (found at <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/issues-report-15jun06.pdf>) and further

discussion took place on the Committee's mailing list prior to the Marrakech meeting.

13. The ICANN Board meeting of 30 June 2006 showed, again, the Board's interest in facilitating the policy development process on new top-level domains, particularly in encouraging ongoing discussions with the GAC. (found at <http://www.icann.org/minutes/resolutions-30jun06.htm>). After inputs from the Marrakech meeting a final version of the *Initial Report* was released on 28 July 2006 (found at <http://gns0.icann.org/drafts/newgtlds-issues-report-01-28jul06.htm>).
14. The Committee conducted another set of face-to-face consultations in Amsterdam between 29 and 31 August 2006 to further refine the Committee's findings and to develop a set of draft *Recommendations*. Prior to the Amsterdam meeting, a comprehensive public comment period was conducted. These public comments (found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00189.html>) were used as working materials for the Committee to consider, in addition to Constituency Statements, the previous set of Expert Papers and comprehensive commentary for a wide variety of observers to the meetings.
15. The Committee met with the GAC on two occasions during the course of the consultations – in Wellington and again in Marrakech – where progress on the Committee's work was shared with GAC members.
16. The most important aspects of the discussion were further clarification about:

- a. string differentiation (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00190.html>);
- b. proposed requirements to provide an operational plan (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00191.html>)
- c. treatment of application fees (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00194.html>)
- d. allocation methods (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00202.html>); and
- e. string checking (<http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00203.html>)

17. Considering all the materials derived from the face-to-face meetings, discussions on email lists, expert materials and expert papers, on 14 September 2006 a set of draft *Recommendations* was released by the Committee for broader consideration (found at <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/recom-summary-14sep06.htm>).

18. Between 14 September and 5 October 2006 email discussion took place that improved and clarified the language of the *Recommendations* and ensured that Constituencies had sufficient time to rework their recommendations where necessary.

19. On 5 October 2006, the Committee conducted a two hour teleconference to discuss the draft *Recommendations* (the MP3 recording can be found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00224.html>). The purpose of the meeting was to confirm that the *Recommendations* reflected the intentions of the Committee and to conduct further work on refining elements of the

Recommendations, particularly with respect to the selection criteria and allocation methods to resolve contention between string applications.

20. On 11 October 2006, the GNSO Committee Chairman and GNSO Chair, Dr Bruce Tonkin, sent formal correspondence to the Chair of the Governmental Advisory Committee and the Chair of GAC Working Group I, requesting the GAC's assistance with the public policy impacts of the introduction of new TLDs (found at <http://gns0.icann.org/mailling-lists/archives/council/msg02891.html>).
21. Based on the substantive nature of the Committee's email traffic on the draft *Recommendations*, a further update was released to the Committee on 18 October 2006 (found at <http://forum.icann.org/lists/gtld-council/msg00234.html>) for consideration whilst the drafting of the *Final Report* takes place.

ANNEX ONE – PARTICIPATION TABLE

Legend:

a = absent

aa = absent apologies

na = not available – one constituency member funded or other conflict

rp = remote participation

NEW TLDs COMMITTEE MEETINGS											
NAME	24 & 25 Feb 06	25 Mar 06	26 Mar 06	Brussels			TC	Amsterdam			
	Washington DC	Wellington, NZ	Wellington, NZ	11 May 06	12 May 06	13 May 06	15 Jun 06	29 Aug 06	30 Aug 06	31 Aug 06	5 Oct 06
CBUC											
Marilyn Cade	x	x	x	x	x	x	aa	x	x	x	
Philip Shepherd	a	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	
Alistair Dixon	rp	x		rp	rp		x	na	rp	na	
Grant Forsyth	rp	x									
ISPC											
Tony Holmes	rp	x	x	na	na	na	aa	x	x	x	
Tony Harris	a	x	x	x	x	x	x	na	na	na	
Greg Ruth	rp	x		na	na	na	x	rp	rp		
Mark McFadden	x										

Author: ICANN – Liz Williams

GNSO PDP-Dec05

Introduction of new TLDs – Draft Final Report

This is a working document and has no official status.

Maggie Mansourkia	x										
IPC											
Lucy Nichols	x	a		x	x	x	aa	na	na	na	na
Ute Decker	a	a		x	x	x	aa	x	x	x	x
Kiyoshi Tsuru	x	x	x	na	na	na	a	na	na	na	na
Steve Metalitz	x										
NCUC											
Robin Gross	na	x	x	na	na	na	x	na	na	na	na
Mawaki Chango	x	a		x	x	x	a	x	x	x	x
Norbert Klein	na	x	x	na	na	na	a	na	na	na	na
Registrars											
Bruce Tonkin	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ross Rader	x	x	x	na	na	na	a	na	na	na	na
Tom Keller	na	a		na	na	na	a	x	x	x	
Registry											
Cary Karp	na	x	x	na	na	na	x	na	na	na	x
Ken Stubbs	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
June Seo		x	x	na	na	na	a				rp
Nominating Committee											
Avri Doria	rp	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Sophia Bekele	x	x	x	a	a	a		a	a	a	a
Maureen Cubberley	rp	x	x	na	na	na		rp	rp	rp	rp
ALAC											

