**GNSO Adoption of the Final Report of the Cross-Community Working Group Framework for the Use of Country and Territory names as TLDs**

Whereas,

1. The GNSO and ccNSO chartered the Cross-community Working Group Framework for the Use of Country and Territory names as TLDs (CWG UCTN) in March, 2014 (<https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/unct-framework-charter-27mar14-en.pdf>). The formation of a cross-community working group to evaluate the feasibility of developing an overarching framework on the use of country and territory names as TLDs was the principal recommendation of a preceding ccNSO Study Group (Final Report of 8 September 2013: <https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/unct-final-08sep12-en.pdf>).
2. The CWG UCTN published an Interim Paper dated 9 February 2017 (<https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccwg-ctn-interim-paper-09feb17-en.pdf>) setting out the history and context of ICANN policy-making on country and territory names, and proposing four recommendations, with Recommendation 3 articulated in three alternatives. A public comment period on the Interim Paper was held from 24 February 2017 to 21 April 2017, with comments summarised in a report dated 3 May 2017 (<https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-cwg-uctn-interim-paper-03may17-en.pdf>).
3. In addition to comments submitted by individual GNSO stakeholders, the GNSO Registry Stakeholder Group, Business Constituency and Intellectual Property Constituency submitted comments supporting Recommendations 1, 2 and 4, as follows:

*1. Close this CWG in accordance with and as foreseen in the charter.*

*2. Recommend that the ICANN community consolidate all policy efforts relating to geographic names (as that term has traditionally very broadly been defined in the ICANN environment to this point) to enable in-depth analyses and discussions on all aspects related to all geographic-related names. This is the only way, in our view, to determine whether a harmonized framework is truly achievable.*

*4. Recommend that future policy development work must facilitate an all-inclusive dialogue to ensure that all members of the community have the opportunity to participate. Again, we believe that this is the only way to determine whether a harmonized framework is truly achievable.*

1. Notably, no objections were raised in any submission during the public comment period to the above Recommendations 1, 2 and 4.
2. A range of support was expressed for each of the alternative wordings of Recommendation 3, with all GNSO commenters expressing support for Alternative A, as follows:

*Alternative A*

*Future work should take place with the authority of a policy development process under ICANN’s Bylaws, with a clearly drafted Charter or scope of work that sets out how conclusions and recommendations will inform that policy development process. This addresses a key deficiency of this CWG, as it has not been made clear how the group’s work can or will be incorporated in policy-making pursuant to ICANN’s Bylaws.*

1. On 24 June 2015, the GNSO adopted the Resolution on the Request for a Preliminary Issue Report on New gTLDs Subsequent Rounds. (<https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201506>) The Preliminary Issue Report, which identified the “requirements around geographic names” as meriting discussion, was adopted by the GNSO Council on 17 December 2015 (https://gnso.icann.org/en/council/resolutions#201512). The Preliminary Issue Report notably recommended that: “A potential PDP-WG on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures could consider collaborating with other parts of the ICANN community, such as the GAC or ccNSO in particular, in determining if strings described above should be allowed and if so, what requirements would be needed to govern that process. The PDP-WG should also consider the work of the Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs before reaching any conclusions.” (Preliminary Issue Report at page 59, https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/subsequent-procedures-prelim-issue-31aug15-en.pdf)
2. The GNSO Policy Development Process on New gTLD Subsequent Procedures (“Subsequent Procedures PDP”) was chartered on 21 January 2016 to, inter alia: “Review whether geographic names requirements are appropriate.” (<https://gnso.icann.org/en/issues/new-gtlds/subsequent-procedures-charter-21jan16-en.pdf>) This issue formed part of Work Track 2, covering legal issues.
3. Following two cross-community sessions led by the leadership of the Subsequent Procedures PDP WG at ICANN59 in Johannesburg on the topic of the use of geographic names, the formation of a new Work Track 5 was proposed to better facilitate broad community participation in the discussion of policy on geographic name use.

Resolved,

1. The GNSO Council adopts Recommendations 1, 2 and 4 of the Final Report of the Cross-Community Working Group Framework for the Use of Country and Territory names as TLDs.
2. The GNSO Council adopts the underlying objective of Recommendation 3, and in particular supports Recommendation 3 Alternative A, recognizing that the use of geographic names as gTLDs is clearly within the GNSO’s mandate as per ICANN’s Bylaws, and also recognizing that this is a matter of interest for the ICANN community as a whole.
3. The GNSO Council instructs the leadership of the Subsequent Procedures PDP to consider the Final Report of the Cross-Community Working Group Framework for the Use of Country and Territory names as TLDs, and to ensure continued collaboration with other parts of the ICANN community in addressing issues relating to the use of geographic names.
4. The GNSO Council recognizes the significant contribution of the CWG UCTN to the ongoing development of policy on the use of geographic names in the DNS, and thanks the members of the CWG UCTN for their Final Report, which clearly documents the history and context of policy-making in relation to geographic names.
5. The GNSO Council instructs the GNSO Secretariat to communicate these resolutions to the ccNSO Council, as co-chartering organization of the CWG UCTN, as soon as possible.