

New gTLD Protection of Red Cross and IOC Names

This Wiki space will be an ongoing status report as the process evolves. Newer entries will be at the TOP.

February 29, 2012

A [status report](#) on the Drafting Team's activities has been issued in preparation for a teleconference with the DT members as well as any interested members of the GNSO Council and the GAC. The report is a significant expansion on the one particular recommendation discussed below.

This is formally a report of the Chair, although there was extensive discussion on the list which led to a number of changes from the first draft.

February 12, 2012

During the discussions between the Board and the GAC preceding the launch of the new gTLD program, the GAC requested special protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent (RC/RC) and International Olympic Committee (IOC) names, due to the special protection given to these names by a variety of unique international agreements and treaties.

The Board responded by reserving a specific list of names from being used during the first round of the new gTLD program, and remanded the issue to the GNSO for further deliberations. Such deliberations were to address both use of RC/RC and IOC names both at the top and second level for new gTLDs.

The Board action was implemented by means of provisions in the current [Applicant Guidebook](#), Section 2.2.1.2.3 Page 2-10 to 2-11.

To enable the GNSO to properly consider the GAC request, additional information was requested of the GAC. This [additional detail](#) was provided in September.

A GNSO Drafting Team was created with the intent of providing guidance to the GNSO. Details of the group's deliberations (including transcripts) can be found in the [GNSO Calendar](#), with meetings generally held on Wednesdays, and in the group's [mailing list](#) (which has seen much traffic).

If the GNSO were to take no action at this point, the exemptions already in the Applicant Guidebook will stand.

I have made it clear that to the extent that there have been comments on the issue within At-Large and ALAC, the tone has been that special exemptions for these bodies should not be granted. That view is shared by some other participants in the DT. However, it was also generally accepted that an exemption has already been granted and there is little opportunity for the GNSO to change the basic concept.

My personal position has been that although these special exemptions are not what I would have preferred, it is clear that the Board has already agreed to the basic concept, and the DT's major responsibility is to ensure that the exemptions can be implemented in as rational and effective means as possible, minimizing the need for extraordinary action later in the process and definitely minimizing the impact on other gTLD applicants.

The DT decided that the first priority was to provide clarification on how top-level domains should be treated, as it was viewed as important that any changes be finalized prior to the end of the gTLD application period. Following extensive discussion, the group has drafted [a recommendation on how Section 2.2.1.2.3 should be revised](#).

This recommendation, or what results from discussions over the next week, will be discussed with interested members of the GAC on a teleconference on March 2.

The intent is that whatever comes out of the next week of discussions go to the GNSO in Costa Rica, for potential adoption in its meeting on Wednesday, allowing the Board to consider adoption on Friday. The DT will likely also suggest that if any applications already submitted are disqualified due to these changes, that the entire application fee be refunded.