

Work Track 5 - New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process Working Group

Annebeth Lange, presentation at ccNSO Members Meeting

6 November 2019



- Work Track 5 is a sub-team of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group (WG) that is now concluding its work.
- 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 focused on reviewing the existing policy and implementation related to the topic of geographic names at the top level, determining if changes were needed, and recommending revised or new policy and/or implementation guidance, as appropriate.



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

- <u>Two-character ASCII letter-letter combinations</u>
- 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 (also known as non-AGB geographic terms)



- Work Track 5 has drafted a Final Report to the Full Working Group including a set of recommendations for the WG to consider.
- A consensus call was held within Work Track 5 on the Final Report:
 - 34 answers: 3 non-support, 31 support \rightarrow Consensus
- Work Track 5 has now submitted its Final Report to the full Working Group.
- This concludes Work Track 5's work, unless the full Working Group asks Work Track 5 to deliberate on an issue that has not yet been considered in the Work Track.
- All recommendations coming out of Work Track 5 will be reviewed and discussed by the full Working Group and to the extent that they are included in the WG's Final Report, will be subject to a consensus call in the full WG.



Work Track 5 Highlights

- Inclusive leadership team structure with four co-leaders, one from each the ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, and GNSO.
- 168 members and 99 observers. Members include those from:
 - At-Large, ccNSO, GAC, GNSO, and RSSAC
 - GNSO SG/Cs: RySG, NCSG, NCUC, NPOC, IPC, BC, and ISPCP
- Work Track 5 began meeting in November 2017 and held 52 meetings over the course of nearly two years.
- The co-leaders provided updates to interested groups in the community during ICANN meetings and by reporting back to their respective groups between meetings. Newsletters were published regularly and distributed to all interested individuals.
- Additional community input gathered through open working sessions at ICANN meetings, cross-community/high interest topic sessions at ICANN59 and ICANN62, and through public comment on the WT5 Supplemental Initial Report.



Context for Recommendations

- There were significant differences between the 2007 policy recommendations and the 2012 implementation addressing geographic names at the top level.
- An important goal for Work Track 5 was to ensure that policy and implementation on this topic are aligned in subsequent procedures.
- A key premise of Work Track 5's deliberations was that unless there was agreement in the Work Track to recommend a change from the 2012 implementation, the Work Track would recommend maintaining the rules included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and bringing policy recommendations up-to-date to reflect this implementation.
- After extensive discussion, the Work Track was unable to agree to recommendations that depart from the 2012 implementation.
- WT5 recommends updating the GNSO policy recommendations to be consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and largely maintaining the Applicant Guidebook provisions for subsequent procedures. This brings GNSO policy recommendations in line with implementation, which the Co-Leaders consider a significant achievement given the diversity of perspectives on this issue and the challenges in finding compromise that is acceptable to all parties.



WT5 Recommendation 1

Consistent with Section 2.2.1.3.2 String Requirements, Part III, 3.1 of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, <u>continue to reserve all two-character letter-letter ASCII</u> <u>combinations at the top level for existing and future country codes.</u>

This recommendation is consistent with the GNSO policy contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains policy recommendations from 8 August 2007.



WT5 Recommendation 2

Maintain provisions included in the 2012 Application Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1 Treatment of Country and Territory Names, with the following clarification regarding section 2.2.1.4.1.vi:

Permutations and transpositions of the following strings are reserved and unavailable for delegation:

- Iong-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.
- short-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.
- Short- or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as "exceptionally reserved" by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency.
- Separable component of a country name designated on the "Separable Country Names List."

Strings resulting from permutations and transpositions of alpha-3 codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard are available for delegation, unless the strings resulting from permutations and transpositions are themselves on that list.



WT5 Recommendation 3

Maintain provisions included in the 2012 Application Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.2 Geographic Names Requiring Government Support, with the following update regarding section 2.2.1.4.2.4:

The "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical subregions, and selected economic and other groupings" list is more appropriately called the "Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49)." The current link for this resource is https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49.

The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions contained in section 2.2.1.4.2 are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation would make the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation.



- All recommendations coming out of Work Track 5 will be reviewed and discussed by the full Working Group and to the extent that they are included in the WG's Final Report, will be subject to a consensus call in the full WG.
- The Final Report of the full Working Group will be sent to the GNSO Council for further consideration and adoption.
- Once adopted by Council, the recommendations in the Final Report will be sent to the ICANN Board.
- Following consultation with the GAC and community, the Board will vote on the Final Report recommendations.



Q & A

