



# Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs

CWG-UCTN Working Group Session | ICANN57 | 5 November 2016

# Agenda

1. Welcome and roll call
2. Report on meetings to date relevant for CCWG
  - a. GAC WG geographic names (including “repository” initiative)
  - b. Joint ccNSO-GNSO Councils meeting
  - c. WTSA meeting, resolution 47
  - d. GNSO Subsequent procedures
  - e. New gTLD Reviews session
3. Discussion next steps options / recommendation 2
  - a. Result survey monkey (temperature of the WG), included
  - b. Discussion options
4. Next steps Interim Report
  - a. Completion section 5.2
  - b. Final review
5. AOB
6. Closure

# Survey Results – Recommendation 3

Org	Choice	Comments
ccNSO	Option 2	
ccNSO	Option 2	
ccNSO	Option 1	
GNSO	Option 3	
GNSO	Option 3	
GAC Observer member (CTU)	Option 3	I would add the second paragraph of option 1 to option 3 to illustrate that the impact could be across SOs and ACs. In any event, either option 3 or option 1 would be acceptable to me.
GNSO	Option 3	
GNSO	Option 3	
ccNSO	Option 3	
GNSO	Option 1	
ccNSO	Option 3	
ALAC	Option 2	
GNSO	Option 3	

# Recommendation 3 Alternative A

Future work should take place with the authority of a policy development process under ICANN's Bylaws, with a clearly drafted Charter or scope of works that sets out how conclusions and recommendations will inform that policy development process. This addresses a key deficiency of this CWG, as it has not been made clear how the group's work can or will be incorporated in policy-making pursuant to ICANN's Bylaws. Some members of the WG raised the concern that issues that are in scope of both the ccNSO and GNSO policy development processes, for example how full names of countries and territories other than Latin scripts are dealt with, should be addressed through a coordinated effort under both processes.

# Recommendation 3 Alternative B

To ensure that the conclusions and recommendations of a CWG will at one point have the authority of a policy developed through the relevant processes under ICANN's Bylaws, future work should take place with a clear view on how this work at some point will reach the authority of a policy developed as or relates to and provides input to formal policy development processes. With regard to the subject matter, the use of country and territory names as TLDs the CWG notes that this should be defined with respect to both the ccNSO and GNSO Policy development processes. Due to the overlapping definitions used under existing policies, additional policy developed by one group, impact and has an effect upon the policy developed for another group. This may be achieved through a clearly drafted Charter or scope of works that sets out how these policy development processes will be informed. This addresses a key deficiency this CWG has encountered, as it has not been made clear how the group's work can or will be incorporated in policy-making pursuant to ICANN's Bylaws.

# *Recommendation 3 Alternative C*

Future work should clearly align with ICANN policy development processes, and should have a clearly drafted Charter or scope of works that sets out how conclusions and recommendations will inform ICANN policy development.