
IGO Protections

Session 7.1 - GAC/GNSO Dialogue

Contents

Background	2
Issues	3
Leadership Proposal for GAC Action	4
Relevant Developments	5
Maintenance of the IGO List	5
Discussion of IGO Protections at the Second Level in connection with the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms	6
Current Positions	10
GAC Advice	10
Other GAC Contributions and Statements	11
IGO Statements and Substantive Contributions	11
Key Reference Documents	12

Session Objective

Continue discussion with GNSO representative towards resolving the long standing issue of IGO Protections, in light of recent GNSO Council decisions on IGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanisms.

Background

The protection of the names and acronyms of International Governmental Organizations (IGOs) against unauthorized use in the DNS emerged as an issue as part of the [Second WIPO Internet Domain Name Process](#) (2001). Over the following decade, several attempts were made¹ at addressing WIPO's recommendations to include IGO names in the scope of the [Uniform Dispute Resolution Procedure](#) (UDRP).

In the meantime, the [GAC Principles regarding New gTLDs](#) (28 March 2007) recognized that *“the process for introducing new gTLDs must make proper allowance for prior third party rights, in particular [...] rights in the names and acronyms of [...] IGOs”*.

During the development of the [New gTLDs Program](#), the issue was brought to the fore by Legal Counsels of several IGOs through an [open letter](#) (13 December 2011), followed by an IGO Common Position Paper² (4 May 2012) and a [letter on behalf of the United Nations Secretary General](#) (11 July 2012) providing the legal basis and rationale for *“targeted exclusion of third party registrations of the names and acronyms of IGOs both at the top and second level, at least during ICANN's first application round and until further appropriate policy could be developed”*.

Subsequent interactions on this matter between the ICANN Board ([Request for policy advice](#), 11 March 2012), the GAC ([GAC Toronto Commiqué](#) and subsequent communiqués) and the GNSO (which [Initiated](#) a Policy Development Process on this matter on 17 October 2012) led to establishing the foundations of an enduring mixed regime of initial temporary protections to be replaced by permanent protections eventually.

However, since the GNSO delivered its [recommendations on the Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs](#) (20 November 2013), the ICANN Board has been challenged to reconcile the divergence between these policy recommendations and GAC Advice, as reflected in the Board [resolution](#) of 30 April 2014, while the United Nations Secretary General BAN Ki-moon [requested](#) assistance from all Members States *“in obtaining protection for the names and acronyms of IGOs from being registered as Internet Domain Names by third parties who misrepresent themselves as the IGOs in question”* (June 2016).

More recently, the outcome of the ensuing [IGO/INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanism GNSO PDP](#) (June 2016-July 2018) has been disputed by IGOs as summarized in a [letter from the United Nations Assistant Secretary-General, Office of Legal Affairs to the ICANN Board](#) (27 July 2018)³.

¹ see the [WIPO-2 Joint Working Group](#) (2003-2004), and [GNSO Issue Report on Dispute Handling for IGO Names and Abbreviations](#) (2007)

² see Annex 5 of the [Final GNSO Issue Report on the Protection of International Organization Names in New gTLDs](#)

³ letter sent on behalf of the Legal Counsels of the OECD, UPU, WHO, and WIPO, as part of a broader coalition of 40 IGOs, and to which the ICANN CEO [responded](#) on 29 November 2018

Issues

As a result of the development of the [New gTLD Program](#), and the divergence that subsequently emerged between GNSO policy recommendations and GAC Advice, IGO names and acronyms are subject to a multifaceted regime of protections, pending outcomes of several ICANN processes that are still ongoing:

At the top level of the DNS (IGO identifiers as Top-Level Domain Names)

- Under the rules of the 2012 [New gTLD Applicant Guidebook](#), IGOs were eligible to file objections on New gTLD Applications (see Legal Rights Objections, Section 3.2 of the [New gTLD Applicant Guidebook](#))
- Per ICANN Board [resolution](#) (30 April 2014) adopting GNSO Policy recommendations not inconsistent with GAC Advice, Full Names of IGOs on the [GAC List](#) are now permanently reserved at the Top Level.
- It is unclear at this stage whether and how these provisions could be affected by the ongoing [New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP](#)

