

Reconsideration Request Form

Version of 11 April 2013

ICANN's Board Governance Committee is responsible for receiving requests for reconsideration from any person or entity that has been materially affected by any ICANN staff action or inaction if such affected person or entity believes the action contradicts established ICANN policies, or by actions or inactions of the Board that such affected person or entity believes has been taken without consideration of material information. Note: This is a brief summary of the relevant Bylaws provisions. For more information about ICANN's reconsideration process, please visit <http://www.icann.org/en/general/bylaws.htm#IV> and <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/>.

This form is provided to assist a requester in submitting a Reconsideration Request, and identifies all required information needed for a complete Reconsideration Request. This template includes terms and conditions that shall be signed prior to submission of the Reconsideration Request.

Requesters may submit all facts necessary to demonstrate why the action/inaction should be reconsidered. However, argument shall be limited to 25 pages, double-spaced and in 12 point font.

For all fields in this template calling for a narrative discussion, the text field will wrap and will not be limited.

Please submit completed form to reconsideration@icann.org.

1. Requester Information

Name: Motion Picture Domain Registry Pty Ltd

Address: Contact Information Redacted

Email: Contact Information Redacted

Phone Number (optional): Contact Information Redacted

(Note: ICANN will post the Requester's name on the Reconsideration Request page at <http://www.icann.org/en/committees/board-governance/requests-for-reconsideration-en.htm>. Requestors address, email and phone number will be removed from the posting.)

2. Request for Reconsideration of (check one only):

Board action/inaction

Staff action/inaction

3. Description of specific action you are seeking to have reconsidered.

The Applicant seeks reconsideration of action in respect of Authorization for Release of Two-Character Letter/ Letter ASCII Labels at the Second Level for the .film gTLD, as attached hereto as Annexure 1 (hereafter referred to as the “Authorization”). In particular, the Applicant seeks reconsideration of all two-character letter/letter labels in respect of which authorization was withheld, save for those labels specified in section 6 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement.

4. Date of action/inaction:

The action was taken on 12 June 2015, being the date of the Authorization.

5. On what date did you become aware of the action or that action would not be taken?

The Applicant became aware of the action on 12 June 2015.

6. Describe how you believe you are materially affected by the action or inaction:

The Applicant is the Registry Operator of the .film gTLD, the subject of the Authorization. The Applicant is materially affected by the action as it results in the Registry Operator being unable to offer those withheld labels for registration to eligible .film registrants. Further, as we are of the view that ICANN has not followed established processes or provided fair and transparent communication, the Applicant, who is also a contracted party with ICANN via the Registry Agreement, has been materially affected in respect of making decisions for the operation of its business on the basis of established processes.

7. Describe how others may be adversely affected by the action or inaction, if you believe that this is a concern.

We refer to ICANN's public commitment to transparency and due process and note that where established processes are not consistently applied, such adversely affects other Registry Operators, registrants, the domain name industry and the general public. Further, inconsistent application of established ICANN processes, as agreed by the ICANN Board, result in irreparable damage to the domain name industry as a whole as participants have not been afforded the fair and transparent responses they may reasonably expect.

8. Detail of Board or Staff Action – Required Information

Staff Action: If your request is in regards to a staff action or inaction, please provide a detailed explanation of the facts as you understand they were provided to staff prior to the action/inaction presented to the staff and the reasons why the staff's action or inaction was inconsistent with established ICANN policy(ies). Please identify the policy(ies) with which the action/inaction was inconsistent. The policies that are eligible to serve as the basis for a Request for Reconsideration are those that are approved by the ICANN Board (after input from the community) that impact the community in some way. When reviewing staff action, the outcomes of prior Requests for Reconsideration challenging the same or substantially similar action/inaction as inconsistent with established ICANN policy(ies) shall be of precedential value.

Provide the Required Detailed Explanation here:

The Applicant contends that ICANN staff's actions were inconsistent with an established process.

We refer to the Process for Requesting Authorization for Release of Letter/Letter Two-Character Labels, published on the ICANN site at <https://www.icann.org/resources/two-character-labels> and a extract of which is attached hereto as Annexure 2 (the "Authorization Process"). We recognize that

development of the Authorization Process consisted of extensive discussions within the industry, including but not limited to the Governmental Advisory Committee (“GAC”), and underwent various redrafts. The history of the Authorization Process is outlined in numerous ICANN pages; however, for the purposes of this Reconsideration Request, we refer primarily to the current Authorization Process, a result of a resolution of the ICANN Board on 12 February 2015 and effective 23 February 2015.

Generally, the Authorization Process refers to the steps required for a Registry Operator to obtain the release of two-character letter/letter labels, otherwise restricted pursuant to section 2 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement. By way of a broad overview, the Authorization Process requires the Registry Primary Contact to complete and submit to ICANN an Authorization Form. Once such is received and ICANN has validated its completeness, the Authorization Form is posted for public comment for a period of 60 days. Following this comment period, ICANN considers any comments or objections and subsequently makes a determination in respect of the authorization of all or some two-character letter/letter labels. For the avoidance of doubt, we exclude from this Reconsideration Request any reference to those five (5) two character letter/letter ASCII labels which remain restricted from registration under section 6 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement.

In respect of ICANN making the before mentioned determination, we note the following guidance. Firstly, the Authorization Process, in its current form, was a result of Board Resolution 2015.02.12.16 (attached hereto as Annexure 3) and,

inter alia, states that “*Comments from relevant governments will be fully considered*”. We further note that the rationale for resolution 2015.02.12.16, contained within the Board minutes, states as follows:

“The overall impact on the community is anticipated to be positive as new opportunities for diversification and competition in the gTLD namespace are created, while no specific risk of user confusion has been identified. (...) The release of two-character second level domains does not create a reasonable risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security and stability.”

We also note the text of the Authorization Process itself which states that “*Comments will be reviewed and considered by ICANN in determining whether to authorize the release of requested Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels*”. Further, in a blog posted by ICANN staff on 12 November 2014, and a further announcement on 1 December 2014, ICANN stated that “*if there are no relevant or reasoned objections to the request, ICANN will authorize the requested letter/letter two character labels to be released.*”

In reliance upon the before mentioned statements, it is our understanding that there are two considerations which are taken into account when ICANN makes a determination of whether to authorize or withhold the release of certain two-character letter/letter labels. First is that the overarching purpose of the Authorization Process is to balance Registry Operator interests in releasing all letter/letter two-character labels with public and government objectives to maintain a secure and stable internet. Second is that ICANN will consider the

comments and only withhold the release of two-character letter/letter labels in respect of which a reasoned and relevant objection has been lodged by an individual government. It follows naturally that comments which include a blanket objection, or state an objection without justification or substantiating evidence, will not result in the release of such letter/letter two-character labels being withheld. In other words, the mere existence of an objection does not warrant withholding a particular letter/letter two-character label. Whilst we sympathize that ICANN's duty is not to act as a judge or law maker, we are concerned that there is little consideration being made in respect of submitted comments.

We note the Authorization detailed earlier, in respect of the Registry Operator of .film's request to release all letter/letter two-character labels (a copy of which request is attached hereto as Annexure 4). Whilst the Authorization contains only those labels which have been authorized, the Applicant has deduced those which are not authorized, including but not limited to, il, cn, ci and sg. In respect of those unauthorized labels, we refer to the objections submitted on the comments forum located at http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/twochar_comments/. Generally, we note that whilst some comments contain more detailed reasoning, many are inconsistent with the requirements contained within the established process outlined above as they either fail to be relevant (such as the Indian Government's objection to use of 'In' at the second level, despite it not being a country code), fail to be reasoned (such as the Israeli Government's objection to using 'il' without substantiation or evidence), blanket objections (such as by the Governments of China and Singapore) or constitute requests for time to discuss

the matter further domestically (such as the objection lodged on behalf of Korea). Further, whilst certain objections cite concerns around confusion with the country code, many are absent of detailed reasoning and evidence to support such claims. We note that these examples do not intend to target any particular country or person who has submitted objections, but rather seek to demonstrate that the consideration being given to irrelevant and unreasoned objections is inconsistent with the established policies. In addition, whilst each of these governments may have legitimate reason for objecting, ultimately we expect that ICANN would only evaluate the information available to it at the time and where no reasoned or relevant objection was lodged, then we trust that ICANN staff will take action consistent with its processes and release those two-character letter/letter labels.