Bret Fausett	rp	x		rp	rp	rp		x	x	x
GAC										
Suzanne Sene	x									
Observers										
Marcus Faure								x	x	x
Chuck Gomes	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Werner Staub		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Ray Fassett	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x
Elmar Knipp								x	x	x
David Maher	x	x	x							
Kristina Rosette	x									
Matthew Embrescia		x	x							
Danny Younger	x									
Dirk Kirschenowski	rp	x	x	x	x	x				
Alexander Schubert		x	x	x	x	x				
Jon Nevett		x	x	x	x	x				
Philip Grabensee				x	x	x				
M. M-Schönherr				x	x	x				
Becky Burr		x	x							
Keith Drazak	x	x	x							
Sebastien Bachelot		x	x							
Staff										
Liz Williams	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Glen de Saint Gery	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Dan Halloran		x	x					x	x	x
Kurt Pritz	x			x	x	x		x	x	x

Author: ICANN – Liz Williams

GNSO PDP-Dec05

Introduction of new TLDs – Draft Final Report

This is a working document and has no official status.

REFERENCE MATERIALS

Davis and Holt, *Experimental Economics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton: 1993. (Materials for auction models is also available at the University of Haifa website <http://www.gsb.haifa.ac.il>)

DNJournal, *Global TLD Registrations Pass 50 Million as New Users Stream Online*. July 30 2005. On line version at <http://dnjournal.com/columns/50million.htm>.

Guermazi, Boutheina and Isabel Neto, *Mobile License Renewal: What are the issues? What is at stake?*, available at http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSCContentServer/WDSP/IB/2005/09/23/000016406_20050923113019/Rendered/PDF/wps3729.pdf

Johnson, David and Susan Crawford, *Old Delusions and new TLDs*, comments submitted 13 November 2002 as part of ICANN Amsterdam meeting topic (<http://www.icann.org/amsterdam/gtld-action-plan-topic.htm>).

On line version available at <http://forum.icann.org/gtld-plan-comments/general/msg00003.html>.

Johnson, David and Susan Crawford, *A Concrete "Thin Contract Proposal*, submitted 23 August 2003 as comments on new TLD contracts. On line version including proposed draft contract available at <http://forum.icann.org/mtg-cmts/stld-rfp-comments/general/msg00039.html>.

Klensin, John, *RFC 3071 (Reflections on the DNS, RFC 1591, and Categories of Domains)*. 2001. On line version at <http://rfc.net/rfc3071.html>.

Klensin, John, *RFC 3467 (Role of the Domain Name System)*. 2003. On line version at <http://rfc.net/rfc3467.html>.

Matsui, Masayuki, *Comparing Domain Name Administration in OECD Countries*, available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/46/38/2505946.pdf>

National Research Council, *Signposts in Cyberspace: The Domain Name System and Internet Navigation*, Committee on Internet Navigation and the Domain Name System: Technical Alternatives and Policy Implications; Washington, DC: 2005. ISBN: 0-309-09640-5. Executive summary found at http://www.nap.edu/execsumm_pdf/11258.pdf).

Paltridge, Sam and Masayuki Matsui, *Generic Top-level Domain Names: Market Development and Allocation Issues*, Working Party on Telecommunications and Information Services Policies. Paris: 2004.

DSTI/ICCP/TISP(2004)/2Final. On line version at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/56/34/32996948.pdf>

Perset, Karin and Dimitri Ypsilanti, *The Secondary Market for Domain Names*, available at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/14/45/36471569.pdf>

Summit Strategies International, Evaluation of the New gTLDs: Policy and Legal Issues, August 2004. On line version at <http://icann.org/tlds/new-gtld-eval-31aug04.pdf>. On line version of presentation at ICANN's Rome meeting <http://www.icann.org/presentations/sapiro-forum-rome-04mar04.pdf>.

VeriSign, *The Domain Name Industry Brief*, Volume 2, Issue 2, May 2005. On line version at <http://www.verisign.com/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsletter/030725.pdf>

World Intellectual Property Organisation, *New Generic Top-Level Domains: Intellectual Property Considerations*, WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center, 2004. On line version at <http://arbiter.wipo.int/domains/reports/newgtld-ip/index.html>.

ICANN Links

For a full listing of all inputs including Constituency Statements, Public Comment archives and Expert Papers, <http://gns0.icann.org/issues/new-gtlds/new-gtld-pdp-input.htm>.

GNSO gTLDs Committee Final Report on New gTLDs, May- June 2003
9 May, v4:
<http://www.dnso.org/dnso/notes/20030509.gTLDs-committee-conclusions-v4.html>

21 May, v5:
<http://www.dnso.org/dnso/notes/20030521.gTLDs-committee-conclusions-v5.html>

02 Jun, v6:
<http://www.dnso.org/dnso/notes/20030602.gTLDs-committee-conclusions-v6.html>

12 Jun, v7:
<http://www.dnso.org/dnso/notes/20030612.gTLDs-committee-conclusions-v7-1.html>

IANA Listing of all TLDs

<http://data.iana.org/TLD/tlds-alpha-by-domain.txt>.

List of Registry Agreements <http://www.icann.ORG/registries/agreements.htm>