



# Legal/Regulatory

Michael Flemming & Phil Buckingham | Work Track 2 |  
20 October 2016

# Agenda

1

Welcome &  
Admin

2

SOIs

3

Base  
Agreement:  
Reaching Out

4

ICANN57 Teaser  
Questions /  
Other Topics of  
Interest

5

Reserved Names

6

AOB

# Base Agreement (Reaching Out)

## Single Base Agreement versus Category Based Agreements.

Currently we are reaching out to those specific category oriented groups in order to receive reasoning or justification for why a Category Based Agreement as opposed to a Single Base Agreement. Such feedback is to facilitate further discussion within the WT.

Current groups already reached out to:

- Brand Registry Group: Waiting on a deadline for when they can give feedback.
- Geo TLDs: Waiting on a deadline for when they can give feedback.

What other groups should we be reaching out to?

# ICANN57 Teaser Questions / Other Topics of Interest

**Teaser Questions:** Questions that we seek ask in order to receive input from community members who would not be regularly attending these calls.

1. Is a single agreement still suitable for the needs of subsequent procedures? Noting that the 2012 round saw the introduction of TLDs with needs that differ from the standard ICANN model, the idea of different agreements suited to a specific category has seen increased demand. Do we need to consider allowing for category based agreements and what is the justification for such? If yes, in what ways could we consider a "category based agreement"? Or, how should the single base agreement address the various needs of different categories?
2. For Reserved Names, what is a reserved name and what are the reserved names per the RA? Do any changes need to be made to the reserved names to reflect the changes in recent processes that allow for the release of such reserved names?

3. In the 2012 round a Continuing Operations Instrument was required to be submitted in the form of a Letter of Credit to fund an Emergency Back End Registry Operator. That requirement proved to be difficult for a number of registries to meet. What other options are there to fund the EBERO functions? Also, some registries, such as Brand TLDs, consider that a Continuing Operations Instrument is not required due to the nature of their TLD. This spans into the background of EBERO requirements, as well, but would the Continuing Operations Instrument be required for TLDs that would qualify for an exemption to the Code of Conduct for the RA?

**Any other topics to consider?**

# Reserved Names

**Instructions from Final Issue Report.** Review the composition of the reserved names list to determine if additions, modifications, or subtractions are needed (e.g., single letter, two letters, special characters, etc.). Evaluate if the implementation matched expectations (e.g., recommendations of the Reserved Names Working Group). Review whether geographic names requirements are appropriate.

## Areas to look at

1. What are the string restrictions on applying for top level domains?
2. What are the current Registry Agreement rules on reserved names?
3. Does the Registry Agreement match what was recommended in policy?
4. What are the geographic names requirements?

- **Tools for group work.** Utilization of Google Docs for beginning to compile an analysis document that will work towards our conclusion on the issue. *Reference:* See the WT1 document that captures opinions and Pros and Cons mentioned in the meeting and mailing list.