



| ICANN MEETINGS – 42th Edition |

[www.icann.org](http://www.icann.org)

**(Note: translation made with the help of Google Translate)**

The 42th Edition of the ICANN meetings held between 23 and 28 October, the city of Dakar in Senegal. The first day of work stood out a first session on a set of measures proposed to the ICANN board in order to support developing countries in the process of submission and approval of new gTLD's. Ensued, as the public opening ceremony, an intervention of the President of Senegal, referring to the initiatives of this African country in the area of information society and knowledge, where the main fight digital divide falls primarily on the part of the population. During the afternoon the point at issue is the definition of policies and scope of the WHOIS, in which the matter is now DNS.PT particularly involved.

In the days that followed, the discussion focused on IDN's and WHOIS. Today we can find in the root zone 30 ccTLDs / IDN. This rapid growth has led to issues are discussed such as how to solve the problem of confundibilidade strings. In terms of the WHOIS, and the issues remain unresolved in practice remains open the problem of reconciling what are the contractual obligations with ICANN with law enforcement (Community and national) on protection of personal data. In. En this issue is safeguarded, but it is clearly an exception in a world of TLD's.

The day before the closure of another edition of ICANN was as usual marked by so-called "public forum" where the community was called upon to participate freely, openly questioning and commenting on all developments of the work week. The discussion, as expected, focused on new gTLDs, highlighting the fact that from next January 12, any entity that meets the technical, administrative and financial powers for the purpose register their gTLD.

As usual, the ICANN meetings ended with the presentation by all working groups of the systematization of action and the public meeting of the board, where they are publicly presented the resolutions taken by this decision-making body for maximum excellence. Notable in this context two topics: strengthening the role of ICANN to support developing countries in the field of new gTLD's, immediately creating mechanisms that are favorable for the records to be made by those countries, and the question of defining a policy of conflict management and ethics to apply to the inner workings of ICANN.

We now give special focus to a set of points whose relevance may have an impact with regard to the operation of the ccTLD .pt:

### **IDN'S - Internationalized Country Code**

Following the meeting in Mexico City and later the Sydney meeting was set up independent working group to discuss matters related to IDN's. This group included experts in the Internet, but especially in the field of linguistics. It was the beginning of 2009, and the conclusions were to not proceed with variants of TLD's, referring to this possibility when they were filled the precise terms and conditions for each of the offices where there is interest. The call's IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process was then launched with the aim of countries and territories allow the use of non-Latin characters in their domain names. In May 2010, 21 countries representing 11 languages had already led to ICANN's IDN applications for their own TLDs. This was an historical day for the Internet world, since it meant the opening of a way for those that had not used the Internet because the content support areas not accessible in their alphabet. Egypt (. مصر) Saudi Arabia (. ة عودي س ال) United Arab countries (. امارات) and Russia (. Рф) shaped the early history of IDN's, to whom much has been followed.

This matter has continued to be discussed, and is assumed to be a work in progress. In this edition of ICANN are being examined reports produced based on six case studies relating to languages with non-Latin characters, for example: Arabic, Greek, Chinese and Cyrillic. All these works are unanimous on the impact of IDN's end user and security and stability of the DNS, understand that issues are concerned, in the case of Arabic, the bi-directionality of the script where the letters are written from right to the left and the numbers just the opposite.

Making a brief point of situation, the last country to do his "string" Malaysia was approved. There currently are 29 countries / territories that have successfully passed this same stage. Today we can find in the root zone 30 ccTLDs / IDN. This rapid growth has led to issues are discussed such as how to solve the problem of confundibilidade strings. In the immediate future are adopted two criteria, one hand is ugly an analysis of whether the records in question call into question the stability and security of the DNS, then cause some confusion with CTLD's that already exist or are in the seed stage, this task has, however, been subject to several criticisms especially from countries that have seen their string may be refused.

More information: <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/>.