At the second level of the DNS (IGO identifiers as Second Level Domain Names)

- Full Names of IGOs listed on the [GAC List](#) are permanently protected in two languages by virtue of the [Protection of IGO and INGO Identifiers in All gTLDs Policy](#) (an ICANN [Consensus Policy](#) effective since 1 August 2018)
- Acronyms of IGOs listed on the [GAC List](#) are temporarily protected by virtue of an ICANN Board [resolution](#) (9 January 2014) consistent with GAC Advice in the [GAC Buenos Aires Communiqué](#) (20 November 2013), and pending the resolution of [inconsistencies](#) between existing GNSO policy recommendations and GAC Advice, including consideration of the contested [Final Report](#) of the [IGO/INGO Access to Curative Rights Mechanism PDP WG](#) (17 July 2018) [adopted](#) in part by the GNSO Council (18 April 2019)

Currently the GAC is focussing on the following issues:

1. Ensuring that the GAC's [IGO List of 22 March 2013](#) is updated⁴, complete and its currency is maintained in the future, consistent with [Advice](#) in the [GAC San Juan Communiqué](#), in response to which the Board [directed](#) a feasibility study.
2. Seeking to resolve the long-standing issues created by the divergence of policy advice provided to the ICANN Board by GNSO and GAC regarding the regime of protections afforded to IGO acronyms
3. Specifically, addressing the concerns of IGOs that their Immunities (under international and national laws) and related proposals have not been appropriately taken into account in the Final Report of the GNSO PDP WG on IGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms, now [adopted](#) in part by the GNSO Council (18 April 2019).

⁴ according to a set of [criteria](#), as included in the [letter](#) to the ICANN Board date 22 March 2013 which introduced the IGO List.

Leadership Proposal for GAC Action

1. **Consider the work being conducted on the maintenance of the IGO List by the ICANN Org** in connection with [Advice](#) in the [GAC San Juan Communiqué](#) and related Board [response](#), with a view to:
 - assessing the alignment of current plans and output to date with GAC objectives
 - discussing the GAC's role in the longer term maintenance of the List, and particularly a potential GAC process for approving new inclusions into the GAC IGO List.

2. **Follow-up with the ICANN Board to:**
 - Report on the GAC's unsuccessful attempts to:
 - Engage in a substantive solutions-oriented dialogue with the GNSO Council to avoid the adoption of policy recommendations inconsistent with GAC Advice regarding the Access of IGO to Curative Rights Protection Mechanism
 - Secure the participation of the GNSO in the Board-facilitated dialogue that the GAC had requested ([GAC Barcelona Communiqué](#)) and for which the Board [indicated](#) its readiness
 - Discuss options available to the ICANN Board for addressing renewed inconsistencies between GAC Advice and GNSO Policy Recommendation on the long standing issue of IGO Protections
 - Possibly recommending that the ICANN Board considers initiating a facilitated dialogue [similar to that undertaken](#) in March 2017 regarding the protection of identifiers of the International Committee of the Red Cross

3. **Consider the need, opportunity and format of further engagement with the GNSO** given:
 - The GNSO Council reluctance to enter into a facilitated dialogue before the ICANN Board consider its adoption of Recommendation 1-4 of the CRP PDP WG Final Report
 - Possible dependency on the outcome of the Board's consideration of Recommendation 1-4 on substantive discussion of the work to be reinitiated in relation to Recommendation 5.