We recognize that many stakeholders, including the Registry Stakeholder Group, have voiced concerns in respect of the implementation and content of the Authorization Process. We would like to take this opportunity to reiterate that this Reconsideration Request is not an attempt to pursue policy change, but rather seek reconsideration of ICANN staff action in respect of the Authorization Process as it is currently established. Further, we have not identified in this letter those labels which the Applicant finds should be released, but rather request that ICANN reconsider its action and make a determination anew in adherence to the above principles.

9. What are you asking ICANN to do now?

The Applicant requests that ICANN staff:

- a. Release to the Applicant all labels in respect of which:
 - a. Section 6 of Specification 5 does not apply; and
 - b. Where ,no reasoned or relevant comment has been submitted, which in accordance with the principles deduced above, includes a detailed justification for withholding authorization on the basis of confusion with an existing ccTLD only.
 - c. Where ICANN determines that a string is to remain reserved based on a comment received by an individual government that ICANN provides justification for that continued reservation.
- b. As a matter of best practice moving forward, we would request that at the time ICANN provides Authorization for the Release of Two-Character Letter/Letter ASCII Labels at the Second Level to applicants that they also advise of the letter/letter labels that are to remain reserved along with an explanation for the continued reservation.

10. Please state specifically the grounds under which you have the standing and the right to assert this Request for Reconsideration, and the grounds or justifications that support your request.

We are the Registry Operator for the .film gTLD under ICANN's new gTLD program. As such, we have entered into a Registry Agreement with ICANN, which sets out the rights and responsibilities of each party, as relied upon by the Applicant. We note that one of the foundations upon which the relationship

between ICANN and the Registry Operator, and the gTLD community generally, rely is both parties following established ICANN processes. The Applicant has been materially affected, as detailed under question 6.

11. Are you bringing this Reconsideration Request on behalf of multiple persons or entities? (Check one)

Yes

No

11a. If yes, Is the causal connection between the circumstances of the Reconsideration Request and the harm the same for all of the complaining parties? Explain.

Not applicable.

Do you have any documents you want to provide to ICANN?

The following annexures are provided together with this document:

1. Authorization for Release of Two-Character Letter/Letter ASCII Labels at the Second Level;
2. Extract of Process for Requesting Authorization for Release of Letter/Letter Two-Character Labels;
3. Approved Board Resolutions on 12 February 2015, including Resolution 2015.02.12.16; and
4. Request to release all letter/letter two-character labels for .film.

Terms and Conditions for Submission of Reconsideration Requests

The Board Governance Committee has the ability to consolidate the consideration of Reconsideration Requests if the issues stated within are sufficiently similar.

The Board Governance Committee may dismiss Reconsideration Requests that are querulous or vexatious.

Hearings are not required in the Reconsideration Process, however Requestors may request a hearing. The BGC retains the absolute discretion to determine whether a hearing is appropriate, and to call people before it for a hearing.

The BGC may take a decision on reconsideration of requests relating to staff

action/inaction without reference to the full ICANN Board. Whether recommendations will issue to the ICANN Board is within the discretion of the BGC.

The ICANN Board of Director's decision on the BGC's reconsideration recommendation is final and not subject to a reconsideration request.

Signature  Raymond Zylstra

27 June 2015
Date

Annexure 1

12 June 2015

**AUTHORIZATION FOR RELEASE OF TWO-CHARACTER
LETTER/LETTER ASCII LABELS AT THE SECOND LEVEL**

.film

Pursuant to Section 2 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement for the above- identified top-level domain, and subject to compliance with all other terms of the Registry Agreement, ICANN authorizes Registry Operator to release for registration to third parties and activation in the DNS at the second level the two-character letter/letter ASCII labels identified in Appendix 1 to this Authorization.

Akram Atallah
President, Global Domains Division

Attachment 1

Registry Operator is authorized to offer the following two-character letter/letter ASCII labels for registration and activation in the DNS at the second level:

aa	bu	dl	fe	gt	ii	kb	lt
ab	bv	dm	ff	gu	ij	kc	lu
ad	bw	dn	fg	gv	ik	kd	lv
ae	bx	do	fh	gw	im	ke	lw
af	by	dp	fi	gx	ip	kf	lx
ag	bz	dq	fj	gy	iq	kg	ly
ah	ca	dr	fk	gz	ir	kh	lz
aj	cb	ds	fl	ha	is	ki	mb
ak	cc	dt	fm	hb	iu	kj	mc
al	cd	du	fn	hc	iv	kk	md
am	ce	dv	fo	hd	iw	kl	mf
an	cf	dw	fp	he	ix	km	mg
ao	cg	dx	fq	hf	iy	kn	mh
ap	ch	dy	fr	hg	iz	ko	mi
aq	cj	dz	fs	hh	ja	kp	mj
ar	ck	ea	ft	hi	jb	kq	mk
as	cl	eb	fu	hj	jc	ks	ml
at	cm	ed	fv	hk	jd	kt	mm
av	co	ee	fw	hl	je	ku	mn
aw	cp	ef	fx	hm	jf	kv	mo
ax	cq	eh	fy	hn	jg	kw	mp
ay	cr	ei	fz	ho	jh	kx	mq
az	cs	ej	ga	hp	ji	kz	mr
ba	ct	ek	gb	hq	jj	la	mt
bb	cu	el	gc	hr	jk	lb	mu
bc	cv	em	gd	hs	jl	lc	mv
bd	cw	en	ge	ht	jm	ld	mw
be	cx	eo	gf	hu	jn	le	mx
bf	cy	eq	gg	hv	jo	lf	my
bg	cz	er	gh	hw	jp	lg	mz
bi	da	es	gi	hx	jq	lh	nb
bj	db	et	gj	hy	jr	li	nc
bk	dc	ev	gk	hz	js	lj	nd
bl	dd	ew	gl	ia	jt	lk	ne
bn	de	ex	gm	ib	ju	ll	nf
bo	df	ey	gn	ic	jv	lm	ng
bp	dg	ez	go	id	jw	lo	nh
bq	dh	fa	gp	ie	jx	lp	ni
br	di	fb	gq	if	jy	lq	nj
bs	dj	fc	gr	ig	jz	lr	nk
bt	dk	fd	gs	ih	ka	ls	nl

nm	pa	qp	se	tx	vn	xb	yp
nn	pb	qq	sf	ty	vo	xc	yq
no	pc	qr	si	tz	vp	xd	yr
np	pd	qs	sj	ua	vq	xe	ys
nq	pe	qt	sk	ub	vr	xf	yt
nr	pf	qu	sl	uc	vs	xg	yu
ns	pg	qv	sm	ud	vt	xh	yv
nt	ph	qw	sn	ue	vu	xi	yw
nu	pi	qx	so	uf	vv	xj	yx
nv	pj	qy	sp	ug	vw	xk	yy
nw	pk	qz	sq	uh	vx	xl	yz
nx	pl	ra	sr	ui	vy	xm	za
ny	pm	rb	ss	uj	vz	xn	zb
nz	pn	rc	st	uk	wa	xo	zc
oa	po	rd	sv	ul	wb	xp	zd
ob	pp	re	sw	um	wc	xq	ze
oc	pq	rf	sx	uo	wd	xr	zf
od	pr	rg	sy	up	we	xs	zg
oe	ps	rh	sz	uq	wf	xt	zh
of	pu	ri	ta	ur	wg	xu	zi
og	pv	rj	tb	us	wh	xv	zj
oh	pw	rk	td	ut	wi	xw	zk
oi	px	rl	te	uu	wj	xx	zl
oj	py	rm	tf	uv	wk	xy	zm
ok	pz	rn	tg	uw	wl	xz	zn
ol	qa	ro	th	ux	wm	ya	zo
om	qb	rp	ti	uy	wn	yb	zp
on	qc	rq	tj	uz	wo	yc	zq
oo	qd	rr	tk	va	wp	yd	zr
op	qe	rs	tl	vb	wq	ye	zs
oq	qf	rt	tm	vc	wr	yf	zt
or	qg	rv	tn	vd	ws	yg	zu
os	qh	rw	to	ve	wt	yh	zv
ot	qi	rx	tp	vf	wu	yi	zw
ou	qj	ry	tq	vh	wv	yj	zx
ov	qk	rz	tr	vi	ww	yk	zy
ow	ql	sa	ts	vj	wx	yl	zz
ox	qm	sb	tt	vk	wy	ym	
oy	qn	sc	tu	vl	wz	yn	
oz	qo	sd	tv	vm	xa	yo	

Annexure 2

Annexure 2

Extract of Process for Requesting Authorization for Release of Letter/Letter Two-Character Labels located at <https://www.icann.org/resources/two-character-labels>

Authorization Process for Release of Two-Character ASCII Labels

This page was updated 24 March 2015. To view the archive index of the Authorization Webpage and see what was updated, please click [here](#).

