

Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications

Thirty-Eighth Session
Geneva, October 30 to November 2, 2017

UPDATE ON TRADEMARK-RELATED ASPECTS OF THE DOMAIN NAME SYSTEM

Document prepared by the Secretariat

1. At the thirty-seventh session of the Standing Committee on the Law of Trademarks, Industrial Designs and Geographical Indications (SCT), the Chair stated that the SCT had taken note of document SCT/37/5 (Update on Trademark-related Aspects of the Domain Name System) and that the Secretariat was requested to keep Member States informed on future developments in the Domain Name System (DNS) (see document SCT/37/8). Accordingly, the Secretariat has prepared the present document which offers the requested update.

I. DOMAIN NAME CASE ADMINISTRATION

A. UNIFORM DOMAIN NAME DISPUTE RESOLUTION POLICY

2. The DNS raises a number of challenges for the protection of Intellectual Property (IP), which, due to the global nature of the Internet, call for an international approach. WIPO has addressed these challenges since 1998 by developing specific solutions, most notably in the First¹ and Second² WIPO Internet Domain Name Processes. Through the Arbitration and

¹ The Management of Internet Names and Addresses: Intellectual Property Issues – Final Report of the First WIPO Internet Domain Name Process, WIPO publication No. 439, also available at: <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/processes/process1/report>.

² The Recognition of Rights and the Use of Names in the Internet Domain Name System – Report of the Second WIPO Internet Domain Name Process, WIPO Publication No. 843, also available at: <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/processes/process2/report>.

Mediation Center (Center), WIPO provides trademark owners with efficient international mechanisms to deal with the bad-faith registration and use of domain names corresponding to their trademark rights. The principal mechanism administered by the Center, the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (UDRP) was adopted by ICANN on the basis of recommendations made by WIPO in the First WIPO Internet Domain Name Process.

3. The UDRP is limited to clear cases of bad-faith, abusive registration and use of domain names and has proven in high demand for trademark owners³. Since December 1999, the Center has administered over 38,000 UDRP-based cases⁴. Trademark holders in 2016 filed 3,036 UDRP-based complaints with the Center, an increase of 10 per cent over 2015 filing, and the first time that WIPO domain name case filings have surpassed 3,000 in one year. As of June 2017, the total number of domain names in WIPO UDRP-based cases surpassed 70,000.

4. A diverse mixture of enterprises, institutions, and individuals used the Center's domain name dispute resolution procedures in 2016. The top five sectors for complainant business activity were Banking and Finance, Heavy Industry and Machinery, Fashion, Internet and Information Technology, and Biotechnology and Pharmaceuticals. Especially the filings related to consumer-facing brands include those by rights owners alleging counterfeiting *via* the web pages offered under the disputed domain name. Reflecting the global scope of this dispute mechanism, named parties to WIPO cases through 2016 represented 178 countries. In function of the language of the applicable registration agreement of the domain name at issue, WIPO UDRP proceedings have so far been conducted in 21 languages⁵.

5. All WIPO UDRP panel decisions are posted on the Center's website. In 2017, the Center published the Third Edition of the WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions (WIPO Overview 3.0)⁶, a globally-consulted online overview of broad decision trends on important case issues. Now covering over 100 topics, the present overhaul includes reference to almost 1,000 representative decisions from over 265 WIPO Panelists. The increased scope of WIPO Overview 3.0 since publication of version 2.0 in 2011 reflects a range of DNS and UDRP case evolutions in the near doubling of cases managed by the Center since then. The WIPO Overview is instrumental in developing and maintaining consistency of WIPO UDRP jurisprudence. To facilitate access to these decisions according to subject matter, the Center also offers an online searchable Legal Index of WIPO UDRP Decisions⁷. These WIPO resources are accessible globally free of charge.