Relevant Developments

Maintenance of the IGO List

- In the [GAC Toronto Communiqué](#) (17 October 2012), the GAC advised the ICANN Board with a view to seek the protection of IGO names and acronyms at the second level of new gTLDs
- The implementation of these protections has relied on the [IGO List](#) assembled by the GAC according to a set of [criteria](#), per the GAC Chair [letter](#) to the ICANN Board on 22 March 2013
- As part of the effort to implement protections of IGO names ([Consensus Policy](#) effective 1 August 2018), consistent with GNSO Policy [recommendations](#) as [adopted](#) by the ICANN Board (30 April 2014), IGO representatives have identified the need to ensure completeness of the reference IGO List
- Consequently, in the [San Juan Communiqué](#) (15 March 2018) the GAC Advised the ICANN Board to “*Ensure that the list of IGOs eligible for preventative protection is as accurate and complete as possible*” and provided subsequent [clarifications](#) (15 May 2018) in response to ICANN Board questions.
Regarding whether the GAC should remain “*the authoritative organization to determine which IGOs are to be protected, [...] as well as to determine any updates that are to be made to the list?*” the GAC indicated that it “*does not seem best placed to continue to fulfil these functions, e.g. facilitating discussions and interfacing between IGOs and ICANN (who would maintain the aforementioned list). The GAC cannot assume other activities as it currently lacks the resources to be able to carry out such roles effectively.*”
- In the San Juan GAC Advice [scorecard](#) (30 May 2018), the ICANN Board resolved to defer action on the advice until it could assess the feasibility of the GAC’s request
- On 20 October 2018, during a meeting in Barcelona, representatives from the ICANN Org, the GAC Chair, OECD and WIPO agreed on principles of a collaboration on this matter
- In January 2019, an ICANN Org project team was formed, for an initial period of 3 months, to assess the feasibility of the GAC’s request and attempt to update the IGO List, building on previous work conducted by OECD, with subject matter expertise provided by IGO representatives. During this initial work, the GAC is expected to remain the authoritative organization ultimately responsible for determining eligibility of IGOs for inclusion in the list and for determining whether any updates are to be made to the list.
- As part of this project, in late April 2019, communications were sent to 160 IGOs [seeking](#) confirmation of their contact information and identifiers to be protected.
- This process now requires an approval process to be in place for the addition of new IGOs in the GAC [IGO List](#) and its associated [criteria](#) (per the GAC Chair [letter](#) of 22 March 2013). The GAC Leadership and GAC Topic Leads are currently considering a three step process:
 1. A committee of experts (possibly from ICANN, WIPO and OECD) would advise
 2. The GAC Leadership would consider and share a proposal to the GAC for comments
 3. The GAC would be given a window for comments, before adoption of the decision

Discussion of IGO Protections at the Second Level in connection with the GNSO PDP Working Group on IGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanisms

Historical Developments and Substantive Contributions (from IGOs, GAC, GNSO and ICANN)

- The [initiation](#) (5 June 2014) of the [IGO/INGO Access to Curative Rights Protection Mechanism Policy Development Process](#) (CRP PDP) stemmed from the [Final Report](#) of the preceding PDP on [Protection of IGO and INGO Identifier in All gTLDs](#) (10 November 2013) which recommended that current policies be “*amended so that curative rights of the UDRP and URS can be used by those organizations that are granted protections*” (recommendation 3.5.3).
- On 14 April 2014, **IGOs provided [comments](#)** as part of the development of the [Final Issue Report](#) (25 May 2014) required for the PDP to be initiated, stating:
 - “*IGOs dissented from the Working Group's recommendation against preventative protection for IGO acronyms [...]. If, however, owing to the Working Group's recommendation, protection for IGO [acronyms] at the second level is to be curative rather than preventative, it is vital that the limited protections ICANN is willing to grant are implemented in as effective a way as is possible within a registration-driven framework*”
 - noting that “*The focus of the GAC, GNSO, and NGPC is now on second-level protection of IGO identifiers through administrative dispute resolution mechanisms*”, “*IGOs agree with the Staff recommendation that it is more appropriate to create a separate dispute resolution procedure modeled on the UDRP (and one on the URS) but narrowly-tailored to accommodate the particular circumstances of IGOs*”
- In the [GAC Los Angeles Communiqué](#) (16 October 2014), the **GAC issued [Advice to the ICANN Board](#)** regarding the question of whether the URDP should be amended or a separate dispute resolution procedure should be created for IGOs: “*The GAC advises the ICANN Board: i. That the UDRP should not be amended;[...]*”.
- On 29 April 2015, the **GAC [responded](#)** to a [request from the PDP Working Group](#) for input noting that “*GAC advice to the ICANN Board has repeatedly emphasized that IGOs are in an objectively different category to other rights holders and that governments support the implementation of appropriate protections of IGO names and acronyms on public policy grounds*” and pointing to an earlier [IGO Small Group response to questions from the Working Group](#) (16 January 2015) discussing in detail aspects of the legal issues at hand.
- In the course of its deliberations the CRP PDP Working Group requested that ICANN retains [Professor Edward Swaine](#) from George Washington University (USA) to prepare a **legal memo** in response to a set of specific questions related to IGOs immunity from judicial process. Pr. Swaine delivered an [Initial Synopsis of a Draft Memo](#) (28 February 2016) and eventually released the [Memorandum on IGO Immunity](#) (17 June 2016)
- In response to the legal memo, certain **IGO representatives** (WIPO, OECD, World Bank) [commented](#) (12 July 2016), inter alia, that the analysis in the Memo was not requested by

