# Attachment A

**Von:** Contact Information Redacted

**Gesendet:** Montag, 4. August 2014 23:37
**An:** Contact Information Redacted
**Betreff:** Auction Schedule and the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework

As you may have seen, ICANN announced the finalized Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework ("the Framework") (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2014-08-01-en). To learn more about name collisions, including the Framework, please see: www.ICANN.org/namecollision.

Applicants who received an intent to Auction notification were provided an opportunity to request an Auction postponement pending finalization of the Framework. These postponements were accommodated on a per Auction basis. Because the Framework has now been finalized, postponement requests on the basis of pending finalization of the Framework will no longer be accommodated after the August Auction.

The current Auction Schedule can be found at http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/auctions, additionally you can view the planned Auction Date for an unresolved contention set on the Contention Set Status page. Applicants will receive a confirmation of the Auction Date at least 21 days in advance of the Auction. Applicants may request to advance or postpone an Auction Date, provided the request is made by each and every member of the contention set, please refer to the Auction Date Advancement/Postponement Request Form for more details.

**Any Questions?**

Please provide any questions by logging into the customer service portal and submitting a case, or sending an email to: Contact Information Redacted

**Disclosure**
This notification is not application specific and will only be received once per unique Primary Contact email address.

Best Regards,

# Attachment B

"Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework Implementation"

Anmelden

Web Bilder News Videos Shopping Mehr Suchoptionen

9 Ergebnisse (0,27 Sekunden)

## ICANN Approves Name Collision Occurrence Management ...
https://www.icann.org/.../announcement-2-2014-08-... Diese Seite übersetzen
01.08.2014 - Overview: **Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework Implementation**. ICANN registry operators are obligated to comply with ...

## name collision occurrence management framework ...
redhotgeek.com/index.php?...**name_collision_occur**... Diese Seite übersetzen
**name collision occurrence management framework implementation** Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework ICANN and the multistakeholder ...

## Middle East Network Operators Group List () - Gmane
comments.gmane.org/gmane.org.operators.../663 Diese Seite übersetzen
04.08.2014 - Overview: **Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework Implementation**. ICANN registry operators are obligated to comply with ...

## Africa Registry News
www.africaregistry.com/about_africa/news.htm Diese Seite übersetzen
05.08.2014 - For more information see the **Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework Implementation** Announcement [...] ICANN Approves ...

## ICANN will be holding a webinar to provide information ...
news.domfinder.com/.../30661742-icann-join-us-fo... Diese Seite übersetzen
For more information see the **Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework Implementation** Announcement [PDF, 634 KB]. Webinar Details Session 1 ...

## mrarrowhead.com - php tutorials, web design - Facebook
www.facebook.com/permalink.php?id...story... Diese Seite übersetzen
**name collision occurrence management framework implementation**. ICANN and the multi-stakeholder community has announced the implementation of The ...

## News & Articles Archives - Page 4 of 5668 - iGoldRush ...
www.igoldrush.com/news/2014/08/page/4 Diese Seite übersetzen
02.08.2014 - For more information see the **Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework Implementation** [...] Continue reading → · DomainPulse.com ...

## DomainPulse.com - The Beat on the Domain Name Industry ...
feedage.com:8080/.../domainpulsecom-the-beat-on-... Diese Seite übersetzen
... operator requirements followed by a Q&A. For more information see the **Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework Implementation** Announcement ...

## Domain News Headlines - DNHeadlines.com
dnheadlines.com/domain-news-by-date.php
... operator requirements followed by a Q&A. For more information see the **Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework Implementation** Announcement ...

*Damit Sie nur die relevantesten Ergebnisse erhalten, wurden einige Einträge ausgelassen, die den 9 angezeigten Treffern sehr ähnlich sind. Sie können bei Bedarf die Suche unter Einbeziehung der übersprungenen Ergebnisse wiederholen.*

# Attachment C

Governmental Advisory Committee

Durban, 18 July 2013

# GAC Communiqué – Durban, South Africa[1]

## I. Introduction

The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN) met in Durban, South Africa during the week of 13 July 2013. 59 GAC Members and 4 Observers attended the meetings. The GAC expresses warm thanks to the local host, .zadna, for their support.