6. Mindful of WIPO's foundational role in the UDRP, the Center monitors developments in the DNS with a view to adjusting its resources and practices⁸. The Center regularly organizes Domain Name Dispute Resolution Workshops to update interested parties⁹, as well as meetings of its Domain Name Panelists.

³ The UDRP does not prevent either party from submitting a dispute to a competent court of justice; but very few cases that have been decided under the UDRP have been brought before a national court of justice. See Selected UDRP-related Court Cases at <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/challenged>.

⁴ The Center makes available online real-time statistics to assist WIPO UDRP case parties and neutrals, trademark attorneys, domain name registrants, domain name policy makers, the media, and academics. Available statistics cover many categories, such as "areas of complainant activity", "domain name script", and "25 most cited decisions in complaint". See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/statistics>.

⁵ In alphabetical order, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dutch, English, French, German, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Russian, Slovak, Spanish, Swedish, Turkish, and Vietnamese.

⁶ See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/search/overview3.0/>.

⁷ See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/search/legalindex/>.

⁸ See, e.g., WO/GA/41/17 Rev. 2, paragraphs 14 to 16.

⁹ Such workshops organized by the Center are listed at: <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/events>.

B. COUNTRY CODE TOP-LEVEL DOMAINS (ccTLDs)

7. While the mandatory application of the UDRP is limited to domain names registered in generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs) (such as .com) and more recently introduced New gTLDs, the Center also assists ccTLD registries in their establishment of registration conditions and dispute resolution procedures that conform with best practices in registry management and IP protection. These procedures are mostly modeled after the UDRP, but may take account of the particular circumstances and needs of individual ccTLDs. Following discussions with European registry manager EURid, from June 2017 the Center provides services for .eu and .eu (cyrillic script) registrations, in all 24 official EU languages¹⁰. With the addition of this regional registry, and, since then, the .SE domain (Sweden), the Center currently provides domain name dispute resolution services to 76 ccTLD registries¹¹.

II. POLICY DEVELOPMENTS IN THE DOMAIN NAME SYSTEM

8. A number of policy developments in relation to ICANN present both opportunities and challenges for owners and users of IP rights. One is ICANN's introduction of up to 1,400 New gTLDs. Such New gTLDs may be of an "open" nature (similar to .com), or may take on more specific or restrictive characteristics, for example taking the form of .[brand], .[city], .[community], .[culture], .[industry], or .[language]. An important related development concerns the introduction of Internationalized Domain Names (IDNs) at the top level. Also, ICANN's envisaged expansion of the DNS raises rights protection questions in connection with the Second WIPO Process.

A. NEW GTLDS

9. ICANN implementation of its New gTLD Program formally approved in June 2011¹² is detailed in its much-revised "Applicant Guidebook"¹³. Delegation of the first New gTLDs into the Internet's Root Zone took place in October 2013, with over 1,200 more gTLDs delegated by June 2017¹⁴. Together, these New gTLDs appear to have so far attracted over 27 million second-level registrations¹⁵.

10. The Center remains committed to working with stakeholders to attempt to safeguard the observance of general principles of IP protection in New gTLDs. A number of the RPMs have emerged from a series of ICANN committees and processes for New gTLDs¹⁶. Set out below is a broad description of these ICANN RPMs, for the top level and the second level respectively.

(a) Top Level RPMs

(i) Pre- (TLD) Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure

11. This mechanism allowed trademark owners to lodge Legal Rights Objections (LRO) to New gTLD applications at the top level where certain substantive criteria were met¹⁷.

¹⁰ See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/new/eu.html>.

¹¹ The full list of ccTLDs which have retained the Center as domain name dispute resolution provider is available at <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/cctld>.

¹² See <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-20jun11-en.htm>. For further background including references, see document WO/GA/39/10, in particular paragraph 14.

¹³ ICANN's Applicant Guidebook is available at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb>.

¹⁴ Delegated New gTLDs are listed at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/program-status/delegated-strings>.

¹⁵ See <https://ntldstats.com>.