**New gTLD's** - <http://newgtlds.icann.org/>

The general rules for access and registration of new gTLD's (generic Top LevelDomain) as well as their program was approved last June. From 12 January 2012 any person who meets the technical and administrative conditions for the effect can register a gTLD. This ends the first round on April 12, estimating the entry of at least 500 applications. Right now a major concern to this level focuses on the figure created by ICANN to support developing countries in the submission process for new gTLD's, we

refer to the supported new gTLD's. By the next day on December 16 will be in a public discussion document to be submitted later to the ICANN board containing a set of principles that should be applied in this context. It is here particularly focus on measures such as reducing the fee of \$ 185 000 to \$ 47 000, which is an associate most beneficial timing of payments (deferment of payment for more advanced stage of assessment), the creation of a foundation aimed at manage funds allocated to the implementation and promotion of new gTLD's in the geographic space of the countries concerned; administrative support in preparing the application, translation of documents, etc.; technical support in the implementation of DNSSEC and IPv6. It should be noted however that ICANN does not support the creation of gTLD's that match the names of government institutions, the geographic names or to call dot-brand (overlapping records with trademarks). There will also be particularly careful about the nature of entities that may submit their applications, which fall on an analysis of financial viability and credibility in the country. Note finally, that ICANN has set clear how this type of evaluation will be carried out, stressing the need for neutrality and impartiality on the part of any evaluators. Moreover, in force since 2009 is called the political conflicts of interest and ethics applied to organic ICANN. In this edition the GAC stressed the need for this policy be revised, or simply applied with absolute rigor, especially now that is approaching a period where pressures are likely to be of a different decision-makers together with ICANN.

This meeting was attended by a large number of representatives of countries that will be of special assistance under the program launch of the new gTLD's, it is mostly of African countries that, in general, showed little knowledge about the program and also therefore, proved to have many doubts and fears especially in the protection of geographical names. For this reason, in addition to support now that ICANN said it was preparing a road show by several countries for the proper dissemination of new gTLD's. However, last October 23 was made available online at: <http://newgtlds.icann.org/applicants/tas/demo> an interactive application with the aim of facilitating and making known the procedures associated with the process of submitting applications.

Associated with the new gTLD Program's always been a concern to protect the trademarks, this issue goes back to March 2011. The mechanism designed to cope with the strong likelihood of third party marks are appropriate under the registry of the new gTLDs was the creation of so-called trade mark clearing house. In practice it is a computing platform that will accept, validate and authenticate the brands that are deposited there by their respective owners. This system, established as a true database will immediately establish itself as an important source of information in the sunrise period for new gTLDs. What will happen is that there is an intersection of data that may prevent a mark deposited in a gTLD TMCH be reproduced without the knowledge and possible authorization from the owner. We left here some final notes on this subject: the brand will only be in TMCH if deposited by the licensee; the TMCH does not constitute, nor constitute, per se, any right, going into production platform provides support only for 4. quarter of 2012.

Leaflet in Portuguese about the new gTLD's: <http://www.icann.org/pt/topics/new-gtlds/gtld-facts-31jul11-pt.pdf>

## WHOIS

In the field of issues relating to WHOIS the discussion focused on how these data should be managed in the new gTLD's, but there's ccTLD may not be unrelated to future settings that seem to follow shortly. Thus, it remains a concern for balancing the principles of privacy on the one hand, and the other security and stability of the DNS. As recommendations come as the obligations on the part of the registry, to periodically verify the accuracy and operation of the contacts associated with each domain, and the possibility of applying penalties for registrars who are managing domains with contacts of date or incorrect. The latter possibility should be shaped in contracts registry / registrars. It should be noted that in relation to their gTLD's registrars are required to obtain and make available to the public the following information: the domain name, identification of support servers, creation date and expiry of the domain. Finally, name and form contact the owner of the domain and responsible technical and administrative.

With regard to treatment Whois in ccTLD's issues associated summarizes the paradigms that are not today's news: differences between the terms of Community law and U.S. law regarding the form of data protection and a reflection of the impositions of ICANN As regards the obligation to provide, without limitation, information associated with contacts already identified above.

This issue was given special focus to the case. Fr whose management is in charge of AFNIC, and where the existing WHOIS policy since 2006 has fled to what is the usual regime of other ccTLD's. Here the data of registrants are not online, except in cases where they want to say clearly that they are released. This does not obviate the direct contact that turns out to be secured through a webform technically directed to the holder of the domain. As for other contacts, especially because typically deal with legal persons, the data is made available without restrictions. In a universe of 2 million registered domains, the statistics show a very small number of requests for provision of contact details, interested parties in any way they always have to justify your request and many of them are rejected outright. For example, an application that is based on the fact that a website having illegal content is rejected on the grounds that the intervention of the AFNIC is limited to the domain name itself and not the content of the site that it go to be associated. To date this policy has proved effective, found one of the reasons for this fact is the circumstance of the case have been conducted in close collaboration with the community (the equivalent of our advisory board. En), a logic of multistakeholder participation .