## II. Inter-constituency Activities

### 1. Briefing from the Geo TLD Registry Group

The GAC met with the Geo TLD Registry Group and received information on the organization's origins, values, missions and current concerns.

### 2. Meeting with the Accountability and Transparency Review Team 2 (ATRT 2)

The GAC met with the ATRT 2 and discussed expectations and priorities. The GAC encouraged the ATRT2 to give advice on improving the accountability and transparency in ICANN's financial operations reporting. The ATRT2 was invited to advise on how to improve outreach and active participation, especially from developing countries. Broad participation of stakeholders from all regions is vital for the legitimacy of ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model. The GAC also invited the ATRT2 to give advice on how to improve the GAC and the transparency of GAC meetings, and to better explain and provide rationales for the advice of the GAC. The ATRT2 invited individual GAC members to provide further written inputs to the Review Team.

[1] To access previous GAC advice, whether on the same or other topics, past GAC communiqués are available at: https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Recent+Meetings and older GAC communiqués are available at: https://gacweb.icann.org/display/gacweb/GAC+Meetings+Archive.

3. **Meeting with the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO)**

   The GAC met with the GNSO and exchanged views on key policy development work in the GNSO, including an ongoing Policy Development Process (PDP) regarding protection of IGO and INGO names and acronyms. An exchange focused on the opportunities for the GAC to engage early in GNSO Policy Development Processes.

4. **Meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC)**

   The GAC met with the SSAC and received an update on recent SSAC work regarding namespace collisions, internal name certificates and dotless domains, and exchanged views on ensuing concerns.

5. **Meeting with the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO)**

   The GAC met with the ccNSO and received information about the recently concluded policy development regarding IDN ccTLDs, the modification of the IDN Fast Track process with creation of a second panel and the Framework of Interpretation work. The GAC and the ccNSO also discussed how to further improve the future dialogue between the GAC and the ccNSO.

6. **Meeting with the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)**

   The GAC met with the ALAC and received an introduction to ALAC's organization, bottom-up processes and output, including formal ALAC objections to certain new gTLD applications. The ALAC voiced concerns regarding issues on dot-less domains and domain name collisions and expressed support for recent SSAC statements. The ALAC also expressed concerns over the high threshold in the dispute resolution procedure for Public Interest Commitments (PIC) in particular in relation to the measurable harm standard required to file a complaint and the enforcement of these.

7. **Briefing from the Domain Name Association (DNA)**

   The GAC met with the Domain Name Association and received information on its structure and objectives.

8. **Meeting with the Expert Working Group on gTLD Directory Services (EWG)**

   The GAC met with the EWG and exchanged views on the model proposed by the EWG for the next generation directory service as a successor to the WHOIS service.

The GAC referenced its WHOIS principles from 2007 and its Beijing advice regarding the WHOIS Review Team recommendations, which both have served as input for the work of the EWG. The GAC expressed its concerns about the risks associated with centralized storage of data in one repository in one jurisdiction, and raised a series of issues relating to the proposed data repository structure and access including security, data accuracy, consistency with national law, accreditation of database users, and privacy governance. The GAC looks forward to further discussion of these issues as the working group progresses.

**9. Briefing from Architelos**

The GAC received a briefing on the TLD market and its development from Architelos, a consultancy focused on the domain name industry.

***

The GAC warmly thanks the GNSO, the SSAC, the ccNSO and the ALAC, as well as all those among the ICANN community who have contributed to the dialogue with the GAC in Durban.

## III. Internal Matters

1. The GAC held its second capacity building session for new and existing members on 13 July, which included an update to the GAC on internationalization and the ICANN's strategy for engagement in the Africa region.
2. The GAC welcomed Madagascar, Namibia, São Tomé and Príncipe, Swaziland, and Zambia to the GAC as members.
3. The chair and vice chairs provided an update in Durban on progress with regard to ACIG providing secretariat support to the GAC.

## IV. GAC Advice to the Board[2]

**1. New gTLDs**

**1. GAC Objections to Specific Applications (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.)**

**a. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:**

i. The GAC has reached consensus on GAC Objection Advice according to Module 3.1 part I of the Applicant Guidebook on the following applications:[3]

---

[2] To track the history and progress of GAC Advice to the Board, please visit the GAC Advice Online Register available at: https://gacweb.icann.org/display/GACADV/GAC+Register+of+Advice

[3] Module 3.1: "The GAC advises ICANN that it is the consensus of the GAC that a particular application should not proceed. This will create a strong presumption for the ICANN Board that the application should not be approved.