¹⁶ For further background including references, see WO/GA/39/10, in particular paragraphs 23 to 30. It is noted here that ICANN rejected a proposal for a "Globally Protected Marks List".

¹⁷ Other objection grounds recognized by ICANN were: "String Confusion Objections", "Community Objections", and "Limited Public Interest Objections". The Applicant Guidebook further includes a number of other procedures which governments could avail themselves of following ICANN announcement of New gTLD applications. Notably,

The Center assisted ICANN in the establishment of these criteria on the basis of the “WIPO Joint Recommendation Concerning Provisions on the Protection of Marks, and Other Industrial Property Rights in Signs, on the Internet”¹⁸.

12. Appointed by ICANN as the exclusive provider of LRO dispute resolution services¹⁹, the Center received 69 compliant LRO filings, which it completed processing by September 2013²⁰. All WIPO LRO expert panel determinations are available on the Center’s website²¹ as is a Center report on the LRO process²².

(ii) Post- (TLD) Delegation Dispute Resolution Procedure (PDDRP)

13. In early 2009, the Center communicated to ICANN a concrete substantive proposal for a permanent administrative option that would allow for the filing of a complaint with respect to an approved New gTLD registry operator whose manner of operation or use of its registry is alleged to cause or materially contribute to trademark abuse²³. The proposal’s intent was to offer standardized assistance to ICANN’s own compliance oversight responsibilities, by providing an administrative alternative to court litigation, encouraging responsible conduct by relevant actors and including appropriate safe-harbors²⁴.

14. Following various ICANN processes, including consultations with registry operators, the effectiveness of this PDDRP in the form adopted by ICANN remains uncertain, in particular given the addition of overlapping procedural layers, and issues concerning the intended substantive scope of this mechanism. In light of broader policy interests, the Center in 2013 agreed with ICANN to become a provider for the trademark PDDRP.

(b) Second Level RPMs

(i) Trademark Clearinghouse (TMCH)

15. ICANN’s New gTLD Program includes a TMCH as a centralized repository of authenticated trademark data which could be invoked as the basis for filing under New gTLD RPMs²⁵. The Center has commented that the TMCH should not unfairly burden rights holders

section 1.1.2.4 provides for “GAC Early Warning,” and section 1.1.2.7 provides for “Receipt of GAC Advice on New gTLDs” for the ICANN Board’s consideration.

¹⁸ Adopted by the WIPO General Assembly in September 2001; see <http://www.wipo.int/edocs/pubdocs/en/marks/845/pub845.pdf>.

¹⁹ See section 3.2 of the ICANN Applicant Guidebook at <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/objection-procedures-04jun12-en.pdf>.

²⁰ See WIPO Rules for New gTLD Dispute Resolution, and Schedule of Fees and Costs, respectively at <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/docs/wipolrrules.pdf> and <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/lro/fees/>; see WIPO-registered LRO cases at <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/lro/cases/>.

²¹ See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/domains/lro/cases/>.

²² The WIPO LRO report notes that an overwhelming majority of LROs were filed against applications for gTLD strings with descriptive or dictionary meaning. Many expert panels concluded that where a trademark owner has adopted a common dictionary term as a trademark, a gTLD application intended solely to take advantage of such common dictionary meaning would not as such violate the decision standards for LROs. In certain cases panels addressed trademark registrations that were primarily obtained for the purpose of supporting an application for a New gTLD and/or LRO, with little or no demonstrable prior use. See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/docs/lroreport.pdf>.

²³ See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/docs/icann130309.pdf>.

²⁴ Given the perceived convergence of registry, registrar, and registrant roles within the DNS, the Center has further recommended, *inter alia* taking account of its UDRP-based experiences, and ICANN’s decision to allow for cross-ownership between registries and registrars (see <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-05nov10-en.htm>), that ICANN consider extending the PDDRP for registries also to registrar conduct (see, *inter alia*, <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/docs/icann260310rap.pdf>).

