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What is Work Track 5

> New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP
  - GNSO Policy prevails - established 5 sub-groups/work tracks
> Work Track 5 will focus on developing proposed recommendations regarding the treatment of geographic names at the top-level
  - [https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/Work+Track+5%3A+Geographic+Names+at+the+Top+Level](https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/Work+Track+5%3A+Geographic+Names+at+the+Top+Level)
> 144 members/81 observers
  - 28 altogether from ccNSO
  - [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=71604562](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=71604562)
Community Work on Geo Names as TLDs

1. **Work Track 5**
   - Formed as new Work Track within GNSO
   - Subsequent Procedures PDP
   - Final consensus recommendations must to be sent to full PDP Working Group

2. **Why not use a CCWG?**
   - CCWGs not intended for policy work within a Supporting Organization remit
   - Issue extensively discussed by community at ICANN59 (June 2017), leading to formation of Work Track 5

3. **Who is steering the work?**
   - Co-chairs from ALAC, GAC, ccNSO, GNSO
   - Terms of Reference (process, decision making etc.) agreed in January 2018

4. **Status of other community work**
   - GAC Working Group chair is a co-chair of Work Track 5
   - Cross community working group on country and territory names recommended a collaborative approach

5. **Issues to Monitor**
   - Difficult to get consensus on definition of “geographic name”
   - Continuing concern over using the GNSO PDP vs a cross community working group
   - Timeline pressures
What is going on with Round 2? (Best Guess)

- April 2018: Sub Pro PDP publishes Initial Report Worktrack 1-4
- Q4 2018: Sub Pro PDP Publishes final report Worktrack 1-4
- Q1 2019: GNSO Council Approves Policy
- Q2 2019: ICANN Board Approves Final Report and starts implementation
- Q1 2020: New Applicant Guidebook Published
- Q3 2020: Round 2 Begins
- Q1 2021: First Applications Submitted

And where does Worktrack 5 fit in?
What do we discuss

> Terms of Reference (ToR)
  - Adopted after long discussions
    - https://community.icann.org/display/NGSPP/Terms+of+Reference

> Define geographic terms
  - Treatment in 2007 GNSO PDP
  - Treatment in 2012 AGB Module 2
    - https://newgtlds.icann.org/en/applicants/agb
  - Future treatment
    - Retain/remove/change?

> Geographical names not specifically mentioned in AGB
  - Suggested treatment in new rounds
Geographic Names - Work Track 5

> Issue:

- In the 2012 round, certain geographic strings were “reserved” and not available for delegation.
- For other types of geographic names in the 2012 round, applicants needed support or non-objection of relevant government authorities to apply for the string.
- For some applications, there were different perspectives about whether an application should be permitted to go forward.
- Work Track 5 is focused on making recommendations about the treatment of geographic names at the top level in subsequent procedures.
- Shared leadership model with co-leaders from ALAC, ccNSO, GAC, and GNSO.

- Current Status:
  - Completed Terms of Reference document.
  - Held a webinar on the history of geographic names at the top level.
The WT is currently discussing the following for geographic names that received specific treatment in the 2012 round:

A. Is it a valid geographic term for the purposes of new gTLDs?
B. What were the positive impact/merits based on the treatment applied to the term in the AGB?
C. What were the negative impact/opportunities lost based on the treatment applied to the term in the AGB?
Positions so far - generalized

> GAC - Too “cold” - they generally want more protection on names not included in first round

> GNSO - Too ”hot” - they generally want less protection - more liberalization - remove protection from first round

> ccNSO - AGB 2012 an acceptable compromise - “just right” - we can live with this

> ALAC - not very clear where they stand so far
Is this labor of Sisyphus?

It does not matter how slowly you go as long as you do not stop.

Confucius
There is a time frame ....

> The "goal"
  - Initial WT 5 report by the end of the summer 2018
  - Final report by end of Q1-2019

> Differences are huge
  - Will we achieve consensus?
  - Process described in ToR
  - 2-letter codes in the end the most important for ccTLDs
  - Seems to be consensus so far that all 2-letter combinations will be reserved for ccTLDs
What can ccTLDs do

> Engage

> If a member, participate in teleconferences and suggest good solutions for ccTLDs

> If not a member, be one - WT5 ccTLD participants need support
Want to learn more?

> Webinar 8\textsuperscript{th} February 19 UTC
  - You can find the transcripts at the GNSO websites

> Will give better understanding of the issues of geographic names at the top level at ICANN from a historical perspective

> Intended for everyone new to the subject of geographic names at the top level

> Or - contact me and I will bring you up to date
Questions?

annebeth.lange@norid.no