

Report of Public Comments

Title:	Protection of IOC-RCRC Names Recommendations Report		
Publication Date:	15 November 2012		
Prepared By:	Berry Cobb		
Comment Period:		Important Information Links	
Open Date:	28 September 2012		
Close Date:	9 November 2012		
Time (UTC):	23:59 UTC		
Staff Contact:	Brian Peck	Email:	policy-staff@icann.org
Section I: General Overview and Next Steps			
<p>The ICANN Board had requested policy advice from the GNSO Council and the GAC on whether special protections should be afforded to the RCRC, IOC and/or IGOs. Specifically, in its Singapore resolution, the Board authorized the President and CEO to implement the New gTLD Program "which includes the following elements: "the 30 May 2011 version of the Applicant Guidebook, subject to the revisions agreed to with the GAC on 19 June 2011, including: ...(b) incorporation of text concerning protection for specific requested Red Cross and IOC names for the top level only during the initial application round, until the GNSO and GAC develop policy advice based on the global public interest....."</p> <p>During September 2011, the GAC also sent advice to the GNSO with a proposal for granting second level protections based upon the protections afforded to IOC/RCRC at the first level. In the same month, section 2.2.1.2.3 was added to the latest version of the new gTLD Applicant Guidebook dated 19 September 2011.</p> <p>As a result of the GAC proposal submitted to the GNSO, the GNSO Council created a call for volunteers to form a drafting team about creating a response to the GAC. The IOC/RCRC Drafting Team was formed has since created a set of recommendations for protecting the IOC/RCRC names at the second level and includes an outline for a response to the GAC from the GNSO. The Drafting Team now wishes to solicit feedback from the community prior to submission of the recommendations to the GNSO Council.</p> <p>See the IOC/RCRC Drafting Team page for more detail at: http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/red-cross-ioc.htm</p>			
Section II: Contributors			

At the time this report was prepared, a total of three (3) community submissions had been posted to the Forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
Not-for-Profit Operational Concerns	Alain Berranger	NPOC
Non-Commercial Stakeholders Group	Avri Doria	NCSG

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
Richard Tindal	Donuts Inc.	RT
Avri Doria		AD
Ana Cristina Amoroso das Neves	Department of Information Society FCT	FCT
Michael Meyer	Red Cross	MM
Marcus Jaeger		MJ
Lucy Lindale Brown	Red Cross	LLB
Kiran J. Malancharuvil	Silverberg, Goldman & Bikoff, L.L.P.	KM

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments submitted to this Forum, but not to address every specific position stated by each contributor. Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).

General Comments

NPOC – is in favor to initiate a PDP, and scope should cover all IGO-INGO organizations, in addition to IOC-RCRC

NCSG – Position restated per the minority position included in the recommendation report; NPOC, NCSG positions aligned to PDP.

RT – Recognizes the efforts of the DT and announces reservation protections offered within their delegated TLDS.

AD – Notes that temporary solutions risk becoming permanent implementations; refers to ICANN Board motion; Recommendations do not include IGOs pending PDP; supports dropping recommendations #2 &3; applicants should consider adopting their own protection strategies.

FCT – Supports PDP; policy should be set up for organizations that meet specific set of abstract criteria and not for specifically named organizations.

MM – RCRC Names have special status in humanitarian law (1949 Geneva Convention); protection by national legislation in most countries; if PDP is pursued, temporary protections should be put in place.

MJ – No special protections should be granted; perhaps agree on protections for humanitarian; already against the protections at the top-level.

LLB – Designations serve as an important purpose; in times of conflict, designations are a symbol or signal that the personnel working under these designations are neutral actors that should be allowed safe passage; use the designations to execute the Movement's humanitarian mission throughout the world; recognize issue for IGO-INGO protections; preexisting uses are permitted, or grandfathered, as of the date of enactment of the national legislation or the entry into force of the first 1949 Geneva Convention for the given State.

KM – Reply to Mr. Stoll; IOC is not a commercial organization; it is a not-for-profit organization

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: This section is intended to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments received along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.

The IOC-RCRC DT is responsible for analyzing and evaluating the comments received. Its review of the comments should be available in due time on the Working Group's workspace (see <http://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=31162836>).