Authorization for Release of Non-Letter/Letter Two-Character Labels

Effective 1 December 2014, ICANN published a general authorization for release of all non-Letter/Letter two-character ASCII labels for all new gTLD Registry Operators. No further actions are required from new gTLD Registry Operators that seek to register and activate these two-character ASCII labels.

Process for Requesting Authorization for Release of Letter/Letter Two-Character Labels

The process for new gTLD Registry Operators to request authorization for the release of Letter/Letter two-character ASCII labels, will require the Registry Primary contact to complete the Authorization for Release of Letter/Letter Two-Character Request Form provided below. Note: In accordance to Section 6 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement, a list of reserved names for this section are still subject to the reservation requirements and will not be available for release at this time.

Once the request is received, ICANN will validate the completeness of the request and post it to this page for comments. The comment period for each request is 60 calendar days, and the GAC will be notified of each request posted to this page. Within 7-10 days of the close of the comment period, the non-objected Letter/Letter two-character ASCII labels will be released via an Authorization that will be provided by ICANN to the Registry Operator.

All authorizations to release two-character ASCII labels from reservation will continue to be subject to all terms of the Registry Agreement.

Submitting Comments on Letter/Letter Requests

To post a comment to a request, click the "Submit Comments" hyperlink located next to the request in the table below. Only those comments submitted while the public comment period is open will be considered. If a comment is submitted for a letter/letter two-character label that has already been authorized for the TLD, the comment will not be considered.

When submitting a comment, please include the two-character label reference #, the first name of the commenter, the last name of the commenter, the title/position of the commenter, the commenters respective government (if applicable), and the comments on the request. ICANN may use the email address of the commenter to

further communicate with the requestor and/or to substantiate or clarify the request. This may also be provided to the Registry Operator, if requested.

Comments will be reviewed and considered by ICANN in determining whether to authorize the release of requested Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels.

Resources

Click [here](#) to read ICANN's blog on two-character ASCII Label Authorizations

Click [here](#) to read ICANN's announcement of the process to request the release of two-character letter/letter ASCII Labels

Click [here](#) to read ICANN's announcement of the updates to the process for release of two-character letter/letter ASCII Labels

Click [here](#) to view the Authorization for Release of Non-Letter/Letter Two-Character ASCII Labels

Click [here](#) to download the Request for Release of Letter/Letter Two-Character Labels

Click [here](#) to download the Request for Release of Letter/Letter Two-Character Labels – Appendix A

Click [here](#) to submit comments

Click [here](#) to view all comments

Click [here](#) to download a How-to-Guide describing how to receive automated updates regarding Two-Character Requests

[Click here to read Background information regarding the Authorization Process](#)

Annexure 3

Annexure 3

Approved Board Resolutions on 12 February 2015, including Resolution 2015.02.12.16

Welcome to the new ICANN.org! [Learn more \(https://www.icann.org/news/blog/introducing-a-new-icann-org-site\)](https://www.icann.org/news/blog/introducing-a-new-icann-org-site), and send us [your feedback \(mailto:tickets@icann.uservice.com\)](mailto:tickets@icann.uservice.com). [✖ Dismiss](#)

[Translations \(/translations\)](#) [Français \(/fr\)](#) [Español \(/es\)](#) [العربية \(/ar\)](#)

[Русский \(/ru\)](#) [中文 \(/zh\)](#)

[Log In \(/users/sign_in\)](#) [Sign Up \(/users/sign_up\)](#)

Q



[GET STARTED \(/GET-STARTED\)](#)

[NEWS & MEDIA \(/NEWS\)](#)

[POLICY \(/POLICY\)](#)

[PUBLIC COMMENT \(/PUBLIC-COMMENTS\)](#)

[RESOURCES \(/RESOURCES\)](#)

[COMMUNITY \(/COMMUNITY\)](#)

[IANA STEWARDSHIP & ACCOUNTABILITY \(/STEWARDSHIP-ACCOUNTABILITY\)](#)

Resources

- ▶ [About ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\) \(/resources/pages/welcome-2012-02-25-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Board \(/resources/pages/board-of-directors-2014-03-19-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Accountability & Transparency \(/resources/pages/accountability-2012-02-25-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Governance \(/resources/pages/governance-2012-02-25-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Groups \(/resources/pages/groups-2012-02-06-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Business \(/resources/pages/business\)](#)
- ▶ [Contractual Compliance \(/resources/pages/compliance-2012-02-25-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Registrars \(/resources/pages/registrars-0d-2012-02-25-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Registries \(/resources/pages/registries-46-2012-02-25-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Operational Metrics \(/resources/pages/metrics-gdd-performance-2015-01-30-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Identifier Systems Security, Stability \(Security, Stability and Resiliency\) and Resiliency \(IS-SSR\) \(/resources/pages/is-ssr-2014-11-24-en\)](#)
- ▶ [ccTLDs \(/resources/pages/cctlds-21-2012-02-25-en\)](#)
- ▶ [Internationalized Domain Names \(/resources/pages/idn-2012-02-25-en\)](#)

Approved Board Resolutions | Regular Meeting of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board

This page is available in: English | العربية (<http://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-ar>) | Español (<http://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-es>) | Français (<http://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-fr>) | Русский (<http://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-ru>) | 中文 (<http://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-zh>)

12 Feb 2015

1. Consent Agenda:

- a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes
- b. Delegation of the 6er ("bel") domain representing Belarus in Cyrillic script to Reliable Software Inc.
Rationale for Resolutions 2015.02.12.02 – 2015.02.12.03
- c. Removal of the .TP top-level domain representing Portuguese Timor
Rationale for Resolution 2015.02.12.04
- d. GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council Policy Recommendations - Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D
Rationale for Resolutions 2015.02.12.05-2015.02.12.06
- e. Recommendations for the Collection of Metrics for the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program to Support the future AoC Review on Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice
Rationale for Resolutions 2015.02.12.07 – 2015.02.12.09
- f. Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR))and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)) Member Reappointments
Rationale for Resolution 2015.02.12.10
- g. Appointment of Geoff Huston to the Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR))and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee))
Rationale for Resolution 2015.02.12.11
- h. Thank You to Departing Community Members
- i. Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 52 Meeting

2. Main Agenda:

- a. Release of Two-Letter Codes at the Second Level in gTLDs
Rationale for Resolution 2015.02.12.16

1. Consent Agenda:

- a. Approval of Board Meeting Minutes

- ▶ Universal Acceptance Initiative
(/resources/pages/universal-acceptance-2012-02-25-en)
- ▶ Policy
(/resources/pages/policy-01-2012-02-25-en)
- ▶ Public Comment (/public-comments)
- ▶ Contact
(/resources/pages/contact-2012-02-06-en)
- ▶ Help
(/resources/pages/help-2012-02-03-en)

Resolved (2012.02.12.01), the Board approves the minutes of the 17 November 2014 and 3 December 2014 meetings of the [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\) Board](#).

b. **Delegation of the бел ("bel") domain representing Belarus in Cyrillic script to Reliable Software Inc.**

Resolved (2015.02.12.02), as part of the exercise of its responsibilities under the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Functions Contract, [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)](#) has reviewed and evaluated the request to delegate the бел country-code top-level domain to Reliable Software Inc. The documentation demonstrates that the proper procedures were followed in evaluating the request.

Resolved (2015.02.12.03), the Board directs that pursuant to Article III, Section 5.2 of the [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\) Bylaws](#), that certain portions of the rationale not appropriate for public distribution within the resolutions, preliminary report or minutes at this time due to contractual obligations, shall be withheld until public release is allowed pursuant to those contractual obligations.

Rationale for Resolutions 2015.02.12.02 – 2015.02.12.03

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

In accordance with the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Functions Contract, the [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)](#) staff has evaluated a request for ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain) delegation and is presenting its report to the Board for review. This review by the Board is intended to ensure that [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)](#) staff has followed the proper procedures.

