

**COMPARISON TABLE OF GAC ADVICE, GNSO RECOMMENDATIONS¹ &
PROPOSED GNSO COUNCIL MODIFICATION (AS OF 22 JUNE 2014)**

GAC Advice (Durban, BA & S'pore Communiqués)	GNSO Recommendation (Nov 2013)	Proposed Modification (June 2014)
<p>Red Cross & Red Crescent (RC):</p> <p>Terms associated with international RC movement “permanently protected from unauthorized use” – to include 189 national RC societies (English and official language) and Full Names of Int’l C’ttee of the RC & Int’l Federation of RC Societies (in UN6)</p> <p>Acronyms of international RC entities (ICRC, CICR, IFRC, FICR) to have same “complementary cost neutral mechanism” as for IGOs</p> <p><i>[NOTE: See new GAC advice from London, below]</i></p>	<p>Red Cross & Red Crescent (RC):</p> <p><u>90 days</u> TMCH claims notice for Exact Match of RC Scope 2 Identifiers (i.e. full names and acronyms of 189 national RC societies (in English and respective national language) and of international RC entities - ICRC, CICR, IFRC, FICR (in UN6))²</p>	<p>Red Cross & Red Crescent (RC):</p> <p>Claims notice for <u>life of TMCH</u> (pre-registration notice to registrant plus post-registration notice to relevant RC entity) for Exact Match of RC Scope 2³ Identifiers</p> <p>New Curative Rights PDP WG to consider same no/low cost mechanism for acronyms of international RC entities (ICRC, CICR, IFRC, FICR) as any that may be recommended for IGOs/INGOs</p>
<p>IGO Acronyms:</p> <p>Permanent second level protection in the form of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Permanent system of notifications to both the potential registrant of a matching domain and 	<p>IGO Acronyms:</p> <p><u>90 days</u> TMCH claims notice for acronyms of IGOs on GAC list of 22 March 2013⁴</p> <p>Issue Report (initiated now as a GNSO PDP) to address</p>	<p>IGO Acronyms:</p> <p>Claims notice for <u>life of TMCH</u> (pre-registration notice to registrant plus post-registration notice to relevant IGO) for acronyms of IGOs on</p>

¹ The IGO-INGO PDP WG Final Report can be accessed here: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/igo-ingo-final-10nov13-en.pdf>. The GNSO Council’s resolution unanimously adopting the WG’s consensus recommendations can be accessed here: <http://gns0.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20131120-2>.

² See Section 3.1.5, 3.1.6 and 3.1.8 of the IGO-INGO PDP WG Final Report.

³ i.e. those identifiers defined by the IGO-INGO PDP WG.

⁴ See Section 3.3.5 and 3.3.7 of the IGO-INGO PDP WG Final Report.

the relevant IGO;	curative rights access for IGOs (and INGOs) ⁵	GAC list
2. Allow the IGO a timely opportunity to effectively prevent potential misuse and confusion;		New Curative Rights PDP WG directed to consider no/low cost procedure for IGOs on GAC list
3. Allow for final and binding determination by an independent third party in order to resolve any disagreement between an IGO and a potential registrant; and		New Curative Rights PDP WG directed to consider third party binding arbitration (in lieu of appeal to national courts) for second level domain name disputes involving acronyms of IGOs on GAC list
4. Be at no cost or of a nominal cost only to the IGO		

UPDATE: GAC Communiqué from London (June 2014):

On the Red Cross:

“The GAC now advises that:

- The Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names should not be equated with trademarks or trade names and that their protection could not therefore be adequately treated or addressed under ICANN's curative mechanisms for trademark protection;
- The protections due to the Red Cross and Red Crescent terms and names should not be subjected to, or conditioned upon, a policy development process;
- The permanent protection of these terms and names should be confirmed and implemented as a matter of priority, including in particular the names of the international and national Red Cross and Red Crescent organisations.”

On IGOs:

⁵ See Section 3.5.3 of the IGO-INGO PDP WG Final Report.

“The GAC reaffirms its advice from the Toronto, Beijing, Durban, Buenos Aires and Singapore Communiqués regarding protection for IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels, as implementation of such protection is in the public interest given that IGOs, as created by governments under international law, are objectively different rights holders; notes the NGPC’s letter of 16 June 2014 to the GNSO concerning further steps under the GNSO Policy Development Process while expressing concerns that the process of implementing GAC advice has been so protracted; welcomes the NGPC's assurance that interim protections remain in place pending any such process; and confirms its willingness to work with the GNSO on outcomes that meet the GAC’s concerns.”