

Work Track 5 on Geographic Names at the Top Level – Public Comment on the Supplemental Initial Report of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process

Work Track 5 Co-Leaders: Olga Cavalli (GAC), Annebeth Lange (ccNSO), Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC), Martin Sutton (GNSO)



Community Webinar
9 January 2019

Welcome

Facilitators for this session:

- ◉ Olga Cavalli (GAC co-leader of Work Track 5)
- ◉ Annebeth Lange (ccNSO co-leader of Work Track 5)
- ◉ Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC co-leader of Work Track 5)
- ◉ Martin Sutton (GNSO co-leader of Work Track 5)

Webinar objective:

The purpose of this webinar is to **provide an overview of Work Track 5's Supplemental Initial Report and answer questions** about the report. This webinar **will not include substantive discussion** of issues contained in the Initial Report. If you have substantive comments, please submit your feedback through the public comment forum.

Agenda

1. Welcome
2. WT5 Scope and Mandate
3. WT5 Status and Next Steps
4. Approach to Supplemental Initial Report
5. Q & A

Work Track 5 Scope and Mandate

About Work Track 5

- ⦿ Work Track 5 is a sub-team of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG).
- ⦿ The overall WG is tasked with calling upon the community's collective experiences from the 2012 New gTLD Program round to determine what, if any changes may need to be made to the existing 2007 Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains policy recommendations.
- ⦿ Work Track 5 seeks to review the existing policy and implementation (i.e., Applicant Guidebook) related to the topic of geographic names at the top level, determine if changes are needed, and recommend revised or new policy or implementation guidance, as appropriate.
- ⦿ Anyone can join Work Track 5 as a member or observer.

Scope of Work

The scope of work includes geographic names at the top-level only:

- ⦿ Two-character ASCII letter-letter combinations
- ⦿ Country and Territory Names (alpha-3 on 3166-1, short and long-form in ISO 3166-1, additional categories in section 2.2.1.4.1 of AGB)
- ⦿ Capital cities in ISO 3166-1, city names, sub-national names (e.g., county, province, state in ISO 3166-2)
- ⦿ UNESCO regions and names appearing in the “Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings”
- ⦿ Other geographic names such as geographic features (rivers, mountains, valleys, lakes, etc.) and culturally significant terms related to geography

WT5 Status and Next Steps

Status and Next Steps

- ⦿ The Work Track published a Supplemental Initial Report on 5 December 2018, which includes preliminary recommendations, options/proposals, and questions for community input, reflecting the work it has completed over the last year.
- ⦿ This report is considered a **Supplemental** Initial Report because it serves as an addition to the Initial Report published by the full Working Group earlier in 2018.
- ⦿ All are encouraged to provide feedback here:
<https://www.icann.org/public-comments/geo-names-wt5-initial-2018-12-05-en>. **The deadline for comments is 22 January 2019.**
- ⦿ Taking into account public comments received, Work Track 5 will work towards developing its final recommendations. Once that is completed, the full Working Group will deliberate and conduct a formal consensus call on all recommendations before they are integrated into the Final Report.

Approach to Supplemental Initial Report

General Approach

- ⦿ The report documents different perspectives and summarizes the status of Work Track discussions on topics within the scope of work.
- ⦿ Where appropriate and applicable, the report presents preliminary recommendations. In some cases, groups of members or individual members have put forward proposals that they believe warrant consideration; all proposals raised in the Work Track are documented in the report, regardless of the level of support. The report also includes a series of questions for which the Work Track is seeking additional input from the community to support further deliberations.
- ⦿ Please see the Executive Summary for an overview of preliminary recommendations.
- ⦿ In addition, all recommendations, options/proposals, and questions for community input are extracted from the report and listed in a table as Annex B. The table is intended to help commenters organize their feedback.

Consensus Calls

As was the case with the Initial Report of the full Working Group, no consensus calls were taken prior to publication of the WT5 Supplemental Initial Report.

There are two main reasons for this approach:

- ⦿ Taking consensus calls at this stage could have the unintended consequence of locking Work Track members into positions of support or opposition prior to soliciting public comment from the community on those recommendations; and
- ⦿ To form such definitive positions at this early of a stage could have the adverse effect of members being less open to modifications to those positions as a result of community input.

