

Work Plan, Outline, and Draft Recommendations: Work Track 5 Report to the Full WG
 Draft updated: 23 September 2019

PROPOSED WORK PLAN

23 September 2019	Outline of Report, draft recommendations, and rationale shared with WT. WT members have 1 week to review and raise any specific concerns about the content of the recommendations and rationale to the mailing list.
25 September	Meeting to go over process for consensus call.
30 September 2019	Deadline to provide feedback on draft recommendations and rationale. Leadership team decides if a meeting is needed to discuss any items raised on list.
2 October 2019	Meeting to discuss resolution of any items raised on list, if needed.
7 October 2019	Draft Report shared with WT. WT members have 1 week to review and raise any specific concerns about the content on the mailing list.
14 October 2019	Deadline to provide feedback on Report. Leadership team decides if a meeting is needed to discuss any items raised on list.
16 October 2019	Meeting to discuss resolution of any items raised on list, if needed, and to discuss consensus call process.
18 October 2019	Revised report sent to WT.
21 October 2019	Final deadline for review and comments.
23 October 2019	Final version of Report sent to WT.
24 October - 28 October 2019	WT5 consensus call on Report to full WG.

REPORT OUTLINE

Overview: As the final product of its work, WT5 will deliver a report to the full Working Group. This report will be more concise than the Initial Report and will focus on WT5's recommendations, context to support these recommendations, and the rationale behind the recommendations. These recommendations will be subject to review and approval in the full Working Group.

Structure:

a. What is the relevant policy and/or implementation guidance (if any)?

[Carried forward from Supplemental Initial Report]

b. How was it implemented in the 2012 round of the New gTLD Program?

[Carried forward from Supplemental Initial Report]

c. What recommendations and/or implementation guidelines does Work Track 5 submit to the full Working Group for consideration?

[To be drafted by the leadership team with staff support based on WT agreements]

d. What is the rationale for recommendations and/or implementation guidelines?

[To be drafted by the leadership team with staff support based on WT deliberations and agreements]

e. New issues raised in deliberations since publication of the Initial Report, if applicable.

[To be drafted by the leadership team with staff support based on WT deliberations]

Appendix 1 - Applicable Rules Contained in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook

Appendix 2 - Additional Proposals Submitted by WT Members

DRAFT TEXT TO INCLUDE IN REPORT - RECOMMENDATIONS AND RATIONALE
(sections c & d)

Note that text for sections a, b, and e will be shared as part of a complete draft of the report.

c. What recommendations and/or implementation guidelines does Work Track 5 submit to the full Working Group for consideration?

1. Consistent with Section 2.2.1.3.2 String Requirements, Part III, 3.1 of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, continue to reserve all two-character¹ letter-letter ASCII combinations at the top level for existing and future country codes.²

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

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:

- long-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, which are themselves not on the ISO 3166-1 list, are available for delegation.

The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions contained in section 2.2.1.4.1 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

¹ The term “character” refers to either a single letter (for example “a”) or a single digit (for example “1”).

² Note that Section 2.2.1.3.2 String Requirements, Part III, 3.1 of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook addresses all 2-character strings. It states, “Applied-for gTLD strings in ASCII must be composed of three or more visually distinct characters. Two-character ASCII strings are not permitted, to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on the ISO 3166-1 standard.” Work Track 5’s recommendation specifically addresses letter-letter combinations, a subset of the strings that this provision addresses, because Work Track considers only letter-letter combinations to be within WT5’s scope.

consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy 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>.³

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.

d. What is the rationale for recommendations and/or implementation guidelines?

The New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Working Group is tasked to determine what, if any changes may need to be made to the existing policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. Work Track 5 focused specifically on making recommendations in this regard with respect to geographic names at the top level. On the topic of geographic names, there were significant differences between the 2007 policy and the 2012 implementation, and therefore a key objective of this group’s work was to ensure that policy and implementation are aligned for subsequent procedures. In submitting recommendations that bring the policy up-to-date with the program implementation, the Work Track is achieving this important goal.

Work Track 5 acknowledges that some view the 2012 Applicant Guidebook itself a compromise solution, which raises challenges in reaching agreement on additional changes layered on top of the 2012 implementation. The different perspectives on this issue are documented in the Initial Report. The Work Track considered different rationales for moving away from the 2012 implementation, and many proposals for changes to the 2012 rules, some of which increased restrictions/protections compared to the 2012 AGB and others that decreased restrictions/protections compared to the 2012 AGB. While some members sought to include more types of terms in the Applicant Guidebook, other members indicated that their acceptance of the 2012 “status quo” in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook would be contingent on no additional categories of terms receiving protection. Ultimately, the group did not hold a unified position on the proposals considered or the rationales supporting those proposals.

³ This information has been confirmed by the Statistical Services Branch of the UN Statistics Division.

After extensive discussion the Work Track arrived at the conclusion that 2012 implementation is an outcome that is more acceptable to the group as a whole than the alternatives considered.

Work Track 5 brought together those with a strong interest in geographic names at the top level, including members of the GAC, ccNSO, ALAC, and GNSO, in an inclusive process that provided all participants with an opportunity to contribute. Work Track 5 also sought to ensure that the community's work related to geographic names, specific to gTLDs, took place in a single forum, to avoid the conflicting or contradictory efforts and outcomes that have taken place in the past. The Work Track successfully met these goals, and in addition to producing the recommendations included in this report, documented the different positions, concerns, and ideas that community members hold on these issues. Public comment on the Initial Report serves as an additional resource reflecting perspectives on the broader ICANN community. These materials may serve as a valuable tool for any future discussions that may take place regarding the treatment of geographic names at the top level in subsequent procedures.