the IGOs and reiterated “longstanding statements of the IGOs regarding the basic facts that preclude IGO recourse to the UDRP”

- On 4 October 2016, the **ICANN Board communicated to the GNSO Council the [IGO Small Group proposal](#)** for the protection of IGO Acronyms at the Second Level of the Domain Name System, which the GAC referred to in the [Hyderabad Communiqué](#) (8 November 2016) as striking “a reasonable balance between rights and concerns of both IGOs and legitimate third parties”, and called on ICANN to establish all of the following:
 - a procedure to notify IGOs of third-party registration of their acronyms;
 - a dispute resolution mechanism modeled on but separate from the UDRP, which provides in particular for appeal to an arbitral tribunal instead of national courts, in conformity with relevant principles of international law; and
 - an emergency relief (e.g., 24-48 hours) domain name suspension mechanism to combat risk of imminent harm.
- On 31 October 2016, the **legal counsels of the IGO coalition [wrote to the GNSO Council Leadership](#)** “to provide the perspective of IGOs on some of the political, legal and practical considerations” of the issue, referring to the [IGO Small Group proposal](#) as a “compromise proposal follow[ing] on years of comprehensive negotiations involving representatives of the ICANN Board, the GAC, IGOs and ICANN staff”, and noted that “thus far, we have seen policy-making on this important matter dominated by Internet domain name registration interests”
- In the [GAC Hyderabad Communiqué](#) (8 November 2016), **the GAC advised the ICANN Board:**
 - “to [...] facilitate, through a transparent and good faith dialogue, the resolution of outstanding inconsistencies between GAC advice and GNSO recommendations with regard to the protection of IGO acronyms in the DNS and to report on progress at ICANN 58.”
 - “that a starting basis for resolution of differences between GAC Advice and existing GNSO Recommendations would be the [small group compromise proposal](#) set out in the October 4, 2016 letter from the ICANN Board Chair to the GNSO”
- On 20 December 2016, **representative of the ICANN Board, Organisation, GAC and GNSO met to prepare a facilitated discussion** during ICANN58 (see [Notes](#) of the meeting). Eventually, these preparations led to the circulation of three documents:
 - [Proposed Process For a Facilitated Dialogue Between GAC and GNSO](#)
 - [Problem Statement](#) (10 March 2017)
 - [Briefing Paper: Reconciling GAC Public Policy Advice & GNSO Policy Recommendations](#) (10 March 2017)
- On 19 January 2017, the CRP PDP **WG released its [Initial Report](#)** on which, **the GAC submitted [comments](#)** (12 March 2017), pointing to inadequate consideration of GAC Advice and IGO contributions. The [US Government](#) and 21 IGOs also submitted contributions. See

section IV. Analysis of Comments in the [Report of Public Comments](#) (5 May 2017) for a summary of comments.

