WG Geographical Names as TLDs

Update Seoul 28.10.09
What happened to the input from ccNSO on geographical names?

• Our first input in Los Angeles
  – Council resolution autumn 2007
• Reiterated through written input
  – December 2008
  – April 2009
  – July 2009
• What was our goal?
• What have we achieved?
• What do we do now?
What was the goal of the ccNSO?

- Country/territory names are ccTLDs, not gTLDs
  - the defining mark of a ccTLD is that it derives its authority from the local internet community, not the number of characters in the TLD
  - the subsidiarity principle should prevail
  - the given name of a country is not generic
  - should at least be removed from the new gTLD process until the ccTLD IDN PDP has finished

- The definition of a country/territory name should be broad enough to give sufficient protection
  - ”Meaningful representation or abbreviation” should be protected – avoid exhaustive lists
  - The name should be protected in all languages
DAG3 – results (1)

• **Country/territory names as ccTLDs**
  ICANN does not accept that country and territory names should be excluded from the gTLD process

• **ICANNs arguments**
  – governments may want a .country name TLD, and except for the IDN ccTLD fast track, this is only possible under the new gTLD process
  – other stakeholders support country/territory names being allowed under the gTLD process
  – requirement that the government must not object to/support an application is protection enough
DAG3 – results (2)

• **Definition of a country/territory name**
  - Covers all languages, not only 6 UN-languages
  
  - ICANN does not accept the broader definition of “a meaningful representation or abbreviation of a country name” – will use an exhaustive list

• **ICANN’s arguments**
  - the original intent was protecting long and short forms of names listed on the ISO 3166-1 list, the revised definition covers that
  - ccNSO says it is not broad enough, GoDaddy feels it is too far reaching – this illustrates that “meaningful representation” was ambiguous, and needed clarity
  - objection process is a final safeguard
GAC shares our goals

• GAC input august 2009
  – Strings that are a meaningful representation or abbreviation of a country name or territory name should not be allowed in the gTLD space

• In fact, they go even further...
  – it would be logical and reasonable to apply existing policy principles and processes for ccTLDs to any TLDs intended to service a specific community within a specific national jurisdiction

• Input seems to not have been included in the analysis leading to DAG3 (came in after the deadline for comments to DAG2)
The way forward?

• Do we reiterate our advice yet another time?
  – Deadline for input 22nd November – leading to DAG4?
  – Combined advice of the GAC and the ccNSO may have an effect...

• We can also focus on finishing the IDN ccPDP, including for Latin-based scripts
  – ICANN to GAC: ”Meaningful representations of country and territory names in non-Latin scripts will be available under the IDN Fast Track process but country and territory names in Latin scripts are available in the gTLD program only, until the ccTLD policy development is complete”