²⁵ The TMCH allows for inclusion of registered word marks, word marks protected by statute or treaty or validated by court, and “[o]ther marks that constitute intellectual property” (the latter being undefined). With respect to RPMs utilizing TMCH data, the availability of “Sunrise” services (*i.e.*, an opportunity for a trademark owner, for a fee, to preemptively register an exact match of its mark as a domain name) is limited to those trademarks for which current use can be demonstrated. Whether or not substantiated by demonstration of current use, trademark owners

in the treatment of trademark registrations legitimately obtained through examination and registration systems as applied in many global jurisdictions, and that, if and where relevant, practical measures may be envisaged to identify any allegedly inappropriate invocation of rights in specific contexts. According to available information, it appears that through March 2017, the TMCH had received over 42,000 entries²⁶.

(ii) Uniform Rapid Suspension (URS) System

16. While importantly the UDRP remains available as a curative tool for New gTLD disputes involving the considered transfer of a disputed domain name to the trademark owner, ICANN has introduced what is intended to be a lighter second-level RPM for appropriate cases²⁷.

17. Having evolved from a sequence of ICANN processes and committees, the URS continues to raise a number of questions, including its relationship to the UDRP²⁸. ICANN invited tenders from prospective URS providers, to which after careful consideration of the ICANN URS model and related resources, the Center has not been in a position to apply²⁹. The Center continues to closely monitor developments.

B. ICANN'S PLANNED REVISION OF THE WIPO-INITIATED UDRP AND OTHER RPMS

18. Accommodating the dynamic development of the DNS, the UDRP has been offering an effective alternative to court litigation for trademark owners, domain name registrants, and registration authorities. Nevertheless, following discussions in 2011 at which the clear majority of participants were of the opinion that more harm than good could result from any review of the UDRP by ICANN as a registration-driven body³⁰ a decision was taken by ICANN's Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) to review the UDRP following the launch of New gTLDs. ICANN's Preliminary Issue Report on this topic was issued in October 2015 describing a range of complex substantive and process-related questions³¹. In this regard, the Center provided observations highlighting both the UDRP's long-proven success and the risks associated with any attempted ICANN revision of the UDRP. Following a public comment period, ICANN issued its Final Issue Report in January 2016 recommending that the GNSO launch a Policy Development Process (PDP) to review all RPMS in two phases; the initial phase is now focusing on RPMS developed for the New gTLD Program, notably the TMCH (including "Sunrise" and "Claims" RPMS)³² and URS, whereas the second phase will focus on the UDRP³³.

would also be eligible to participate in a time-limited "Claims" service (*i.e.*, notice to a potential domain name registrant of the existence of a potentially conflicting trademark right, and notice to the relevant trademark owner(s) in the event that the registrant nevertheless proceeds with domain name registration). As mandated by ICANN, the availability of the Claims service is for a period of 90 days after a New gTLD is opened for general public registration, but users of the TMCH can opt-in to receive notifications indefinitely. The demonstration of use required for Sunrise services similarly applies to the invocation of trademarks as a basis for a complaint filed under the "Uniform Rapid Suspension" RPM described herein.

²⁶ See <http://trademark-clearinghouse.com/content/tmch-stats>.

²⁷ The Center for its part communicated to ICANN in April 2009 a discussion draft of an "Expedited (Domain Name) Suspension Mechanism", (See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/docs/icann030409.pdf>) and has made subsequent proposals for a streamlined mechanism based on this model at ICANN Meetings (see <http://prague44.icann.org/node/31773> and <http://toronto45.icann.org/node/34325>). Such proposals took account of the need to strike a balance between the protection of trademark rights recognized by law, the practical interests of good-faith registration authorities to minimize operational burdens, and the legitimate expectations of *bona fide* domain name registrants.