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to the IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) Department to create the country-code top-level domain and assign the role of sponsoring organization (also known as the manager or trustee) to Reliable Software Inc.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a delegation application, [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)](#) staff consults with the applicant and other interested parties. As part of the application process, the applicant needs to describe consultations that were performed within the country concerning the ccTLD (Country Code Top Level Domain), and their applicability to their local Internet community.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Staff is not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request.

What significant materials did the Board review?

[REDACTED – Sensitive Delegation Information]

What factors the Board found to be significant?

The Board did not identify any specific factors of concern with this request.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

The timely approval of country-code domain name managers that meet the various public interest criteria is positive toward [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)](#)'s overall mission, the local communities to which country-code top-level domains are designated to serve, and responsive to [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)](#)'s obligations under the [IANA \(Internet Assigned Numbers Authority\) Functions Contract](#).

Are there financial impacts or ramifications on [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)](#) (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

The administration of country-code delegations in the DNS (Domain Name System) root zone is part of the [IANA \(Internet Assigned Numbers Authority\)](#) functions, and the delegation action should not cause any significant variance on pre-planned expenditure. It is not the role of [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)](#) to assess the financial impact of the internal operations of country-code top-level domains within a country.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability, or resiliency. This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

c. Removal of the .TP top-level domain representing Portuguese Timor

Whereas, the "TP" two-letter code was removed from the ISO (International Organization for Standardization) 3166-1 standard and superseded by the "TL" code representing Timor-Leste.

Whereas the .TL domain name was delegated in 2005 to replace the .TP domain name, and a multi-year transition was conducted allowing .TP registrants to migrate to the new country-code top-level domain.

Whereas ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) received confirmation from the Government of Timor-Leste supporting the final removal of the .TP delegation from the DNS (Domain Name System) Root Zone (Root Zone).

Resolved (2015.02.12.04), that the delegation of .TP be removed from the DNS (Domain Name System) Root Zone (Root Zone).

Rationale for Resolution 2015.02.12.04**Why the Board is addressing the issue now?**

The .TP top-level domain is planned for removal from the DNS (Domain Name System) Root Zone (Root Zone) by 28 February 2015. The Government of Timor-Leste as the .TP operator confirmed their consent to the removal of .TP from the DNS (Domain Name System) Root Zone (Root Zone).

What is the proposal being considered?

The proposal is to approve a request to IANA (Internet Assigned Numbers Authority) to remove the delegation of the .TP (Portuguese Timor) top-level domain from the DNS (Domain Name System) Root Zone (Root Zone).

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

In the course of evaluating a top-level domain removal request, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff consults with the current operator and other interested parties. As part of the removal process, the current operator needs to describe steps followed to ensure that the removal of the top-level domain does not have unplanned adverse impact on Internet stability.

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

Staff is not aware of any significant issues or concerns raised by the community in relation to this request. The Government of Timor-Leste confirmed that that the .TP top-level domain is no longer in practical use.

Are there any security, stability, or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) does not believe this request poses any notable risks to security, stability, or resiliency. This is an Organizational Administrative Function not requiring public comment.

d. GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council Policy Recommendations - Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D

Whereas, on 17 January 2013, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council launched a Policy Development Process (PDP (Policy Development Process)) on the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy Part D (IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) Part D) addressing six charter questions, set forth at [https://community.icann.org/display/ITPIDWG/3.+WG+\(Working+Group\)+Charter](https://community.icann.org/display/ITPIDWG/3.+WG+(Working+Group)+Charter) (<https://community.icann.org/display/ITPIDWG/3.+WG+Charter>).

Whereas, the PDP (Policy Development Process) followed the prescribed PDP (Policy Development Process) steps as stated in the Bylaws, resulting in a Final Report delivered on 25 September 2014.

Whereas, the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) Part D Working Group (WG (Working Group)) reached full consensus on the recommendations in relation to each of the six issues outlined in the Charter.

Whereas, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council reviewed, and discussed the recommendations of the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) Part D WG (Working Group), and adopted the Recommendations on 15 October 2014 by a unanimous vote (see <http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20141015-1> (<http://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#20141015-1>)).

Whereas, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council vote met and exceeded the required voting threshold (i.e. supermajority) to impose new obligations on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) contracted parties.

Whereas, after the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council vote, a public comment period was held on the approved recommendations, and the comments have been summarized and considered (<https://www.icann.org/public-comments/irtp-d-recommendations-2014-10-20-en> ([public-comments/irtp-d-recommendations-2014-10-20-en](https://www.icann.org/public-comments/irtp-d-recommendations-2014-10-20-en))).

Resolved (2015.02.12.05), the Board adopts the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council Policy Recommendations amending the Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy set forth at <http://www.icann.org/en/transfers/policy-en.htm> ([/en/transfers/policy-en.htm](http://www.icann.org/en/transfers/policy-en.htm)) and the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy (TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy)) set forth at <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/tdrp-2012-02-25-en> ([/resources/pages/tdrp-2012-02-25-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/tdrp-2012-02-25-en)).

Resolved (2015.02.12.06), the Board directs the President and CEO, or his authorized designee(s), to develop and complete an implementation plan for these Recommendations and continue communication and cooperation with the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Implementation Review Team and community on the implementation work.

Rationale for Resolutions 2015.02.12.05-2015.02.12.06

Why the Board is addressing the issue now?

The Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy (IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy)) is a consensus policy that was adopted in 2004 which provides for a straightforward process for registrants to transfer domain names between registrars. The GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council established a series of five Working Groups (Parts A through D) to review and consider various revisions to this policy.

The IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) Part D PDP (Policy Development Process) is the fourth and final in a series of PDPs addressing areas for improvements in the existing policy.

The IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) Part D PDP (Policy Development Process) Final Report received unanimous consensus support from the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) Part D WG (Working Group) as well as the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council. Following the closing of the public comment period, the next step as outlined in Annex A of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws is consideration by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board of the recommendations.

What is the proposal being considered?

The following policy recommendations are being adopted:

Recommendation #1 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that reporting requirements be incorporated into the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) policy. Outcomes of all rulings by Dispute Resolution Providers (DRP) ¹ should be published on Providers' websites, except in exceptional cases – in keeping with practices currently employed in the UDRP (Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution Policy). Exceptions, if sought by the DRP, are to be granted by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Contractual Compliance on a case-by-case basis. The Group recommends publishing reports that follow the example of the Asian Domain Name (Domain Name) Dispute Resolution Centre (ADNDRC).² These reports should include at a minimum:

- a. The domain name under dispute
- b. Relevant information about parties involved in the dispute;
- c. The full decision of the case;
- d. The date of the implementation of the decision

The need for publication does not apply to TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) rulings that have taken place prior to the implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation #2 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) be amended to include language along the lines of this revised version of the UDRP (Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution Policy):

"The relevant Dispute Resolution Provider shall report any decision made with respect to a transfer dispute initiated under the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy). All decisions under this Policy will be published in full over the Internet except when the Panel, convened by the Dispute Resolution, in an exceptional case, determines to redact portions of its decision. In any event, the portion of any decision determining a complaint to have been brought in bad faith shall be published."

Recommendation #3 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) be amended to reflect the following wording, or equivalent: "Transfers from a Gaining Registrar to a third registrar, and all other subsequent transfers, are invalidated if the Gaining Registrar acquired sponsorship from the Registrar of Record through an invalid transfer, as determined through the dispute resolution process set forth in the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy."

Recommendation #4 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that a domain name be returned to the Registrar of Record and Registrant (Registrant) of Record directly prior to the non-compliant transfer if it is found, through a TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) procedure, that a non-IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) compliant domain name transfer occurred.

Recommendation #5 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that the statute of limitation to launch a TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) be extended from current 6 months to 12 months from the initial transfer.

This is to provide registrants the opportunity to become aware of fraudulent transfers when they would no longer receive their registrar's annual WDRP notification.

Recommendation #6 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that if a request for enforcement is initiated under the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) the relevant domain should be 'locked' against further transfers while such request for enforcement is pending. Accordingly, 'TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) action' and 'URS action' are to be added to the second bullet point of the list of denial reasons in the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) (Section 3); the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) and TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) should be amended accordingly.³

The TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) as well as guidelines to registrars, registries and third party dispute providers should be modified accordingly. The WG (Working Group) notes that the locking should be executed in the way that the UDRP (Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution Policy) prescribes – once that the UDRP (Uniform Domain-Name Dispute Resolution Policy) locking process is implemented.

Recommendation #7 - The WG (Working Group) recommends to add a list of definitions (Annex F of Final Report) to the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) to allow for a clearer and more user-friendly policy.

