

# New gTLDs update and geographical names as TLDs

Annebeth Lange

ICANN 65, Marrakech, June 2019

# Contents

1. Timeline
2. Background
3. Recap of the 2012 rules in AGB
4. Relevant Preliminary Recommendations (2-9) in the Supplemental Initial Report
5. Summary of comments to the Preliminary Recommendations from WT 5
6. Where are we now
7. Discussion



# Timeline

- > 2007 - GNSO Policy Advice
- > 2012 - New gTLD Applicant Guidebook - Implementatoin rules
- > 2014 - Subsequent Procedures WG started - goal to make policy for next round(s)
- > 2018 - Initial Report for WT 1 - 4 published for comments July; WT 5 - December
- > 2019 - Hopefully Final Report published
- > 2020-21 - Next round?



# Background

- > The 2012 AGB did not follow the GNSO policy of 2007 when it came to geographical names
- > Still - in general the New gTLD process has been successful - more that 1000 new gTLDs so far
- > What rules will prevail if no consensus for changes are reached
- > Geonames have proven to be a special sensitive and contentious with views spread from A to Z



# 2012 rules in a nutshell

## > Blocked:

- All 2-letter combinations in the latin alphabet (ISO 3166-1 and other combinations)
- The ISO 3166-1 3-letter codes (274 out of 17.576 possible 3-letter combinations)
- Country names - long form and short form) in any language, including «commonly known» names for the country (Holland)

## > Requires support or non-objection letter from relevant authorities:

- Capital cities (Oslo, London etc.)
- Sub-national names (Wales)
- City names where the intention is to use it for that city-community (Casablanca, Newcastle)



# Relevant Preliminary Recommendations (1)

- > *Recommendations 2 - 9 for country & territory names:*
- > *Reserve the following categories against application at the top-level:*
  - *Two-character ASCII strings*
  - *Alpha-3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard*
  - *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.*



# Relevant Preliminary Recommendations (2)

## > *Likevise reserve*

- *Separable component of a country name designated on the “Separable Country Names List.”*
- *Permutation or transposition of any of the names included in the four (4) bullets above.*
  - *Permutations include removal of spaces, insertion of punctuation, and addition or removal of grammatical articles like “the.” A transposition is considered a change in the sequence of the long or short-form name, for example, “RepublicCzech” or “IslandsCayman.”*
  - *Suggestion that this should not apply for the ISO 3166-1 3-letter codes*
- *Name by which a country is commonly known, as demonstrated by evidence that the country is recognized by that name by an intergovernmental or treaty organization.*



# Summary of comments from WT5

- > Most of the preliminary recommendations are in line with the 2012 AGB, with some refinement
- > More agreement on the top of the «hierarchy» than further down
- > WT5 is aware that if no consensus, the rules of today will probably stand
- > Give and take will be necessary, but that was done already in 2012 - nobody got their first choice
- > ccTLDs and GAC more or less agree that we should not make substantial changes from the 2012 rules
- > Languages still is a disputable field
- > From the «g-side» there is first and foremost strong interest for the 3-letter combinations
- >



# Where are we now

- > The co-leads propose that the 13 preliminary recommendations in the Supplemental Initial Report should serve as a baseline for the next phase of deliberations
- > When considering concerns, divergence in the summary documents, these elements are considered in the context of whether or not they warrant deviation from these preliminary recommendations
- > Members should keep in mind that in order to adopt/integrate alterations, new elements and ideas etc. it will require consensus support from fellow WT5 members



# The way forward

- > Potential changes to the preliminary recommendations can be
  - Material, e.g. Increasing or decreasing the level or scope of protections
  - Operational improvements or changes «on the edges»
- > Ultimately the purpose of the phase of the work that we have been doing since Kobe is to reach agreement on a set of recommendations that will be sent to the full WG for their consideration and formal consensus call



# Development in Marrakech

- > Report from WT5 meeting
- > Questions
- > Discussion



# Thank you

**Annebeth B. Lange**

annebeth@norid.no

