

ALAC Statement on the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers

This ALAC Statement is intended to serve the triple purpose of being a reply to the Public Comment on the Draft Final Report on Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs, an ALAC Minority Statement to be attached to the Final Report (modified as necessary based on the content of the Final Report compared to the draft version), and the basis for a Statement of Advice to the ICANN Board.

The ALAC has made a number of statements on the protection of IGO and INGO names, and has participated actively in all GNSO activities related to this topic. Our views specific outcomes of this PDP are at the end of this statement.

Given the wide range of views expressed in this paper, and noting that nothing presented here has received the unanimous support of the PDP Working Group, the ALAC would like to take this opportunity to comment on the nature of the Recommendations as well as identify the principles that have guided its positions.

The Draft Final Report includes a wide variety of “Recommendations” reflecting widely disparate levels of consensus. Not a single one was agreed to by all WG members (Full Consensus), a level of support that is more typical of most GNSO PDPs. For many, the WG views are Divergent¹. It is unclear to the ALAC exactly how the GNSO and then the Board is supposed to treat such a mixed and confusing set of outcomes. Moreover, even if only the Recommendations with some level of consensus were implemented, there is no assurance that they form a cohesive and consistent set of policies.

The ALAC is particularly concerned that granting blocking-level protections may prohibit other reasonable uses of the same strings, and is not satisfied that the exception procedures outlined in the report would be effective.

This being the case, it may be important to consider the principles that guided the ALAC, in our participation in the activities that led to this report, and that the ALAC believes should guide ICANN in considering any special protections.

1. ICANN should grant special protection to organizations that further the public interest and in particular, those with a strong track record of humanitarian activities. However, such protections should only be granted where there is a history or reasonable expectation that the lack of protections would lead to the misrepresentation of the organizations, fraud, deliberate confusion, or other malfeasance.
2. Such protections, when granted, should not unreasonably impinge on the ability of others with a valid right to use the protected string, from registering such names for uses which do not negatively impact the protected organization nor use to the protected name with the intent to deceive users. Formal trademarks should not be necessary to demonstrate such a right².

¹ In one case, the views were represented as being “divergent” where in fact there was a strong consensus that the Recommendation NOT be implemented.

² Although not a gTLD, cern.ca is a good example. The Centre d'exposition de Rouyn-Noranda in northern Quebec has no connection or even a vague relationship with the Conseil Européen pour la Recherche Nucléaire, but they do happen to share an acronym. In the gTLD space, Olympic.diy is a prime example of a new registration that might

3. The procedures used to grant the protection exceptions identified in 2. must be both inexpensive and fast.
4. No top level protections are necessary. Existing or new objection processes are sufficient.

ALAC Positions on Draft Recommendations

Red Cross Red Crescent Movement (RCRC) Recommendations

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|---|--|------------------|---------------|
| | <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 | 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" | Consensus | Can live with |
| 2 | Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 2 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" | Divergence | Can live with |
| 3 | Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> Scope 2 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" | Divergence | No |
| 4 | For <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation at the Top-Level , an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level | Consensus | Can live with |
| 5 | 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 | Consensus | Support |

not be allowed under the proposed rules even though the TLD (diy = Do-it-yourself) is a logical registration for Olympic Paints.

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|----|--|------------------|---------|
| | <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 | Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement | Divergence | Support |
| 7 | Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement | Divergence | No |
| 8 | For <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> 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 | Consensus | Support |
| 9 | 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)** | Consensus | Support |
| 10 | 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** | Consensus | Support |
| 11 | <i>Red Cross Red Crescent Movement</i> Scope 2 identifiers, if added to the TMCH, allowed to participate in <u>90 Day Claims Notification</u> phase of each new gTLD launch for Second-Level registrations | Consensus | Support |

International Olympic Committee (IOC) Recommendations

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|---|--|------------------|------|
| | ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: olympic, olympiad (Language: UN6, + German, Greek, and Korean)** | | |
| 1 | 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" | Consensus | No |