Recommendation #8 - The WG (Working Group) recommends not to develop dispute options for registrants as part of the current TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy).

Recommendation #9 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that staff, in close cooperation with the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) Part C Implementation Review Team, ensures that the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) Part C inter-registrant transfer recommendations are implemented and monitor whether dispute resolution mechanisms are necessary to cover the Use Cases in Annex C of the Final Report. Once such a policy is implemented, its functioning should be closely monitored, and if necessary, an Issues Report be called for to assess the need for an inter-registrant transfer dispute policy. See also Recommendations #17 and #18 below.

Recommendation #10 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) be modified to eliminate the First (Registry) Level of the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy).

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) should monitor the use of TDRPs and if the discontinuation of the Registry layer as first level dispute provider seems to create a barrier to this dispute resolution mechanism, future policy work should be initiated to counter such development. See also #17 below.

Recommendation #11 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) take the necessary steps to display information relevant to disputing non-compliant transfers prominently on its web site and assure the information is presented in a simple and clear manner and is easily accessible for registrants.

This recommendation should be view in combination with Recommendation #12 (below).

Recommendation #12 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) create and maintain a user-friendly, one-stop website containing all relevant information concerning disputed transfers and potential remedies to registrants. Such a website should be clearly accessible from or integrated into the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Registrants' Benefits and Responsibilities page (<https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/benefits-2013-09-16-en> ([/resources/pages/benefits-2013-09-16-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/benefits-2013-09-16-en))) or similar.

This should include:

- Information to encourage registrants to contact the registrar to resolve disputed transfers at the registrar level before engaging ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Compliance or third parties by launching a TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy).
- Improvements to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) website regarding the display of information on the Inter Registrar Transfer Policy and the Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy is regularly updated (see 5.2.3.3 above).
- Links to the relevant information for registrants on the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) website being clearly worded and prominently displayed on the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) home page. This will contribute to improving visibility and content of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) website that is devoted to offering guidance to registrants with transfer issues.
- ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Compliance clearly indicates on its FAQ/help section under which circumstances it can assist registrants with transfer disputes. This should include situations when registrants can ask ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Compliance to insist on registrars taking action on behalf of said registrant.
- Improvements in terms of accessibility and user-friendliness should be devoted especially to these pages:
 - <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/dispute-resolution-2012-02-25-en#transfer> ([/resources/pages/dispute-resolution-2012-02-25-en#transfer](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/dispute-resolution-2012-02-25-en#transfer))
 - <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-holder-faqs-2012-02-25-en> ([/resources/pages/name-holder-faqs-2012-02-25-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/name-holder-faqs-2012-02-25-en))
 - <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/text-2012-02-25-en> ([/resources/pages/text-2012-02-25-en](https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/text-2012-02-25-en))

Links to these registrant help-websites should also be prominently displayed on internic.net and iana.org in order to assure further that registrants have easy access to information.

Recommendation #13 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that, as a best practice, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) accredited Registrars prominently display a link on their website to this ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) registrant help site. Registrars should also strongly encourage any re-sellers to display prominently any such links, too. Moreover, the Group recommends that this is communicated to all ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) accredited Registrars.

Registrars may choose to add this link to those sections of their website that already contains Registrant (Registrant)-relevant information such as the Registrant (Registrant) Rights and Responsibilities, the WHOIS (WHOIS (pronounced "who is"; not an acronym)) information and/or other relevant ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)-required links as noted under 3.16 of the 2013 RAA (Registrar Accreditation Agreement).

Recommendation #14 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that no additional penalty provisions be added to the existing IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) or TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy).

Recommendation #15 - As a guidance to future policy development processes, this Working Group recommends that policy specific sanctions be avoided wherever possible. Rather, sanctions should be consistent throughout policies and be governed by applicable provisions within the RAA (Registrar Accreditation Agreement).

Recommendation #16 - The WG (Working Group) does not recommend the elimination of FOAs. However, in light of the problems regarding FOAs, such as bulk transfers and mergers of registrars and/or resellers, the Group recommends that the operability of the FOAs should not be limited to email. Improvements could include: transmission of FOAs via SMS or authorization through interactive websites. Any such innovations must, however, have auditing capabilities, as this remains one of the key functions of the FOA (Standardized Form of Authorization (for domain name transfer)).

The WG (Working Group) notes that the implementation of this recommendation should not be affected by whether transfers take place in advance (for certain bulk transfers) or in real time.

Recommendation #17 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that, once all IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) recommendations are implemented (incl. IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy)-D, and remaining elements from IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy)-C), the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council, together with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff, should convene a panel to collect, discuss, and analyze relevant data to determine whether these enhancements have improved the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) process and dispute mechanisms, and identify possible remaining shortcomings.

If, after a period of 12 months of such a review, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) (with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Staff) determine that the situation regarding transfers is not improved, then this WG (Working Group) recommends that a top-to-bottom reevaluation of the transfer process be undertaken. The goal of this is to create a simpler, faster, more secure policy that is more readily understood and more accessible to use for registrants."

It is a further recommendation that a security expert be included in any such next review Working Group, should for example real 2-factor authentication be required, that it is implemented according to industry standards.

Recommendation #18 - The WG (Working Group) recommends that contracted parties and ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) should start to gather data and other relevant information that will help inform a future IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) review team in its efforts, especially with regard to those issues listed in the Observations of the Final Report (4.2.7.1).

To facilitate the gathering of relevant data, the Implementation Review Team should closely liaise with ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Staff to assure prompt access to necessary data.

Which stakeholders or others were consulted?

Regular consultation with stakeholders took place during the lifetime of this PDP (Policy Development Process). Details can be found in the Input Tracking List (Annex B of the Final Report).

What concerns or issues were raised by the community?

No community concerns have been raised in relation to the Final Report and its recommendations.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the Final Report, the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council Recommendations Report to the Board, as well as the summary of public comments and the response to those comments.

What factors did the Board find to be significant?

The recommendations were developed following the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Policy Development Process as outlined in Annex A of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws and have received the unanimous support from the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council. As outlined in the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws, the Council's supermajority support for the motion (the Council voted unanimously in favor) obligates the Board to adopt the recommendation unless by a vote of more than two-thirds, the Board determines that the policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

In addition, transfer related issues are the number two area of complaint according to data from ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Compliance. Improvements to

the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) have the potential to reduce the number of complaints, in addition to providing clarity and predictability to registrants as well as registrars.

Are there positive or negative community impacts?

Improvements to the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) and TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) have the potential to reduce the number of complaints, in addition to providing clarity and predictability to registrants as well as registrars. Adoption of the recommendations will require significant changes in processes for registrars as well as registrants and therefore it is expected that the implementation of these recommendations will require substantial time and resources, but these are considered necessary in order to address the issues that are part of this Policy Development Process. The recommendations, if implemented, are expected to usefully clarify and enhance the IRTP (Inter-Registrar Transfer Policy) and TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy), to the advantage of all parties concerned.

Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (strategic plan, operating plan, budget); the community; and/or the public?

In addition to those changes required in the process for registrars as outlined above, there will likely be fiscal impacts related to implementation of the policy, such as updates to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) website - but these costs should be anticipated to be within the budget of the relevant departments.

Are there any security, stability or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

There are no security, stability, or resiliency issues related to the DNS (Domain Name System) if the Board approves the proposed recommendations.

e. Recommendations for the Collection of Metrics for the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program to Support the future AoC Review on Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice

Whereas, in the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC), ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has committed to organizing a review that will examine the extent to which the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program has promoted competition, consumer trust and consumer choice once new gTLDs have been in operation for one year.

Whereas, on 10 December 2010 the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board [requested](#) ([/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-10dec10-en.htm#6](#)) that the At-Large Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee)), the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)), the Generic Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)) and the Country Code Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (ccNSO (Country Code Names Supporting Organization)) provide input on establishing the definition, measures, and three year targets for competition, consumer trust and consumer choice in the context of the domain name system. The Board received input in 2013 from the [GNSO \(Generic Names Supporting Organization\) Council](#) (<http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/cctc/cctc-final-advice-letter-05dec12-en.pdf>) [PDF, 352 KB] and the [ALAC \(At-Large Advisory Committee\)](#) (<http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/statement-new-gtld-metrics-11apr13-en.pdf>) [PDF, 491 KB], each offering recommendations on specific metrics.