²⁸ An extensive inventory of these issues is provided *inter alia* in the Center's letter to ICANN of December 2, 2010, available at <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/docs/icann021210.pdf>.

²⁹ The question of accreditation of providers gives rise to concerns as to the stability of RPMS; WIPO raised concerns about this as early as 2007 in the context of the UDRP (see <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/docs/icann040707.pdf>).

³⁰ See <https://community.icann.org/display/gnsoudrpdtd/Webinar+on+the+Current+State+of+the+UDRP>; see also more generally document WO/GA/39/10, paragraph 31.

³¹ See <http://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/rpm-prelim-issue-09oct15-en.pdf>.

³² See footnote 25.

³³ See <https://gns0.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/rpm-final-issue-11jan16-en.pdf>.

This is a matter of serious concern, and the Center continues to closely follow ICANN stakeholders' intentions with regard to the UDRP and trademark RPMs generally. In this effort, the Center where relevant is in contact with trademark stakeholders such as INTA and MARQUES.

C. IDNS

19. As noted in paragraph 8, another significant policy development in the DNS is the introduction of IDNs (non-Latin script) at the top level³⁴. Many of these were among the first New gTLDs announced by ICANN for delegation in the DNS root zone.

D. OTHER IDENTIFIERS

20. In addition to and in connection with the above, there are further developments taking place at ICANN in relation to the protection of non-trademark identifiers.

(a) International Governmental Organizations (IGOs)

21. It is recalled that the First WIPO Process addressed the relationship between domain names and trademarks. The Second WIPO Process concerned the relationship between domain names and other types of identifiers that had not been addressed, including country names and IGO names and acronyms.

22. The 2002 WIPO General Assembly recommended amending the UDRP in order to provide protection for country names and for the names and acronyms of IGOs³⁵. The WIPO Secretariat transmitted these recommendations to ICANN in February 2003³⁶.

23. Following ICANN deliberations³⁷, ICANN's New gTLD Applicant Guidebook limited its consideration of the protection of IGO names and acronyms to providing recourse through the pre-delegation objection procedure concerning the top level (*i.e.*, an applied-for TLD), discussed in paragraphs 11 and 12. However, following sustained IGO efforts, ICANN's Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) advised the ICANN Board that IGO identifiers should be granted protection against inappropriate third-party registration prior to the delegation of any New gTLDs³⁸. The GAC further advised the ICANN Board that, building on existing criteria for ".int" second-level registrations, it would collaborate with IGOs to develop a list of IGO names and acronyms to be protected against registration for at least the current round of New gTLDs. The GAC also advised the Board that pending implementation work, interim protection for IGO names and acronyms should be provided through a moratorium on third-party registration; while progress has been made on implementation, this moratorium remains in place.

24. The ICANN Board responded to the GAC indicating that it had adopted a resolution for interim protection at the second level based on the existing .int criteria, *via* an ICANN reserve list of IGO identifiers, to be withheld from third-party registration through the New gTLD Registry Agreement. ICANN invited qualifying IGOs to identify themselves to ICANN, while also seeking provision by the GAC (with IGOs) of a consolidated IGO package comprising the criteria and list

³⁴ See also ICANN's Final Implementation Plan for IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process published in November 2009 (see <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/idn-ccTld-implementation-plan-16nov09-en.pdf>). Since then, this has allowed for the introduction of IDN ccTLDs, associated with the two-letter codes in the ISO 3166-1 standard (see http://www.iso.org/iso/english_country_names_and_code_elements).

³⁵ See http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/govbody/en/wo_ga_28/wo_ga_28_3.pdf; see also documents SCT/9/8, paragraphs 6 to 11; and, SCT/9/9, paragraph 149.

³⁶ See <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/docs/wipo.doc>.

³⁷ For background, see WO/GA/41/17 Rev.2, in particular paragraphs 40 and 41.

