#	Preliminary Recommendation	Discussion meeting	Status
1	As described in recommendations 2-9, Work Track 5 recommends, unless or until decided otherwise, maintaining the reservation of certain strings at the top level in upcoming processes to delegate new gTLDs. As described in recommendations 10-13, Work Track 5 recommends, unless or until decided otherwise, requiring applications for certain strings at the top level to be accompanied by documentation of support or non- objection from the relevant governments or public authorities.	Reviewed at meetings: 29 May	Open - need to revert on completion of WT5 review of preliminary recommendations/public comments.
2	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to reserve all two-character letter-letter ASCII combinations at the top level for existing and future country codes. • The starting point of this recommendation is Section 2.2.1.3.2 String Requirements, Part III, 3.1 of the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, which 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 because the focus of the Work Track is on geographic names. Work Track 5 considers letter-letter combinations to be within the scope of this subject area. • Work Track 5 notes that Work Track 2 of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group is considering two-character letter-number combinations and two-character number-number combinations. This recommendation is consistent with the GNSO policy contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains policy recommendations from 8 August 2007. It is also consistent with provisions in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook.	Reviewed at meetings: 29 May & 5 June	Complete - no change to recommendation

3	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation, as stated in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.i: • alpha-3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. Work Track 5 is not proposing to remove from delegation any 3-letter codes that have already been delegated. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation.	Reviewed at meetings: 29 May & 5 June	Complete - no change to recommendation
4	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation, as stated in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.ii: • long-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation. As currently written, the recommendation does not address the issue of translations of these strings, which were reserved in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Please see questions for community input in section e.	Reviewed at meetings: 5 June	Open for final feedback from last meeting.
5	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation, as stated in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.iii: • short-form name listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation. As currently written, the recommendation does not address the issue of translations of these strings, which were reserved in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Please see questions for community input in section e.	Reviewed at meetings: 5 June	Open for final feedback from last meeting.

6	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation, as stated in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.iv: • short- or long-form name association with a code that has been designated as "exceptionally reserved" by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation.	Reviewed at meetings: 5 June	Open for final feedback from last meeting.
7	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation, as stated in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.v: • separable component of a country name designated on the "Separable Country Names List." This list is included as an appendix to the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation. As currently written, the recommendation does not address the issue of translations of these strings, which were reserved in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Please see questions for community input in section e.	Reviewed at meetings (add dates)Reviewed at meetings: 5 June	Open for final feedback from last meeting.

8	Work Track 5 recommends clarifying 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.vi, which designates the following category as a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation:
	
	    • permutation or transposition of any of the names included in items (i) through (v). 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."
	
	Work Track 5 recommends clarifying that permutations and transpositions of the following strings are reserved:
	
	    • 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." This list is included as an appendix to the 2012 Applicant Guidebook.
	
	Strings resulting from permutations and transpositions of alpha-3 codes listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard should be allowed.
	
	The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation clarifies the text from the 2012 Applicant Guidebook and updates the policy to be consistent with Work Track 5's interpretation of 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.vi.
		Reviewed at meetings:
		5 June
			Open to feedback from last meeting.
			
			Suggestion for text change from Justine Chew: "Strings resulting from permutations and transpositions of alpha-3 codes which are themselves not on the ISO 3166-1 list should be allowed".
			
			Suggestion to clarify the definition of "permutation" and "transposition." Is the current definition exhaustive?

9	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a country and territory name which is reserved at the top level and unavailable for delegation, as stated in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook section 2.2.1.4.1.vii: • 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. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation.	Reviewed at meetings: 5 June	Open to feedback from last meeting.

10	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a geographic name requiring government support at the top level. Applications for these strings must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities: • An application for any string that is a representation of the capital city name of any country or territory listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation. As currently written, the recommendation does not address the issue of translations of these strings, which required support/non-objection in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook. Please see questions for community input regarding translations in section e.		
11	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a geographic name requiring government support at the top level. Applications for these strings must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities: • An application for a city name, where the applicant declares that it intends to use the gTLD for purposes associated with the city name. An application for a city name will be subject to the geographic names requirements (i.e., will require documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities) if: (a) It is clear from applicant statements within the application that the applicant will use the TLD primarily for purposes associated with the city name; and (b) The applied-for string is a city name as listed on official city documents. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation.		

12	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a geographic name requiring government support at the top level. Applications for these strings must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities: • An application for any string that is an exact match of a sub-national place name, such as a county, province, or state, listed in the ISO 3166-2 standard. The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent with the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top- Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation.		
13	Work Track 5 recommends continuing to consider the following category a geographic name requiring government support at the top level. Applications for these strings must be accompanied by documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant governments or public authorities: • An application for a string listed as a UNESCO region or appearing on the "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub- regions, and selected economic and other groupings" list. In the case of an application for a string appearing on either of the lists above, documentation of support will be required from at least 60% of the respective national governments in the region, and there may be no more than one written statement of objection to the application from relevant governments in the region and/or public authorities associated with the continent or the region. Where the 60% rule is applied, and there are common regions on both lists, the regional composition contained in the "Composition of macro geographical (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings" takes precedence." The 2012 Applicant Guidebook provisions related to this category are inconsistent the GNSO policy recommendations contained in the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains from 8 August 2007. This recommendation makes the policy consistent with the 2012 Applicant Guidebook, and therefore represents a change to the existing policy recommendation.		