1. The application for .amazon (application number 1-1315-58086) and related IDNs in Japanese (application number 1-1318-83995) and Chinese (application number 1-1318-5591)
2. The application for .thai (application number 1-2112-4478)

**b. guangzhou (IDN in Chinese), shenzhen (IDN in Chinese), .spa and .yun**

i. The GAC agrees to leave the applications below for further consideration and **advises the ICANN Board**:

i. Not to proceed beyond initial evaluation until the agreements between the relevant parties are reached.

1. The applications for .spa (application number 1-1309-12524 and 1-1619-92115)
2. The application for .yun (application number 1-1318-12524
3. The application for .guangzhou (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-1121-22691)
4. The application for .shenzhen (IDN in Chinese - application number 1-1121-82863)

**2. .wine and .vin (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.)**

a. **The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:**

i. The GAC considered the two strings .vin and .wine and due to the complexity of the matter was unable to conclude at this meeting. As a result the GAC agreed to take thirty days additional time with a view to conclude on the matter.

**3. .date and .persiangulf (ref. Beijing Communiqué 1.c.)**

a. **The GAC has finalised its consideration of the following strings, and does not object to them proceeding:**

i. .date (application number 1-1247-30301)

ii. .persiangulf (application number 1-2128-55439)

**4. .indians and .ram**

**a. The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:**

i. The GAC has noted the concerns expressed by the Government of India not to proceed with the applications for .indians and .ram.

**5. Protection of IGO Acronyms**

a. The GAC reaffirms its previous advice from the Toronto and Beijing Meetings that IGOs are in an objectively different category to other rights holders thus warranting special protection by ICANN. IGOs perform important global public missions with public funds and as such, their identifiers (both their names and their acronyms) need preventative protection in an expanded DNS.

b. The GAC understands that the ICANN Board, further to its previous assurances, is prepared to fully implement GAC advice; an outstanding matter to be finalized is the practical and effective implementation of the permanent preventative protection of IGO acronyms at the second level.

**c. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that:**

**i.** The GAC is interested to work with the IGOs and the NGPC on a complementary cost-neutral mechanism that would:

**a.** provide notification to an IGO if a potential registrant seeks to register a domain name matching the acronym of an IGO at the second level, giving the IGO a reasonable opportunity to express concerns, if any; and

**b.** allow for an independent third party to review any such registration request, in the event of a disagreement between an IGO and potential registrant.

**ii.** The initial protections for IGO acronyms confirmed by the NGPC at its meeting of 2 July 2013 should remain in place until the dialogue between the GAC, NGPC, and IGO representatives ensuring the implementation of preventative protection for IGO acronyms at the second level is completed.

**5. Protection of Red Cross/Red Crescent Acronyms**

**a. The GAC advises the ICANN Board that**

i. The same complementary cost neutral mechanisms to be worked out (as above in 4.c.i.) for the protection of acronyms of IGOs be used to also protect the acronyms of the International Committee

of the Red Cross (ICRC/CICR) and the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC/FICR).

**6. Category 1 Safeguard Advice**

**i.** The GAC has met with the NGPC to discuss the Committee's response to GAC advice contained in the Beijing Communique on safeguards that should apply to Category 1 new gTLDs. **The GAC Advises the ICANN Board that:**

1. The GAC will continue the dialogue with the NGPC on this issue.

**7. Geographic Names and Community Applications**

**a. Geographic Names**

**i.** The GAC recommends that ICANN collaborate with the GAC in refining, for future rounds, the Applicant Guidebook with regard to the protection of terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance, in accordance with the 2007 GAC Principles on New gTLDs.

**b. Community Applications**

i. The GAC reiterates its advice from the Beijing Communiqué regarding preferential treatment for all applications which have demonstrable community support, while noting community concerns over the high costs for pursuing a Community Objection process as well as over the high threshold for passing Community Priority Evaluation.

