

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