Whereas, the Board directed (in Resolutions [2013.07.18.05 – 2013.07.18.07](#) ([/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-18jul13-en.htm#2.b](#)) and [2013.09.28.13 – 2013.09.28.14](#) ([/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-28sep13-en.htm#2.d](#))) the President and CEO to convene a volunteer group (the Implementation Advisory Group for Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice [IAG-CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust)]) in advance of a future AoC Competition, Consumer Trust and Consumer Choice Review Team, for several purposes, including evaluating and reporting to the Board on the feasibility, utility and cost-effectiveness of adopting the recommendations of the GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Council and the ALAC (At-Large Advisory Committee).

Whereas, on 1 October 2014, the IAG-CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust) [submitted](#) (<http://mm.icann.org/pipermail/iag-cct/2014-October/000388.html>) to the Board its [final report](#) (<https://community.icann.org/display/IAG/IAG-CCT+report>) on its recommendations for the collection of data to inform the review on competition, consumer choice and consumer trust.

Resolved (2015.02.12.07), the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board thanks the IAG-CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust) for

its diligent work and its recommendations providing for collection of data as an input to the future reviews on competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice in the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) space;

Resolved (2015.02.12.08), the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) President and CEO, or his designee, is hereby directed to immediately begin collecting data on the metrics recommended in the [IAG-CCT \(Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust\) Final Report](#), prioritizing those that are time-sensitive, and where data has been determined to be available.

Resolved (2015.02.12.09), the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) President and CEO, or his designee, is hereby directed to collect data for metrics listed in Table 4 of the [IAG-CCT \(Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust\) Final Report](#) (<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/48349551/IAG-CCT%20Final%20report.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1418863127000&api=v2>) [DOCX, 105 KB] as data is available, noting that these metrics are marked for possible collection at a later date, pending discussion by the Review Team to be convened.

Rationale for Resolutions 2015.02.12.07 – 2015.02.12.09

Why is the Board addressing the issue?

This resolution is a continuation of the Board's resolutions ([2013.07.18.05 – 2013.07.18.07](#) ([/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-18jul13-en.htm#2.b](#)) and [2013.09.28.13 – 2013.09.28.14](#) ([/en/groups/board/documents/resolutions-28sep13-en.htm#2.d](#))) relating to evaluation of the metrics proposed by the community for use in a future review under the Affirmation of Commitments (AoC) of the impact of new gTLDs in the areas of competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice. It also builds upon Board resolutions ([2014.03.27.22 - 2014.03.27.26](#) (<https://features.icann.org/collection-benchmarking-metrics-new-gtld-program-support-future-aoc-review-competition-consumer>)) relating to the adoption of interim recommendations from the Implementation Advisory Group on a consumer survey and economic study.

What is the proposal being considered?

The Board's resolution calls for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to immediately begin collecting data on those metrics recommended by the IAG-CCT (Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust). The resolution adopts the majority of the IAG recommendations and allows for the Review Team to revisit certain metrics regarding costliness and usefulness, though data on those metrics will be collected as available.

This work is to commence immediately, and involves authorizing staff time to collect the necessary data, or to purchase or otherwise acquire data from relevant third parties, including ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s contracted parties.

What significant materials did the Board review?

The Board reviewed the final report from the Implementation Advisory Group dated 1 October 2014 (<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/48349551/IAGCCT%20Final%20report.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1418863127000&api=v2>) (<https://community.icann.org/download/attachments/48349551/IAGCCT%20Final%20report.docx?version=1&modificationDate=1418863127000&api=v2>), the briefing materials submitted by staff, the resolutions adopted in March 2014 approving funding for a consumer survey and economic study, and the related prior advice letters from the [ALAC \(At-Large Advisory Committee\)](#) (<http://www.atlarge.icann.org/correspondence/statement-new-gtld-metrics-11apr13-en.pdf>) [PDF, 491 KB] and the [GNSO \(Generic Names Supporting Organization\)](#) (<http://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/cctc/cctc-final-advice-letter-05dec12-en.pdf>) [PDF, 352 KB], including an updated version of said advice with the [IAG-CCT \(Competition, Consumer Choice & Consumer Trust\)](#)'s current recommendations.

What factors did the Board find to be significant?

The Board believes that the data to be collected for this evaluation is important to supporting an accurate examination of the extent to which the introduction of gTLDs has promoted competition, consumer trust, and consumer choice. By engaging in these activities now, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) is committing to ensuring that relevant data is available to the future Review Team, as well as the broader community, to support the future examination of the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Program that will occur under the AoC. The resolution calls for implementation work to proceed that is intended to facilitate the work of the AoC review at the appropriate time.

Are there fiscal impacts or ramifications on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) (strategic plan, operating plan, or budget)?

The funds to implement this resolution are included in the 2015 Fiscal Year Budget, and are being accounted for in budget planning for FY2016.

Are there any security, stability, or resiliency issues relating to the DNS (Domain Name System)?

This resolution does not affect the security, stability, or resiliency of the DNS (Domain Name System).

Is public comment required prior to Board action?

This is an Organizational Administrative Function that does not require public comment.

f. Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR))and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)) Member Reappointments

Whereas, Article XI, Section 2, Subsection 2 of the Bylaws governs the Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR))and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)).

Whereas, the Board, at Resolution 2010.08.05.07 approved Bylaws revisions that create three-year terms for SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) members, require staggering of terms, and obligate the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) chair to recommend the reappointment of all current SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) members to full or partial terms to implement the Bylaws revisions.

Whereas, the Board, at Resolution 2010.08.05.08 appointed SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) members to terms of one, two, and three years beginning on 01 January 2011 and ending on 31 December 2011, 31 December 2012, and 31 December 2013.

Whereas, in June 2014 the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) Membership Committee initiated an annual review of SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) members whose terms are ending 31 December 2014 and submitted to the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) its recommendations for reappointments.

Whereas, on 24 November 2014, the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) members approved the reappointments.

Whereas, the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) recommends that the Board reappoint the following SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) members to three-year terms: Greg Aaron, Don Blumenthal, KC Claffy, Lyman Chapin, Steve Crocker, Mark Kusters, Russ Mundy, Rod Rasmussen, and Mark Seiden.

Resolved (2015.02.12.10) the Board accepts the recommendation of the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) and reappoints the following SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) members to three-year terms beginning 01 January 2015 and ending 31 December 2017: Greg Aaron, Don Blumenthal, KC Claffy, Lyman Chapin, Steve Crocker, Mark Kusters, Russ Mundy, Rod Rasmussen, and Mark Seiden

Rationale for Resolution 2015.02.12.10

The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) is a diverse group of individuals whose expertise in specific subject matters enables the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) to fulfill its charter and execute its mission. Since its inception, the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) has invited individuals with deep knowledge and experience in technical and security areas that are critical to the security and stability of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems. The above-mentioned individuals provide the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) with the expertise and experience required for the Committee to fulfill its charter and execute its mission.

g. Appointment of Geoff Huston to the Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR))and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee))

Whereas, the Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR))and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)) reviews its membership and makes adjustments from time-to-time.

Whereas, the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) Membership Committee, on behalf of the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee), requests that the Board should appoint Geoff Huston to the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee).

Resolved (2015.02.12.11), the Board appoints Geoff Huston to the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee).

Rationale for Resolution 2015.02.12.11

The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) is a diverse group of individuals whose expertise in specific subject matters enables the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) to fulfill its charter and execute its mission. Since its inception, the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) has invited individuals with deep knowledge and experience in technical and security areas that are critical to the security and stability of the Internet's naming and address allocation systems.

The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)'s continued operation as a competent body is dependent on the accrual of talented subject matter experts who have consented to volunteer their time and energies to the execution of the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) mission. Geoff Huston brings valuable skills to the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee). Mr. Huston is Chief Scientist at APNIC (Asia-Pacific Network Information Center). He is generally involved in projects relating to measurement and network metrics. Recently he has been focused on studying the exhaustion of the remaining pool of unallocated IPv4 addresses, the related topic of the uptake of IPv6, the measurement of the DNS (Domain Name System) and the uptake of DNSSEC (DNS Security Extensions), and the design and operational stability of the Resource Public Key Infrastructure (RPKI). The SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) believes he would be a significant contributing member of the SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee).

n. Thank You to Departing Community Members

Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) wishes to acknowledge the considerable energy and skills that members of the stakeholder community bring to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) process.

Whereas, in recognition of these contributions, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) wishes to acknowledge and thank members of the community when their terms of service on Supporting Organizations (Supporting Organizations) and Advisory Committees (Advisory Committees) end.