**ii. Therefore the GAC advises the ICANN Board to:**

a. Consider to take better account of community views, and improve outcomes for communities, within the existing framework, independent of whether those communities have utilized ICANN's formal community processes to date.

**8. DNS Security and Stability**

a. The GAC shares the security and stability concerns expressed by the SSAC regarding Internal Name Certificates and Dotless Domains. The GAC requests the ICANN Board to provide a written briefing about:

i. how ICANN considers this SSAC advice with a view to implementation as soon as possible. The GAC believes that all such stability and security analysis should be made publicly available prior to the delegation of new gTLDS.

ii. **The GAC Advises the ICANN Board to:**

a. As a matter of urgency consider the recommendations contained in the SSAC Report on Dotless Domains (SAC053) and Internal Name Certificates (SAC057).

**9. Registry and Registrar Agreements and Conflicts with Law**

**a.** It was noted that there are provisions in the Registry Agreement and Registrar Accreditation Agreement that may conflict with applicable law in certain countries, in particular privacy and data retention, collection and processing law. The importance of having adequate procedures to avoid these conflicts was highlighted.

## V. Next Meeting

The GAC will meet during the 48th ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina.

# Attachment D

I-REGISTRY LTD.
Contact Information Redacted

Contact Information Redacted

Cherine Chalaby
Chair, New gTLD Program Committee
Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers
Contact Information Redacted

*via email to* Contact Information Redacted

July 27, 2014

**Re: letter of RySG, IPC and BC on Rights Protection Mechanism to Name Collision Blocklists**

Dear Mr Chalaby, dear members of the NGPC,

First of all, we would like to express our support for the letter sent July 17, 2014 on behalf of the RySG, BC and IPC. Although there has been no formal vote on this proposal, we appreciate the initiative taken and outcome.

However, we would like to note that while this proposal serves the needs of both rights owners and registries, we are concerned that registrants might get confused. As we've experienced ourselves, registrants are crucial for the success of the gTLD program and their needs to be taken serious. Many of them do not understand the reasons for reservation and block lists and under which TLDs they can register, allocate or not register names from these lists. Having said this, the goal should be to simplify and unify the release for name collision names across all gTLDs. Therefore, some implications of this proposal need a more thorough analysis:

- The proposal does provide uncertainty to registrants into which category a gTLD falls and thus lacks guidance which rights protection mechanisms are available.
- The proposal has not been agreed-upon by the ICANN community at-large, in contrast to the development of the RPM rules where the community was involved.

Therefore we ask ICANN to thoroughly evaluate the proposed model and we propose that:

- ICANN, together with the community, extend the existing RPM rules for the allocation and activation of APD names.
- ICANN takes into account the different registration models and phases of existing and future gTLD operators.
- ICANN together with the community al-large develops a set of common rules, valid for all gTLDs.
- Those common rules should apply to both, already delegated gTLDs and not-yet delegated gTLDs, to avoid registrant confusion.
- Provide Registries with a limited timeframe to either stay with their existing policies or develop new one for the allocation and activation of names of their APD list under the to-be-developed RPM rules.

We kindly ask the NGPC to take these issues into consideration.

With best regards,

I-REGISTRY Ltd.

- sgd. Anschelika Smoljar -

# Attachment E

**Von:** Cherine Chalaby Contact Information Redacted
**Gesendet:** Dienstag, 29. Juli 2014 09:52
**An:** Anschelika Smoljar
**Cc:** Akram Atallah; Christine Willett; Megan Bishop; Michelle Bright; Karine Perset
**Betreff:** Re: letter of RySG, IPC and BC on Rights Protection Mechanism to Name Collision Blocklists

Dear Anschelika Smoljar,

On behalf of the New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC), I acknowledge receipt of the I-REGISTRY Ltd letter dated July 27, 2014.
Best regards,

Cherine Chalaby
Chair, New gTLD Program Committee

---

**From:** Anschelika Smoljar Contact Information Redacted
**Date:** Monday, 28 July 2014 21:26
**To:** Cherine Mohsen Chalaby Contact Information Redacted
**Cc:** Anschelika Smoljar Contact Information Redacted
**Subject:** Re: letter of RySG, IPC and BC on Rights Protection Mechanism to Name Collision Blocklists

Dear Mr Chalaby,

attached I'm sending you our letter dated July 27 in regard to Rights Protection Mechanism to Name Collision Blocklists

I would appreciate it if you could send me a confirmation of receipt.