- In the meantime, on 12 March 2017, during the ICANN58 meeting in Copenhagen **the GAC and GNSO participated in a [Facilitated Dialogue session](#)** (see [summary](#) by the session's facilitator). There were no subsequent developments in the facilitation process as the facilitator, Bruce Tonkin eventually [indicated](#) (16 June 2017) a dependency on progress of the CRP PDP WG.
- In the November 2017-June 2018 timeframe, **the CRP PDP Working Group experienced procedural difficulties and formal challenge** in the formation of consensus on its recommendation, as discussed in a GNSO Council [Paper on Policy & Procedural Options relating to IGO Jurisdictional Immunity](#) (9 March 2018). A later [Summary Report on the Current Status of Consultations with the IGO CRP PDP WG](#) (12 April 2018) recognized a number of challenges in the PDP WG deliberations which made them "highly unlikely" to "result in clear consensus", noting that "*any consensus recommendation on this topic will likely conflict with GAC advice*". This ultimately led a closer involvement of the GNSO Council with sought a timely delivery of the Final Report.
- In the [GAC Panama Communiqué Advice](#) (28 June 2018), the **GAC advised the ICANN Board to work with the GNSO to ensure that GAC Advice and the [IGO Small Group proposal](#) is "adequately taken into account in any related Board decision"**. The rationale referred the [2007 GNSO Issue Report on Dispute Handling for IGO Names and Abbreviations](#) as providing "*a blueprint for a means for handling domain name disputes concerning IGO identifiers which substantially matches the 'small group' proposal.*"

Conclusion of the CRP PDP, GNSO Council deliberations and GNSO/GAC engagement

- On 17 July 2018, **the CRP PDP Working Group** submitted its [Final Report](#) for consideration by the GNSO Council. The report includes several substantial Minority Statements (see Annex B)
- On 27 July 2018, **IGOs disputed the Final Report** in a [letter from the United Nations Assistant Secretary-General, Office of Legal Affairs to the ICANN Board](#). In reaction, participants of the PDP Working Group expressed their views with the ICANN Board ([Letter From IGO-INGO Working Group](#) and [Letter from Paul R. Keating](#), 16 August 2018)
- In a letter from [GAC Chair to GNSO Council Chair](#) (21 October 2018), the **GAC expressed "its serious concerns about this report given the clear conflict between its conclusions and longstanding GAC advice"** and asked "*that the GNSO Council gives serious consideration to the option of deferring its decision on the [...] PDP final recommendations until a dialogue between GAC and GNSO Council has been conducted*"
- During the ICANN63 meeting (22 October 2018), at the request of the GNSO Council, **IGO representatives provided a [high-level overview of concerns](#)** with the CRP PDP WG Final Report, quoting or echoing the minority statement of the resigned co-chair of the Working Group (in addition to a more detailed discussion of each recommendation):

- *“After four years of effort this WG has utterly failed to provide a policy recommendation that reasonably resolves the central challenge it confronted”*
- *“Not only has the working group failed to provide any recommendations that would facilitate IGO access to curative rights mechanisms, they have actually passed one recommendation that would *penalise* an IGO that successfully asserts an immunity claim”*
- it also pointed the *“imbalance of the working group members’ votes on the final recommendations: “Of the 11 WG members who supported the Recommendation, a majority (7) were either domain investors or attorneys representing domain investors (domainers), indicating that the WG’s consensus call process had been captured by a narrow segment of the ICANN community with a significant commercial interest in the outcome”*
- In the [GAC Barcelona Communiqué](#) (25 October 2018), the GAC [advised](#) the ICANN Board **to: “facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented dialogue between the GNSO and the GAC in an effort to resolve the longstanding issue of IGO protections, on which it reaffirms its previous advice, notably with respect to the creation of a curative mechanism and maintenance of temporary protections.”**
- On 29 November 2018, the ICANN CEO hinted at the ICANN Board’s readiness to facilitate the requested dialogue in his [response to the Legal Counsels of the IGOs](#), while [reassuring](#) other stakeholders that the *“ICANN Board is fully cognizant of the need for the bottom-up policy”*.
- On 27 January 2019, the ICANN Board **confirmed its readiness** to *“facilitate a substantive, solutions-oriented discussion should it be invited to do so by the GNSO and the GAC”* in its [response](#) to the GAC Barcelona Communiqué.
- On 18 April 2019, after 9 months of internal deliberations (including a dedicated [webinar](#) on 9 October 2018), and in spite of engagement with the GAC through correspondence ([response to GAC Chair](#) on 14 January 2019) and bilateral meetings ([GAC/GNSO Leadership discussion](#) on 14 February 2019, [GAC/GNSO Joint Meeting during ICANN64](#) on 10 March 2019), the GNSO Council [resolved](#) to approve Recommendations 1 to 4 of the CRP PDP WG Final Report and to refer Recommendation 5 to the ongoing RPM Review PDP WG.
- To date, GAC efforts to secure the GNSO’s participation in a facilitated dialogue, both before the GNSO Council vote ([GAC letter](#) of 17 April 2019) and after its decision ([GAC/GNSO Leadership Call](#) on 21 May 2019 and the subsequent GAC Chair [letter](#) of 23 May 2019), have been unsuccessful. The GNSO Council confirmed, in its [response](#) to the GAC Chair (31 May 2019), awaiting the ICANN Board’s decision on Recommendation 1-4, while initiating work on charter further work on Recommendation 5.

