Work Track 5 Meeting

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



11 July 2018

Agenda

Welcome/Agenda Review/SOI Updates (5 mins)

Recap of ICANN62 sessions (10 mins)

Principles: Non-Capital City Names (20 mins)

Principles: Terms not in the 2012 AGB (20 mins)

AOB (5 mins)



Welcome/Agenda Review/SOI Updates



Recap from session 1



- <u>Session 1</u>: Breakout groups discussed specific questions related to noncapital city names:
 - Should there be universal protections for non-capital city names?
 - O What are the relevant government/public authorities?
 - O Does intended usage of the string matter?
 - Also, non-capital city name process from 2012
- Some of the Session 1 feedback received:
 - Support for universal protections based on local or national laws, UN lists. Should respect their historical, sometimes unique, identifiers.
 - Against universal protections no universal definition of city. No basis for this level of protections. Local laws only applicable in jurisdiction.
 - Relevant govt/public authorities could depend on which city applicant is targeting. Or may be dependent upon a certain list of non-capital city names.



- Some of the Session 1 feedback received, continued:
 - Definitive list of protected terms support for a list, but unclear if there
 is such a list. Some suggestions of using UN lists, population, airport
 locations.
 - Should usage matter some support for existing rules, where govt/public authority approval needed only when used as a city name. If approval is needed regardless of usage, difficult to determine what entity can grant approval (e.g., all cities with the same name?).



- Session 2: Discussed principles as they relate to non-capital city names.
 - Purpose: principles may be used as a way to evaluate potential proposed solutions and help the group focus on high-level goals.
 - Sought additional proposals "in the middle" between extremes.
- Some of the session Session 2 feedback:
 - Suggestion that rather than meeting in the middle, it could be about improving the parts of the existing process that did not work as well as they could have.
 - General support for the principles, with the addition of "simplicity"
 - O How do we create incentives for parties to work together?



Results of the sessions:

- Interactive discussions validating many of the key points and positions raised in the Work Track but from new participants.
- Additional new points and ideas raised; Some common ground identified on principles.
- Input from the Cross-Community sessions is included in the working document.



Revisiting Principles: Non-Capital City Names



Principles and Next Steps

- Reminder: Why focus on Principles?
 - If we agree on the principles, we can test our potential changes against them to make sure we are on the right track.
- During the Cross-Community Sessions, some support was expressed for several principles, detailed on the following slides. Does the Work Track still feel that these are valid? Summary of proposed principles:
 - Allow for new non-capital city gTLDs
 - Increase predictability for all parties
 - Reducing the reasons and likelihood for conflict within the process, as well as after delegation
 - Simplicity simple to understand, follow, and implement
- What other principles should be considered?
- Would it be helpful to look at some of the solutions proposed in the Work Track for non-capital city names in light of these principles?



Principles: Terms Not in the 2012 AGB



Principles: Terms Not in the 2012 AGB

- We have previously discussed potential categories of strings not included in the Applicant Guidebook that may be considered geographic names.
- Do the principles identified for non-capital city names also apply to potential solutions for non-AGB terms?
 - Allow for new gTLDs
 - Predictability
 - Reducing the reasons for conflict
 - Simplicity
- o If yes, why? If no, what principles might we apply?



Any Other Business