Initial Report Structure

The core of this document is **Section 2: Deliberations of the Working Group**. The high-level structure of this section is similar to that in the Initial Report published by the full WG earlier this year. It includes the following:

- a. *What is the relevant 2007 policy and/or implementation guidance (if any)?*
- b. *How was it implemented in the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program?*
- c. *What are the preliminary recommendations and/or implementation guidelines?*
- d. *What are the options under consideration, along with the associated benefits / drawbacks?*
- e. *What specific questions are the PDP WG seeking feedback on?*
- f. *Deliberations*
- g. *Are there other activities in the community that may serve as a dependency or future input to this topic?*

Preliminary Recommendations: Section 2, Part c (1/2)

Continue to reserve as unavailable at the top level

- All two-character letter-letter ASCII combinations
- Alpha-3 codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard
- Short or long-form names listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard *
- Short or long-form name associations with codes that have been designated as “exceptionally reserved” by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency
- Separable components of country names designated on the “Separable Country Names List.” *
- Permutations and transpositions: Work Track 5 preliminary recommendations suggest clarifying that permutations and transpositions of the following are reserved. This is an adjustment to the 2012 Applicant Guidebook:
 - Should apply to all categories above with the exception of strings resulting from permutations and transpositions of alpha-3 codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard (which should be allowed)
- Names by which a country is commonly known, as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization.

* For these items, translations in any language were reserved in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Work Track 5 has not yet agreed on whether translations should be reserved in the future, and if so, in which languages.

Preliminary Recommendations: Section 2, Part c (2/2)

Continue to require a letter of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities at the top level for:

- capital city names of any countries or territories listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard **
- city names, where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name (see specific language from the 2012 Applicant Guidebook for details)
- Applications for any string that is an exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a county, province, or state, listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard.
- Applications for a string listed as a UNESCO region or appearing on the “Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical subregions, and selected economic and other groupings” list.

** For this item, translations in any language were reserved in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Work Track 5 has not yet agreed on whether translations should require support/non-objection in the future, and if so, in which languages.

Options: Section 2, Part d and Questions: Part e

- ⦿ In the full WG Initial Report, options were captured in Section 2, Part d of the report. However, in the Work Track 5 report, the **options / proposals** are captured in the appropriate section of the deliberations section (given the extensive number of options / proposals under discussion). See the following slide for further details.
- ⦿ Section 2, Part e contains a number of **questions** where the Work Track is seeking additional input. Topics here include Overarching Issues, Country and Territory Names, Geographic Names requiring letters of support/non-objection, and additional categories of terms.
- ⦿ *To reiterate, all recommendations, options/proposals, and questions for community input are extracted from the report and listed in a table as Annex B. The table is intended to help commenters organize their feedback.*

Deliberations Summary: Part 2, section f

Part 2, section f includes discussion of specific categories of terms and also reflects high-level discussion on broader issues, such as:

- Who owns a string? Who has rights to a string? What is the appropriate role of geographic communities and governments? (see f.1.2.1)
- What types of mechanisms should exist to exercise rights or establish roles in the process? (see f.1.2.2)
- What law and policy considerations should be taken into account? Which should take precedent? (see f.1.2.3)
- What is a geographic name for the purposes of the New gTLD Program? Does the intended use of the string matter? (see f.1.2.4)
- What are the key takeaways from the 2012 round for the purposes of future policy development and implementation? (see f.1.2.5)
- Are there alternate methods of consultations or collaborations in the application process that could satisfy all stakeholders? (see f.1.2.6)

During the public comment period, feedback is welcome on all aspects of the report, including ideas, positions, and proposals discussed in Part 2, section f.

Questions and Answers

Questions Submitted Prior to the Webinar

Please note that substantive issues are out of scope for this webinar and will not be discussed on this call.

Questions:

- ⦿ “How will ICANN prevent incumbent Registries and Registrars from warehousing multiple geographical names relating to third countries? Since the 2012 AGB (application guide book) clearly permitted the accumulation of portfolios of gTLDs by incumbent operators.”

Engage with ICANN – Thank You and Questions



One World, One Internet

Visit us at icann.org



[@icann](https://twitter.com/icann)



facebook.com/icannorg



youtube.com/icannnews



flickr.com/icann



linkedin/company/icann



slideshare/icannpresentations



soundcloud/icann