³⁸ See

https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132070/FINAL_Toronto_Communique_20121017.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1354149148000&api=v2.

of IGO names and acronyms for which the GAC advised protection³⁹. In response, an IGO coalition developed .int-based criteria for IGO protection and an accompanying list of IGOs, which the IGO coalition forwarded to the ICANN Board in February 2013. This was followed by a GAC communication to the ICANN Board concerning IGO protection eligibility criteria⁴⁰, together with a list of protectable IGO names and acronyms⁴¹.

25. On April 1, 2013, the Board expressed concerns to the GAC on how to reconcile protection of IGO acronyms with certain potentially legitimate third-party attempts to register corresponding domain names and asked how cases of potentially legitimate co-existent use of such acronym could be managed in practice⁴². In July 2013, following further discussions with ICANN and sustained efforts from IGOs, the GAC issued advice to the ICANN Board that highlighted the need for special preventative protection for IGO names and acronyms in the DNS⁴³. Following this advice, the ICANN Board issued a resolution extending interim protection for IGOs until the first meeting of the ICANN Board's New gTLD Program Committee (NGPC) after the November 2013 ICANN meeting⁴⁴.

26. In October 2013 the NGPC made a proposal for protection of IGO acronyms at the second level that fell short of providing IGO acronyms with the permanent preventative protection envisaged in previous GAC Communiqués⁴⁵.

27. In parallel to the policy efforts undertaken by the NGPC, the GAC, and IGOs⁴⁶, the GNSO had launched a PDP concerning IGO protection, in which process the Center with other IGO representatives participated. Over IGO objections, this GNSO process largely rejected preventative protection for IGO acronyms at the second level. Instead, it recommended curative protection mechanisms for IGO acronyms, coupled with the removal of the temporary protections for IGO acronyms in place. These recommendations were adopted unanimously by the GNSO Council in November 2013. In April 2014, the ICANN Board resolved to adopt the GNSO Council recommendations not in conflict with GAC advice, namely reserving from registration the full names of IGOs at the top and second levels in two languages while requesting more time to consider the recommendations that then differed from GAC Advice (duration of "claims notices"⁴⁷ and a potential curative RPM).

28. Despite GAC advice and IGO positions, in June 2014, the GNSO Council voted to initiate a second PDP on the desirability and modalities of giving IGOs access to curative RPMs (such as the UDRP or URS) to address abusive registration of IGO acronyms, or of IGO full names not covered by the aforementioned exclusion. Notwithstanding continuing discussions, including at ICANN's June and November 2016 meetings, questions remain as to the specifics of such RPMs; it has again been affirmed by the GAC however that any IGO-specific RPM should not amend the existing UDRP. Together with other involved IGOs, the Center continues to closely monitor developments in this longstanding ICANN file, with the Board now facilitating

³⁹ See <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-16jan13-en.pdf>.

⁴⁰ Such criteria comprise treaty-based IGOs with international legal personality, or which are UN Observers, or which are funds or programs of the UN.

⁴¹ See <http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/dryden-to-crocker-chalaby-22mar13-en>.

⁴² The Board also sought further specifics on means for periodic review of the list, along with clarification of any additional languages in which protection of IGO names and acronyms is sought. See <http://www.icann.org/en/news/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-01apr13-en>.

⁴³ The GAC further advised that it expressly assumed that the ICANN Board was prepared to fully implement the GAC advice and focus on practical and effective implementation of preventative protection at the second level in New gTLDs, and that the interim protections for IGO names and acronyms should remain in place until the dialogue between the GAC, ICANN and IGOs was completed. See <http://durban47.icann.org/meetings/durban2013/presentation-gac-communique-18jul13-en.pdf>.

⁴⁴ See <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-new-gtld-2013-07-17-en#1.a>.

⁴⁵ The GAC and the NGPC had cancelled their participation in a September 30 meeting proposed by IGOs.

⁴⁶ For a more complete summary see document WO/GA/48/12 Rev., paragraphs 42 to 45.