Thank you.

Best regards

Anschelika Smoljar

I-REGISTRY Ltd.
Contact Information Redacted

Contact Information Redacted

Contact Information Redacted

# Attachment F

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

8 August 2014

Anschelika Smoljar
I-REGISTRY Ltd.

Re: Letter of RySG, IPC and BC on Rights Protection Mechanism to Name Collision Blocklists

Dear Ms. Anschelika Smoljar:

Thank you for your letter of 27 July 2014. We appreciate I-REGISTRY Ltd's comments, and we have posted the letter to the New gTLD correspondence page (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/smoljar-to-chalaby-27jul14-en.pdf).

As you may be aware, on 30 July 2014, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) approved the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2014-08-01-en). The framework implementation requirements were developed with input from many sources including the ICANN community, a report published by JAS Global Advisors LLC, and advice from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC). To view the framework, see (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf).

For information on how the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework impacts registry operators and new gTLD applicants, we encourage you to participate in the upcoming webinars scheduled for 12 August 2014 (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-3-2014-08-01-en). Questions for ICANN staff may be submitted in advance to newgtld@icann.org or gdd-communications@icann.org.

We look forward to I-REGISTRY Ltd's continued participation in the multi-stakeholder process.

Sincerely,

Cyrus Namazi
Vice President, Domain Name Services & Industry Engagement
Global Domains Division
ICANN

# Attachment G

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

8 August 2014

Mr. Andrew Merriam
Secretary
The New TLD Applicant Group (NTAG)

Dear Mr. Andrew Merriam and Members of the NTAG:

Thank you for your letter of 25 June 2014. We appreciate the New TLD Applicant Group's (NTAG) comments, and we have posted the letter to the New gTLD correspondence page (http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/correspondence/ntag-to-atallah-25jun14-en.pdf)

As you may be aware, on 30 July 2014, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) approved the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2014-08-01-en). The framework implementation requirements were developed with input from many sources including the ICANN community, a report published by JAS Global Advisors LLC, and advice from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC). To view the framework, see (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf).

For information on how the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework impacts registry operators and new gTLD applicants, we encourage you to participate in the upcoming webinars scheduled for 12 August 2014 (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-3-2014-08-01-en). Questions for ICANN staff may be submitted in advance to newgtld@icann.org or gdd-communications@icann.org.

We look forward to the NTAG's continued participation in the multi-stakeholder process.

Sincerely,

Cyrus Namazi
Vice President, Domain Name Services & Industry Engagement
Global Domains Division
ICANN

# Attachment H

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers

8 August 2014

Elisa Cooper
Chair, Business Constituency

Keith Drazek
Chair, Registry Stakeholder Group

Kristina Rosette
President, Intellectual Property Constituency

Re: Application of Rights Protection Mechanism to Name Collision Blocklists

Dear Ms. Cooper, Ms. Rosette, and Mr. Drazek:

Thank you for your letter of 17 July 2014. We appreciate the Registry Stakeholder Group (RySG), the Business Constituency (BC) and the Intellectual Property Constituency's (IPC) comments, and we have posted the letter to the New gTLD correspondence page (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/cooper-et-al-to-chalaby-ngpc-17jul14-en.pdf).

As you may be aware, on 30 July 2014, the ICANN Board New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) approved the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-2-2014-08-01-en). The framework implementation requirements were developed with input from many sources including the ICANN community, a report published by JAS Global Advisors LLC, and advice from the Security and Stability Advisory Committee (SSAC). To view the framework, see (https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/name-collision-framework-30jul14-en.pdf).

For information on how the Name Collision Occurrence Management Framework impacts registry operators and new gTLD applicants, we encourage you to participate in the upcoming webinars scheduled for 12 August 2014 (https://www.icann.org/news/announcement-3-2014-08-01-en). Questions for ICANN staff may be submitted in advance to newgtld@icann.org or gdd-communications@icann.org.

We look forward to the RySG, the BC, and the IPC's continued participation in the multi-stakeholder process.

Sincerely,

Cyrus Namazi
Vice President, Domain Name Services & Industry Engagement
Global Domains Division
ICANN