Whereas, the following member of the Root Server System Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee)) is concluding his term of service:

- Dr. Jun Murai – RSSAC (Root Server System Advisory Committee) Founding Chair

Resolved (2015.02.12.12), Dr. Jun Murai has earned the deep appreciation of the Board for his term of service, and the Board wishes him well in his future endeavors within the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and beyond.

Whereas, the following Security (Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency (SSR)) and Stability (Security, Stability and Resiliency) Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee)) are concluding their terms of service:

- Rodney Joffe – SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) Member
- Jason Livingood – SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) Member
- Bruce Tonkin – SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) Member
- Stefano Trumpy – SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) Member
- Paul Vixie – SSAC (Security and Stability Advisory Committee) Member

Resolved (2015.02.12.13), Rodney Joffe, Jason Livingood, Bruce Tonkin, Stefano Trumpy and Paul Vixie have earned the deep appreciation of the Board for their terms of service, and the Board wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and beyond.

Whereas, the following member of the Generic Names Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) (GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization)) are concluding her terms of service:

- Kristina Rosette – GNSO (Generic Names Supporting Organization) Intellectual Property Constituency Chair

Resolved (2015.02.12.14), Kristina Rosette have earned the deep appreciation of the Board for her terms of service, and the Board wishes them well in her future endeavors within the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and beyond.

Whereas, the following members of the Governmental Advisory Committee (Advisory Committee) (GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)) are concluding their terms of service:

- Tracy Hackshaw – GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Vice-Chair
- Peter Nettlefold – GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Vice-Chair

Resolved (2015.02.12.15), Tracy Hackshaw and Peter Nettlefold have earned the deep appreciation of the Board for their terms of service, and the Board wishes them well in their future endeavors within the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) community and beyond.

i. Thank You to Sponsors of ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) 52 Meeting

The Board wishes to thank the following sponsors: VeriSign, Inc., Public Interest Registry, Afiliis Limited, CentralNic, Internet Domain Name (Domain Name) System Beijing Engineering Research Center (ZDNS), Neustar, NCC Group, Trademark Clearinghouse, Uniregistry Corp., Minds + Machines Group, Iron Mountain, Inc., ION Magazine, Radix FZC, and ICANNWIKI, InterConnect Communications Ltd, and Sedo GmbH.

The Board expresses its deepest appreciation to the scribes, interpreters, audiovisual team, technical teams, and the entire ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) staff for their efforts in facilitating the smooth operation of the meeting.

The Board would also like to thank the management and staff of the Fairmont Singapore and Swissôtel The Stamford, for providing a wonderful facility to hold this event. Special thanks are extended to:

Ms. Dawn Ng, Manager, Conventions, Singapore Tourism Board; NG Pei Sze, Senior Sales Manager Meetings, Incentives, Conventions & Exhibitions; Ng Sok Hia, Executive Assistant Manager Sales and Marketing; Joanne Kaeli Phua, Conference Services Executive, Raffles City Convention Centre.

2. Main Agenda:

a. Release of Two-Letter Codes at the Second Level in gTLDs

Whereas, the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registry Agreement provides two methods to release two-character domain names: (1) such two-character names may be released to the extent that Registry Operator reaches agreement with the related government and country-code manager, or (2) the Registry Operator may propose the release of the names based on its implementation of measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes, subject to approval by ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers).

Whereas, on 16 October 2014 (</resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en#2.b>), the Board directed staff to develop and implement an efficient procedure for ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) to consider requests for release of two-character names, taking into account the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice in the 16 October 2014 [Los Angeles Communiqué](https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/35455781/Los%20Angeles_GAC%20Communique_Final.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1414072141000&api=v2) (https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/35455781/Los%20Angeles_GAC%20Communique_Final.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1414072141000&api=v2) [PDF, 127 KB].

Whereas, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) [published](/news/blog/icann-clears-the-way-for-two-character-second-level-domain-names) (</news/blog/icann-clears-the-way-for-two-character-second-level-domain-names>) and implemented the process, effective 1 December 2014.

Whereas, on 26 January 2015 the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Chair sent a [letter](/en/system/files/correspondence/schneider-to-crocker-26jan15-en.pdf) (</en/system/files/correspondence/schneider-to-crocker-26jan15-en.pdf>) [PDF, 215 KB] to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board raising concerns on behalf of some GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) members as users of the process. The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) provided a list of suggestions for possible solutions to address its concerns.

Whereas, on 11 February 2015, the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) issued advice to the Board in the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) [Communiqué](https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/GAC_SINGAPORE52_COMMUNIQUE_version=1&modificationDate=1423679058420&api=v2) (https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/GAC_SINGAPORE52_COMMUNIQUE_version=1&modificationDate=1423679058420&api=v2) [PDF, 264 KB] regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level in gTLDs. The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)

advised the Board to amend the current process to establish an effective notification mechanism, so that relevant governments can be alerted as requests are initiated. Comments from relevant governments should be fully considered. The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) also advised the Board to extend the comment period to 60 days. A list of GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Members who intend to agree to all requests and do not require notification will be published on the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) website.

Resolved (2015.02.12.16), the Board accepts the advice of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) from the 11 February 2015 GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Communiqué regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level in gTLDs. The Board directs the President and CEO, or his designee(s), to revise the [Authorization Process for Release of Two-Character ASCII Labels \(/resources/two-character-labels\)](#) and proceed immediately as follows:

- Implement improvements to the process to alert relevant governments when requests are initiated. Comments from relevant governments will be fully considered.
- For new requests, the comment period will be for 60 days.
- For requests with pending or completed comment periods, extend or re-open the comment period so that each request will undergo 60 days of comment period in total.

Rationale for Resolution 2015.02.12.16

The Board is taking action at this time to accept the advice of the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) from the 11 February 2015 GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) [Singapore Communiqué \(https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/GAC_SINGAPORE52_COMMUNIQUE_version=1&modificationDate=1423679058420&api=v2\)](#) [PDF, 264 KB] regarding the release of two-letter codes at the second level in gTLDs. [Article XI, Section 2.1 \(/en/about/governance/bylaws#XI\)](#) of the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws permits the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) to "put issues to the Board directly, either by way of comment or prior advice, or by way of specifically recommending action or new policy development or revision to existing policies." The ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Bylaws require the Board to take into account the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice on public policy matters in the formulation and adoption of the policies. If the Board decides to take an action that is not consistent with the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice, it must inform the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) and state the reasons why it decided not to follow the advice. The Board and the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) will then try in good faith to find a mutually acceptable solution. If no solution can be found, the Board will state in its final decision why the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) advice was not followed.

The Board's action today to accept the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice follows on from its 16 October 2014 resolution where the Board authorized the President and CEO to develop and implement an efficient procedure for the release of two-character domains currently required to be reserved in the New gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) Registry Agreement, taking into account the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee)'s advice in the [Los Angeles Communiqué \(https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/35455781/Los%20Angeles_GAC%20Communiqué_Final.pdf?version=1&modificationDate=1414072141000&api=v2\)](#) [PDF, 127 KB].

ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) developed the [Authorization Process for Release of Two-Character ASCII Labels \(/resources/two-character-labels\)](#) to implement the Board's resolution. On 12 November 2014 ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) issued a [blog \(/news/blog/icann-clears-the-way-for-two-character-second-level-domain-names\)](#) explaining the new process to release the two-character domains, which it also provided to the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee). The process became effective on 1 December 2014. On 26 January 2015 the GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) Chair sent a [letter \(/en/system/files/correspondence/schneider-to-crocker-26jan15-en.pdf\)](#) [PDF, 215 KB] to the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Board raising concerns on behalf of some GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) members, as users of the process. The GAC (Governmental Advisory Committee) provided a list of suggestions for possible solutions to address its concerns with the process.

To date, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) has received requests from over 300 registries in total. As a result of the Board's action today, ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) will extend or re-open the comment period required by the process so that requests are the subject of 60 days of comment in total. For requests that have completed or are in the process of completing the existing 30-day requirement, the comment period will be extended or re-opened so that each request will satisfy the new 60-day requirement. For example, a request that has completed 30 days of comments, will have a new additional 30-day comment period. A request that has been under

comment for 15 days will have its current comment period extended by 30 days, so that it will run for a total of 60 days. All new requests going forward will likewise undergo a 60-day comment period.

