Work Track 5 Meeting

Work Track 5 Co-Leaders: Olga Cavalli (GAC), Annebeth Lange (ccNSO), Javier Rúa-Jovet (ALAC), Martin Sutton (GNSO)

25 July 2018

ICANN

Agenda

1 Welcome/Agenda Review/SOI Updates (5 mins)

2 Problems to be Solved from the 2012 round (55 mins)

3 Focus on Implementation Guidance (20 mins)

4 Looking Ahead: Work Plan and Initial Report (5 mins)

5 AOB (5 mins)

Welcome/Agenda Review/SOI Updates

Agenda Item #1

Problems to be Solved from the 2012 Round

Agenda Item #2

Problems from the 2012 Round

- In our last meeting, the WT discussed that it might be helpful to look at problems encountered in the 2012 round.

- By focusing on **concrete problems that were observed and experienced**, we may be better positioned to identify targeted solutions that address those problems.

- For the moment, let's **focus on the problems**. We can discuss solutions next.

- Picking up where we left off on the last call, let's first discuss problems experienced with respect to the treatment of **non-capital city names**.

2012 Round Problems: Examples - Non-Capital Cities

Problem Reported	Examples	Possible Solution(s)
Lack of timely response from govt/public authority	?	Require response within a specific timeframe.
Uncertainty about which govt/public authority to contact	?	Provide mechanisms to more efficiently connect applicants to correct governments/public authorities.
Unauthorized change of use after delegation	?	Potential use of PICs / PICDRP

Input Requested on Problems: <u>Non-Capital Cities</u>

Questions for brainstorm:

◉ What **concrete problems** did you experience or observe with the rules or process in the 2012 round regarding non-capital city names?

◉ Can you provide specific **examples** of cases demonstrating this problem?

◉ What is the **root cause** of the problem, from your perspective?

◉ What was the **impact** of the problem on you or other stakeholders?

As members identify problems, we will make a list. After we have a list, members will have an opportunity to reflect and respond.

Discussion: Problems Related to <u>Non-Capital Cities</u>

Now that we have a list of possible issues related to non-capital city names, let's discuss the items we have brainstormed. Discussion questions:

⊙ Do you agree that the items on this list are problems that need to be solved?

⊙ Do you agree with the root causes identified?

⊙ Are policy or implementation changes the way to solve these problems?
  ○ If yes, what possible policy or implementation changes could address each of these problems?

Discussion: Problems Related to <u>Non-Capital Cities</u>

Reduce Restrictions	Existing Restrictions	Extend Restrictions
Rationale: • Overreach by governments. • Context of use must be considered. • No formal/legal basis to impose restrictions. • Ignores others rights and freedom of expression. • No evidence of abuse/confusion.	AGB: Non–Capital Cities. • Should we maintain current restrictions (but focus on process improvements)?	Rationale: • Deemed to be in public interest. • Avoid potential for abuse and/or confusion. • Provide better control for relevant authorities. • Protect interests of local population.
Outcome:(examples): • Manage risks through application process (evaluations, objections) and post-delegation controls (compliance and dispute mechanisms). • Approval/non-objection of geo-use only required from relevant authority not all places sharing same name.	Outcome (examples): • Introduce time limit for responses from govt/local auth. • Improve guidance and advice on good practices. • Create resources to identify relevant authority contacts.	Outcome (examples): • All use cases require approvals/non-objections from authorities with same place name. • Restrictions applicable to all non-capital cities over certain size/population/significance.

Input Requested on Problems: <u>Non-AGB Terms</u>

At various points in our discussion, we have considered that some stakeholders feel that certain terms not included in the 2012 AGB should receive special treatment in subsequent procedures.

⊙ What **concrete problems** did you experience or observe with the rules or process in the 2012 round regarding such terms?

⊙ Can you provide **specific examples** of cases demonstrating this problem?

⊙ What is the **root cause** of the problem, from your perspective?

⊙ What was the **impact** of the problem on you or other stakeholders?

As members identify problems, we will make a list. After we have a list, members will have an opportunity to reflect and respond.

Discussion: Problems Related to <u>Non-AGB Terms</u>

Now that we have a list of possible issues related to terms not included in the 2012 AGB, let's discuss the items we have brainstormed. Discussion questions:

⊙ Do you agree that the items on this list are problems that need to be solved?

⊙ Do you agree with the root causes identified?

⊙ Are policy or implementation changes the way to solve these problems?
   ○ If yes, what possible policy or implementation changes could address each of these problems?

Focus on Implementation Guidance

Agenda Item #3

Why focus on Implementation Guidance?

- In our last meeting, it was suggested that after looking at principles to guide policy development, it may be helpful to do the reverse – focus on specific suggestions to improve implementation and then work backwards to develop policy recommendations.

- The working document contains a number of implementation-oriented suggestions that are believed to slot into the existing structure of the 2012 implementation. These suggestions span the program as a whole and do not necessarily focus on only one area of the process.

- A sampling of these suggestions is included on the next slides.

Suggestions for Implementation Guidance (1/2)

- ⊙ **Advisory Panel:** Provide an advisory panel that applicants can contact to assist in identifying if a string is related to a geographic term as well as any applicable governments and/or public authorities. Could be new panel or additional responsibility for Geo Names Panel.

- ⊙ **GAC Member Input on Geographic Sensitivities:** Leverage the expertise of GAC members to help applicants determine if a string is related to a geographic term and which governments and/or public authorities would be applicable.

- ⊙ **Repository of Geographic Names:** Maintain a list of geographic names reflecting terms that governments consider sensitive and/or important as geographic names. Countries could contribute terms to this repository.

- ⊙ **Confusing Similarity**: If an applicant applies for a string that is similar to a geographic term, the applicant should be required to obtain government support/non-objection.

Suggestions for Implementation Guidance (2/2)

- **Online Tool for Applicants**: Develop an online tool for prospective applicants that indicates whether a string is eligible for delegation any applicable rules.

- **Application Research Requirement**: Require that an applicant demonstrate that it has researched whether the applied-for string has a geographic meaning prior to submitting the application.

- **Government Involvement at Contract Renewal**: At the end of the contract period, a government entity may have the option of adding provisions to the contract that specifies conditions rather than there being an assumption that the contract will be renewed.

- **Mediation Related to Support/Non-Objection Letter**: If government support/non-objection is required for certain applications, provide mediation services to assist if the applicant disagrees with the response received by a government or public authority.

Discussion

- What are the group's initial response to these proposals?

- Are there other proposals to add to the list for consideration?

- What can we take from these suggestions as we think more broadly about policy for subsequent procedures?

Looking Ahead: Work Plan and Initial Report

Agenda Item #4

Looking Ahead

- Target date for Initial Report

- Work plan will soon be shared proposing how we will use our time to wrap up discussions and prepare for the Initial Report

- Next steps once WT5 has produced the Initial Report

Any Other Business

Agenda Item #5