Current Positions

GAC Advice (in reverse chronological order)

- ICANN63 [Barcelona Communiqué](#) (25 October 2018) includes [Advice](#) regarding the facilitation of a dialogue and reaffirming previous advice on maintaining of temporary protections and creating curatives rights mechanisms.
- ICANN62 [Panama Communiqué](#) (28 June 2018) includes [Advice](#) regarding the maintenance of the IGO List, maintaining temporary protections and the ICANN Board working with the GNSO to ensure that GAC Advice and the [IGO Small Group proposal](#) is “adequately taken into account in any related Board decision”. The rationale refers to a [2007 GNSO Issue Report](#) which “provided a blueprint for a means for handling domain name disputes concerning IGO identifiers which substantially matches the “small group” proposal.”
- ICANN61 [San Juan Communiqué](#) (15 March 2018) includes [Advice](#) regarding the maintenance of the IGO List, followed by subsequent [clarifications](#) (15 May 2018)
- ICANN60 [Abu Dhabi Communiqué](#) (1 November 2017) includes [Advice](#) calling on a close review of decisions related to the CRP PDP WG with a rationale signaling the expectation that recommendations would conflict with GAC Advice and comments on the Initial Reports.
- ICANN59 [Johannesburg Communiqué](#) (29 June 2017) includes [Advice](#) regarding the creation of curative dispute resolution mechanism and calling on the Board to ensure IGO input and expertise is reflected in the CRP PDP WG’s recommendations
- ICANN58 [Copenhagen Communiqué](#) (15 March 2017) notes the start of the facilitated dialogue and includes [Advice](#) regarding maintaining the temporary protections, facilitating continued discussions and urging the CRP PDP WG to take into account the GAC’s [comments](#) on its Initial Report.
- ICANN57 [Hyderabad Communiqué](#) (8 November 2016) includes [Advice](#) calling on the Board to “take action” and facilitate of the resolution of inconsistencies in GAC advice and GNSO recommendations by ICANN58, on the basis of the [Small Group proposal](#), inviting the CRP PDP WG to take into account this proposal, and maintaining the temporary protections.
- ICANN54 [Dublin Communiqué](#) (21 October 2015) includes [Advice](#) to facilitate the timely conclusion of discussions with the “small group” to resolve the issue of IGO protections.
- ICANN53 [Buenos Aires Communiqué](#) (24 June 2015) [notes](#) progress and invites “small group” to develop a concrete proposal, while preventative protections remain in place.
- ICANN51 [Los Angeles Communiqué](#) (15 October 2014) reaffirms advice from Toronto, [Beijing](#), [Durban](#), [Buenos Aires](#), [Singapore](#) and [London](#) regarding protection of IGO names and acronyms at the top and second levels and [advises](#) the ICANN Board that: the UDRP should not be amended, and that interim protections should remain in place while dialogue continues between Board, GAC and GNSO to develop concrete solutions to long standing GAC Advice.