The Board reviewed several materials and also considered several significant factors during its deliberations on the action being taken. The significant materials and factors that the Board considered as part of its deliberations, included, but are not limited to the following:

- [RSETP Report on Internet Security \(Security – Security, Stability and Resiliency \(SSR\)\) and Stability \(Security, Stability and Resiliency\) Implications of the .name proposal for the Limited Release of Initially Reserved Two-Character Names \(/en/system/files/files/rstep-gnr-proposal-review-team-report-04dec06-en.pdf\)](#) [PDF, 785 KB] (4 December 2006)
- [Letter from GAC \(Governmental Advisory Committee\) Chair to ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\) Board \(8 August 2014\) \(/resources/correspondence/dryden-to-crocker-2014-08-08-en\)](#)
- [Letter from Stephen Crocker to Heather Dryden \(2 September 2014\) \(/resources/correspondence/crocker-to-dryden-2-2014-09-02-en\)](#)
- [Letter from Heather Dryden to Stephen Crocker \(10 September 2014\) \(/resources/correspondence/dryden-to-crocker-2014-09-10-en\)](#)
- [GAC \(Governmental Advisory Committee\) Los Angeles Communiqué \(15 October 2014\) \(/en/system/files/correspondence/gac-to-board-15oct14-en.pdf\)](#) [PDF, 127 KB]
- [ICANN \(Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers\)'s blog on two-character ASCII Label Authorizations \(12 November 2014\) \(/news/blog/icann-clears-the-way-for-two-character-second-level-domain-names\)](#)
- [Letter from Thomas Schneider to Stephen Crocker \(26 January 2015\) \(/en/system/files/correspondence/schneider-to-crocker-26jan15-en.pdf\)](#) [PDF, 215 KB]
- [Authorization Process for Release of Two-Character ASCII Labels \(/resources/two-character-labels\)](#)
- [GAC \(Governmental Advisory Committee\) Singapore Communiqué \(11 February 2015\) \(https://gacweb.icann.org/download/attachments/27132037/GAC_SINGAPORE52_COMMUNIQUE_VERSION=1&modificationDate=1423679058420&api=v2\)](#) [PDF, 264 KB]

The overall impact on the community is anticipated to be positive as new opportunities for diversification and competition in the gTLD (generic Top Level Domain) namespace are created, while no specific risk of user confusion has been identified. The implementation of the Board's action is not anticipated to have a significant fiscal impact on ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers), the community or the public. As determined by the ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers) Registry Services Technical Evaluation Panel in a 4 December 2006 report on proposed release of two-character domains in the .name gTLD (generic Top Level Domain), the release of two-character second level domains does not create a reasonable risk of a meaningful adverse effect on security and stability. The Board's action is not a defined policy process within ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Supporting Organization (Supporting Organization) or ICANN (Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers)'s Organizational Administrative Function decision requiring public comment.

Published on 12 February 2015

¹ The Working Group recommends in Charter question C to remove the Registry as the first dispute resolution layer of the TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy). Therefore, despite wording of Charter question A, no reporting requirements for the Registries are included here.

² See four ADNDRC Reports on TDRP (Transfer Dispute Resolution Policy) decisions: http://www.adndrc.org/mten/TDRP_Decisions.php?st=6 (http://www.adndrc.org/mten/TDRP_Decisions.php?st=6)

³ <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/policy-transfers-2014-07-02-en> (/resources/pages/policy-transfers-2014-07-02-en)



YouTube



Twitter



LinkedIn



Flickr



Facebook



RSS Feeds (/en/news/rss)



Community Wiki

<http://www.youtube.com/icann> <https://www.twitter.com/icann> <https://www.linkedin.com/company/icann> <https://www.flickr.com/photos/icann/> <https://www.facebook.com/icannorg> <https://community.icann.org>



[ICANN Blog \(/news/blog\)](#)

Who We Are	Contact Us	Accountability & Transparency	Governance	Help
Get Started (/get-started)	Offices (/forms.icann.org/en/about/offices)	Accountability Mechanisms (/news/in-focus/accountability/mechanisms)	Documents (/en/about/governance)	Dispute Resolution (/en/help/dispute-resolution)
Learning (/en/about/learning)	Customer Service (/resources/pages/customer-support-2015-06-22-en)	Independent Review Process (/resources/pages/irp-2012-02-25-en)	Agreements (/en/about/agreements)	Domain Name Dispute Resolution (/en/help/dndr)
Participate (/en/about/participate)	Security Team (/about/staff/security)	Request for Reconsideration (/groups/board/governance/financials/consideration)	AOC Review (/en/about/aoc-review)	Name Collision (/en/help/name-collision)
Groups (/https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/groups-2012-02-06-en)	PGP Keys (/en/contact/pgp-keys)	Ombudsman (/help/ombudsman)	Annual Report (/about/annual-report)	Registrar Problems (/en/news/announcements/announcement-06mar07-en.htm)
Board (/resources/pages/board-of-directors-2014-03-19-en)	Certificate Authority (/contact/certificate-authority)		Financials (/en/about/financials)	WHOIS (http://whois.icann.org)
President's Corner (/presidents-corner)	Registry Liaison (/resources/pages/contact-f2-2012-02-25-en)		Document Disclosure (/en/about/transparency)	
Staff (/en/about/staff)	AOC Review (/http://forms.icann.org/en/about/aoc-review/contact)		Planning (/en/about/planning)	
Careers (/https://icann-openhire.silkroad.com/epostings/index.cfm?fuseaction=app.allpositions&organization_id=16025&amp.version=1)	Reviews (/http://forms.icann.org/en/groups/reviews/contact)		Dashboard Beta (/https://www.icann.org/dashboard)	
Newsletter (/en/news/newsletter)	Request a Speaker (/http://forms.icann.org/en/contact/speakers)		RFPs (/en/news/rfps)	
Development and Public Responsibility (/https://www.icann.org/dev-and-public-responsibility)	For Journalists (/en/news/press)		Litigation (/en/news/litigation)	
			Correspondence (/en/news/correspondence)	

© 2014 Internet Corporation For Assigned Names and Numbers. [Privacy Policy \(/en/help/privacy\)](#) [Terms of Service \(/en/help/tos\)](#)
[Cookie Policy \(/en/help/privacy-cookie-policy\)](#)

REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF LETTER/LETTER TWO-CHARACTER ASCII LABELS

To request the release of Letter/Letter two-character ASCII labels at the second level, this form **must** be completed by the Registry Primary Contact and submitted as an attachment as a case in the GDD Portal (<https://gddportal.icann.org>). The Registry Primary Contact may submit a single request for multiple TLDs provided that (1) it is the Registry Primary Contact for all TLDs in the request AND (2) the label(s) being requested for release is identical across all the TLDs identified below. If submitting a request for more than five (5) TLDs, please enter "multiple TLDs" in the "TLD(s)" section of Step 1 below and include a list of TLDs with their corresponding Registry Operator legal entity name (as identified in the Registry Agreement or any subsequent Assignment thereof, if applicable) as a separate attachment to this form. All requests for release are subject to ICANN's review and approval. Any approval related to this request will not be effective until communicated to you by ICANN in writing.

For more information on the process to request release of letter/letter two-character ASCII labels, please see <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/two-character-authorization>.

Step 1: Please provide the requested information below.

TLD(s):	.film
Full Legal Name of the Registry Operator:	Motion Picture Domain Registry Pty Ltd

Step 2: Please specify which letter/letter two-character ASCII labels you would like to release (check **ONLY ONE**).

- All letter/letter two-character ASCII labels
- Only the letter/letter two-character ASCII labels as specified in attached chart (Please complete Appendix A by removing all labels that you do *NOT* wish to request.)

Step 3: In addition to continued compliance with all other terms and conditions of the Registry Agreement, please confirm the following is understood as it relates to the authorization of release of any two-character ASCII labels:

- Registry Operator will implement measures to avoid confusion with the corresponding country codes pursuant to Section 2 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement; and
- Registry Operator acknowledges that any two-character ASCII label included on the list referenced in Section 6 of Specification 5 of the Registry Agreement may not be activated in the DNS and may not be released for registration to any person or entity other than Registry Operator.

Step 4: Please provide your signature and name for your confirmation statement below.

I understand and confirm that the use of this request applies only to the TLD(s) that are operated by the Registry Operator listed in Step 1 and any such release is based upon the express and limited statements provided herein.

Signature:	
Name:	Mick DeBorja

1 April 2015