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Timeline

• 2007 – GNSO policy advice
• 2012 – new gTLDs applicant guidebook
• 2014 – policy for future rounds (subsequent procedures) started
• 2018 – initial reports for Work Tracks 1-4 published July
• 2018 – initial report for Work Track 5 published December
• 2019 – Final Report due
• 2021-3 – next round of new gTLDs ...

Background
• The 2012 AGB did not follow the GNSO advice
• In general the new gTLD programme has been successful (now over 1,000 gTLDs)
• Geo names in particular is a sensitive and contentious issue
Recap of the 2012 rules

Blocked:
• All 2 letter combinations in latin alphabet (AA – ZZ)
• The alpha-3 codes from ISO 3166-1 (274 out of 17,576 of the AAA – ZZZ)
• Country names (in any language)

Requires support or non-objection letter from relevant authorities
• Sub-national names (Wales)
• Capital city names (Tokyo)
• City names where the intention is to use for that city’s community (Nagoya, Yokohama)
WT 5 recommendations (simple version)

Make no changes!
Typical comments (1)

“The ccNSO Council believes that the rules in the Applicant Guidebook 2012 (AGB) applicable to Geographical names as TLDs worked relatively well and struck a reasonable balance between the different interests at stake. Although the treatment of geographical names in the AGB ended up differently from the New Generic Top-Level Domains policy recommendations from 8 August 2007, in hindsight, the AGB has served the community well.”
Typical comments (2)

“The GAC would like to reiterate the GAC advice about these issues (28 March 2007)

The new gTLDs should respect ... sensitivities regarding terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance.

ICANN should avoid country, territory or place names, and country, territory or regional language or people descriptions.

GAC Helsinki communiqué (30 June 2016) ... advised ...

Keep the current protections in place for 3-letter codes in the ISO-3166 list in place and not to lift these unless in depth discussions involving the GAC and the other ICANN constituencies would lead to a consensus that use of these 3-letter codes as TLDs would be in the public interest.”
Typical comments (3)

“A gTLD that merely corresponds to a geographic location, but is intended to be used for purposes unrelated to the place, should not be considered a “geographic name”. Since there are no inherent governmental rights in geographic names or terms, the United States does not support the notion of reserving geographic names or terms requiring documents of individual government support or non-objection.”
Typical comments (4)

“RySG members have opposed, as stated in the 2015 and 2017 RySG comments, the practice of reserving 3-character codes and have expressed in favour of making all 3-character codes (ASCII as well as IDN) eligible for the use as gTLDs, regardless of whether they are listed as alpha-3 codes on the ISO 3166-1 list.”

“There are no valid reasons that justify a process or policy of reserving 3-letter codes: (1) There is no basis for countries or country-code operators to claim sovereignty or ownership rights over 3-character codes; (2) Using 3 characters or more for gTLDs and reserving 2 characters for ccTLDs is consistent with current practice of the domain name system; (3) There exist several 3-character gTLDs while there are no examples of 3-character strings that are used as a ccTLD, and reserving 3-character strings for use by governments, public authorities or other entities risks creating confusion”
Areas in dispute

Blocked:
- All 2 letter combinations in latin alphabet (AA – ZZ)
- The alpha-3 codes from ISO 3166-1 (274 out of 17,576 of the AAA – ZZZ)
- Country names (in any language)

Requires support or non-objection letter from relevant authorities
- Sub-national names (Wales)
- Capital city names (Tokyo)
- City names where the intention is to use for that city’s community (Nagoya, Yokohama)
.vodka or .gin?