

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*"