⁴⁷ See footnote 25.

further dialogue on the differences between GAC Advice and GNSO recommendations as to IGO-related RPMs.

(b) Geographical Terms

29. Concerning geographical terms, the GAC in particular has expressed concerns about their use and protection in the New gTLDs⁴⁸. Concerning the top level⁴⁹, ICANN's Applicant Guidebook provides that "applications for strings that are country or territory names will not be approved, as they are not available under the New gTLD Program in this application round"⁵⁰. Applied-for strings which are considered by ICANN to be certain other geographical names, e.g., capital city names, should be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities⁵¹.

30. GAC members have expressed further reservations regarding a number of New gTLD applications on grounds of correspondence to geographical or other "sensitive" terms, advising the ICANN Board not to proceed beyond initial evaluation, and seeking Board clarification on scope for applicants to modify their New gTLD applications to address specific GAC concerns⁵².

31. In December 2016, ICANN authorized the release of all previously-reserved 2-character domain names at the second level in New gTLDs provided that registry operators first allow respective governments a thirty-day period to acquire such domain names; require registrants to represent that they would not falsely imply government affiliation in connection with the use of such 2-character domain name; and provide a means for post-registration complaints⁵³. In this context, the Center submitted comments to ICANN noting that the Second WIPO Process considered the possibility of exploring measures for the UDRP to apply to third-level registrations in order to mitigate the potential for trademark abuse⁵⁴.

⁴⁸ In 2007, the GAC issued the "GAC Principles regarding New gTLDs", which states *inter alia* that ICANN should avoid delegation of New gTLDs concerning country, territory or place names, and regional language or people descriptions, unless in agreement with the relevant governments or public authorities. Those GAC Principles further stated that new registries should adopt procedures for blocking/challenge of names with national or geographical significance at the second level upon demand of governments. See <https://archive.icann.org/en/topics/new-gtlds/gac-principles-regarding-new-gtlds-28mar07-en.pdf>.

⁴⁹ Concerning second-level registrations, ICANN's base registry agreement includes a "Schedule of Reserved Names at the Second Level in gTLD Registries" which makes provision for certain country and territory names. See <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/base-agreement-specs-04jun12-en.pdf> at Specification 5.

⁵⁰ See <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/evaluation-procedures-04jun12-en.pdf>, from section 2.2.1.4.1 "Treatment of Country or Territory Names".

⁵¹ See <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb/evaluation-procedures-04jun12-en.pdf>, from section 2.2.1.4.2 "Geographic Names Requiring Government Support".

⁵² See <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/gac-to-board-27mar14-en.pdf>, at "4. Specific Strings". While the Board has accepted the GAC's advice against proceeding with certain applications, it has sought further information from the GAC, as well as public comments, on a range of additional safeguards sought by the GAC concerning several broad categories of New gTLD applications such as for those New gTLDs which correspond to regulated industries or dictionary terms. See <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/correspondence/gac-to-board-11apr13-en.pdf>. Concerning the .amazon application, see <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/irp-amazon-v-icann-2016-03-04-en>. A GAC Sub-group on Geographic Names (a Sub-group of the GAC Working Group on Future New gTLDs) has developed a draft document for future New gTLD rounds outlining several public policy aspects related to geographic names which is currently subject to further ICANN discussions. See <https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/Geo%20names%20in%20new%20gTLDs%20Updated%20%20V3%20%2029%20august%202014%5B4%5D.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1411549935000&api=v2>.

⁵³ Together these comprise ICANN's so-called "confusion mitigation" plans. See <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/two-character-ltr-ltr-authorization-release-13dec16-en.pdf>.

⁵⁴ See <https://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-proposed-measures-two-char-08jul16/pdfECmcS9knuk.pdf>.

32. The Secretariat will continue to monitor these developments and provide input where possible.

33. *The SCT is invited to take note of the contents of this document.*

[End of document]