

All,

Going into next week, Costa Rica and beyond, we need to also focus on protections at the second-level to see if we can find consensus within the group on the GAC proposals. As we did initially with top-level, I am drafting this straw man to lay out the GAC proposal along with the Questions we will need to discuss. For each question, I have laid out what I believe are the options available to us to recommend. There may be other options I have not thought of, so the first order of business for each question is to discuss whether there are any other options available and to document those. Then, we will discuss the pros and cons with respect to each option and the merits associated with them. If people want to express their opinions as to which option they prefer on any question, that would be great. If not, and there is no pressure to pick an option in the immediate future.

I am also attaching the original GAC advice along with the Q & A document.

#### I. **GAC PROPOSALS AT THE SECOND LEVEL**

With respect to second-level names, the GAC requests that ICANN amend the new gTLD Registry Agreement to add a new schedule of second-level reserved names. The new schedule should reserve those terms set forth in Schedule A attached to their proposal. They recommend the identical terms be protected in the 6 UN languages with an “encouragement” to registries to provide additional languages. Please note that the GAC in their Q&A document did not ask to protect “similar” strings to the terms in Schedule A, but only identical matches.

#### Questions

1. Should Olympic and/or Red Cross names be reserved at the second level in all new gTLDs?
  - i. Option 1: No, there should be no change to the schedule of second-level reserved names currently in the new gTLD Registry Agreement.
  - ii. Option 2: Yes, we should change the schedule of second-level reserved names currently in the new gTLD Registry Agreement to include:
    1. Option 2(a)(i): All of the RCRC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages
    2. Option 2(a)(ii): A subset of the RCRC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages
    3. Option 2(b)(i): All of the IOC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages
    4. Option 2(b)(ii): A subset of the IOC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages
    5. Option 3(a): All of the RCRC and IOC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages
    6. Option 3(b): All of the RCRC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages, but only a subset of the IOC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages.
    7. Option 3(c): A subset of the RCRC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages, but all of the IOC terms set forth in Schedule A in the 6 UN languages.

#### ADDITIONAL NOTES AND QUESTIONS ON #1

\* If we were to select any of the options involving a subset of terms, we would then need to consider which of the terms

\*\*All of the options above, I have included the 6 UN languages, but of course we can consider protecting just a subset of those languages as well.

\*\*\*The question posed above talks about protecting in ALL new gTLDs, but are there any new gTLDs in which these protections should not apply

2. If we have selected any option above that allows for the protection of either or both of the IOC or RCRC terms (or just a subset of those terms) what type of reserved name would this be?

i. Option 1: The reserved names should be treated as “forbidden names” that can never be registered (not even by those organizations) – NOTE *The GAC in the Q&A said this is not what they want.*

ii. Option 2: The reserved names should be treated as “modified forbidden names” that can only be registered by the applicable organizations or their component parts.

iii. Option 3: Like a 2 letter country code where the Registry Operator may also propose release of these reservations based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes. In this case, the Registry Operator may propose release of these reservations based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the IOC or the RCRC as applicable.

iv. Option 4: Like Country or Territory Names, which are initially reserved, but the reservation of specific country and territory names may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the applicable government(s). In this case, the IOC/RCRC terms would be initially reserved, but the reservation of the IOC/RCRC terms may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reached agreement with the IOC and/or RCRC as applicable.

3. If we have chosen either option ii, iii or iv for Question 2, what would be the mechanism for removing from the reserved list for such option? NOTE, I HAVE NOT LAID OUT THE OPTIONS YET FOR THIS ONE AS THERE ARE A NUMBER OF THEM. IF AND WHEN IT COMES TIME TO ADDRESS, OPTIONS WILL BE CRAFTED.