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|--|---|------------------|---|
| ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: olympic, olympiad (Language: UN6, + German, Greek, and Korean)** | | | |
| 2 | For <i>International Olympic Committee</i> Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation at the Top-Level , an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level | Consensus | No |
| 3 | Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match</u> , <u>Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>International Olympic Committee</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement | Consensus | No, since exceptions for other orgs not mentioned |
| 4 | For <i>International Olympic Committee</i> 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 | Consensus | No |

International Governmental Organizations (IGO) Recommendations

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|--|---|------------------|---|
| ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List (22 March 2013) - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages) | | | |
| ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List (22 March 2013) - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages) | | | |
| 1 | Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match</u> , <u>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" | Consensus | Can live with |
| 2 | Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match</u> , <u>Acronym</u> Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> are placed in the Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.2.3, Strings "Ineligible for Delegation" | Divergence | No |
| 3 | For <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation at the Top-Level , an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level | Consensus | No, since exceptions for other orgs not mentioned |
| 4 | Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match</u> , <u>Full Name</u> Scope 1 identifiers of the <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement | Consensus | Can live with |

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|--|--|---|---------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: GAC List (22 March 2013) - Full Name (Language: Up to two languages) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: GAC List (22 March 2013) - Acronym (Language: Up to two languages) | | | |
| 5 | Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Acronym</u> Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement | Divergence | No |
| 6 | For <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> 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 | Consensus | Can live with |
| 7 | 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** | Strong Support but Significant Opposition | Support |
| 8 | <i>International Governmental Organizations</i> Scope 2 identifiers, if added to the TMCH, allowed to participate in <u>90 Day Claims Notification</u> phase of each new gTLD launch for Second-Level registrations** | Consensus | Support |

International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGO) Recommendations

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|--|---|------------------|---------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: ECOSOC List (General Consultative Status) (Language: English only) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: ECOSOC List (Special Consultative Status) (Language: English only) <p>***Note, this list of Identifiers are INGOs other than the RCRC and IOC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2011INF4.pdf | | | |
| 1 | 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" | Consensus | Can live with |
| 2 | Top-Level protections of <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 2 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" | Divergence | Can live with |

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|---|---|------------------|---------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scope 1 Identifiers: ECOSOC List (General Consultative Status) (Language: English only) ○ Scope 2 Identifiers: ECOSOC List (Special Consultative Status) (Language: English only) ***Note, this list of Identifiers are INGOs other than the RCRC and IOC ○ See http://csonet.org/content/documents/E2011INF4.pdf | | |
| 3 | For <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> Identifiers, if placed in the Applicant Guidebook as ineligible for delegation at the Top-Level , an exception procedure should be created for cases where a protected organization wishes to apply for their protected string at the Top-Level | Consensus | Can live with |
| 4 | 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 | Divergence | Support |
| 5 | Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> are placed in Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement | Divergence | Can live with |
| 6 | For <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> 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 | Consensus | Can live with |
| 7 | Second-Level protections of only <u>Exact Match, Full Name</u> Scope 1 (unless otherwise reserve protected) & Scope 2 identifiers of the <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> are bulk added as a single list to the Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH) | Consensus | Support |
| 8 | 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 | Divergence | Support |
| 9 | <i>International Non-Governmental Organizations</i> 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 for Second-Level registrations | Consensus | Support |

General Recommendations

| # | Recommendation | Level of Support | ALAC |
|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | 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. | Consensus | Support |
| 2 | IGO-INGO organizations be granted a fee waiver (or funding) for objections filed against applied-for gTLDs at the Top-Level | Divergence | Support |
| 3 | IGO-INGOs allowed to participate in <u>Sunrise</u> phase of each new gTLD launch | Strong Support but Significant Opposition | Support |
| 4 | Fee waivers or reduced pricing (or limited subsidies) for registering into the Trademark Clearinghouse the identifiers of IGO-INGO organizations | Divergence | Support, BUT ONLY IF OTHER TMCH USERS DO NOT PAY FOR THIS SUBSIDY |
| 5 | IGO-INGOs allowed to participate in <u>permanent Claims Notification</u> of each gTLD launch | Divergence | Support, BUT ONLY IF APPLICABLE TO TRADEMARKS AS WELL |
| 6 | Fee waivers or reduced pricing for IGO-INGOs filing a URS or UDRP action | Divergence | No |