- [Letter from the GAC Chair to the ICANN Board](#) (22 March 2013) on agreed [criteria](#) and corresponding [final list for protection of IGO names and acronyms](#) at the second level in the current round of gTLDs.
- ICANN45 [Toronto Communiqué](#) (17 October 2012) includes advice to implement IGO protections at the second level prior to the delegation of any new gTLDs, and in future rounds of gTLDs at the second and top level

Other GAC Contributions and Statements (in chronological order)

- GAC [response](#) to a [request](#) for input from the CRP PDP WG (29 April 2015)
- GAC [comments](#) on the CRP PDP WG Initial Report (12 March 2017)
- Letter from [GAC Chair to GNSO Council Chair](#) (21 October 2018)

IGO Statements and Substantive Contributions (in chronological order)

- [Open Letter from IGOs on the Expansion of gTLDs](#) (13 December 2011)
- IGO Common Position Paper, included as Annex 5 in the [Final GNSO Issue Report on the Protection of International Organization Names in New gTLDs](#) (4 May 2012)
- [Letter on behalf of the United Nations Secretary General](#) to ICANN (11 July 2012)
- IGOs [comments](#) on Issue Report to amend the UDRP and URS to enable access by protected IGOs (14 April 2014)
- [IGO Small Group response](#) to CRP PDP WG (16 January 2015)
- [United Nations Secretary General BAN Ki-moon letter to Member States](#) requesting assistance from all Members States in obtaining protection for the names and acronyms of IGOs (June 2016)
- [Response by certain IGO representatives](#) (WIPO, OECD, World Bank) to the CRP PDP Legal Memorandum on IGO Immunity (12 July 2016)
- [IGO Small Group proposal](#) for the protection of IGO Acronyms at the Second Level of the Domain Name System (4 October 2016)
- [Letter of the legal counsels of the IGO coalition](#) to the GNSO Council Leadership (31 October 2016)
- [21 IGOs comments](#) on the CRP PDP WG Initial Report (5 May 2017)
- [Letter from the United Nations Assistant Secretary-General, Office of Legal Affairs](#) to the ICANN Board (27 July 2018)

Key Reference Documents

- [IGO Small Group proposal](#) for the protection of IGO Acronyms at the Second Level of the Domain Name System (4 October 2016)
- [CRP PDP Working Group Final Report](#) (17 July 2018)
- [Letter from the United Nations Assistant Secretary-General, Office of Legal Affairs to the ICANN Board](#) (27 July 2018)
- [IGO representatives' High-Level Overview of Concerns](#) with the CRP PDP WG Final Report (22 October 2018)
- GNSO Council [resolution](#) (18 April 2019)

Further Information

ICANN Board Facilitation Documentation

- [Proposed Process For a Facilitated Dialogue Between GAC and GNSO](#) (March 2017)
- [Problem Statement Relating to the Protection of Acronyms of IGOs at the Second Level in gTLDs](#) (10 March 2017)
- [Briefing Paper: Reconciling GAC Public Policy Advice & GNSO Policy Recommendations](#) (10 March 2017)
- [Presentation](#), [recordings](#) and [summary](#) of the GNSO-GAC Facilitated Dialogue on IGO Protections (12 March 2017)

Policy Development Documentation

- [Issue Report](#) on Dispute Handling for IGO Names and Abbreviations (15 June 2007)
- [Final Issue Report](#) on amending the UDRP and URS to enable access to them by protected IGOs (24 May 2014)
- Pr. Edward Swaine [Legal Memorandum on IGO Immunity](#) (17 June 2016)
- [Initial Report](#) of the CRP PDP WG (19 January 2017)
- GNSO Council [Paper on Policy & Procedural Options relating to IGO Jurisdictional Immunity](#) (9 March 2018)
- [Summary Report on the Current Status of Consultations with the IGO CRP PDP WG](#) (12 April 2018)
- [Final Report](#) of the CRP PDP WG (17 July 2018)

Document Administration

Meeting	ICANN65 Marrakech, 24-27 June 2019
Title	IGO Protections
Distribution	GAC Members and Public (after meeting)
Distribution Date	Version 2: 17 June 2019