

Work Track 5 Meeting

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



22 August 2018

Agenda

1

Welcome/Agenda
Review/SOI Updates
(5 mins)

2

Status of Draft
Recommendations on 2-
Letter ASCII Strings and
Country and Territory
Names (15 mins)

3

Non-AGB Terms
(65 mins)

4

AOB
(5 mins)

Welcome/Agenda Review/SOI Updates

Agenda Item #1

Review of Draft Recommendations on 2-Letter ASCII Strings and Country and Territory Names

Agenda Item #2

Revisiting Process

- ⦿ The WT co-leaders heard concerns raised in response to the recently shared work plan, which proposes moving forward with consensus calls in the near future:
 - Timelines are aggressive
 - WT members still have additional perspectives to share and may not be ready to be “locked in” to a set of recommendations for the Initial Report

- ⦿ In response to these concerns, the co-leaders propose an adjusted plan:
 - Defer any consensus calls until after the Initial Report is published and the WT has had an opportunity to review public comment
 - Include preliminary recommendations in the Initial Report based on rough assessment of the group’s perspective, making clear in the report that consensus calls were not taken
 - This approach follows the approach used for the full Working Group’s Initial Report, which is currently out for public comment
 - Advantages: Helps avoid the group feeling “locked into” recommendations before considering public comment and provides more time for discussion in the coming month

Update on Recommendations

- The leadership team has shared a revised set of draft recommendations on two-letter ASCII strings and country and territory names, incorporating feedback that appears to have support from the group.
- Additional feedback on the revised recommendations is encouraged.
- Summary of changes:
 - Revised summary/introductory text at the beginning of the document to clarify purpose and provide context.
 - Clarified in each of the recommendations that the recommendation applies to the top level only.
 - Noting that there is not yet agreement on reservation of translations, removed this element from the recommendations and added it as a question for community input to include in the Initial Report.
 - Revised recommendation 7 to clarify the text following feedback on the mailing list.
 - Pulled the text “the ICANN community may want to consider. . .” out of the recommendations 2-8 and added a pared down recommendation 9 focused only on the scope of work for the PDP.

Non-AGB Terms

Agenda Item #3

Non-AGB Terms

- ⦿ **What is this about?** Some Work Track members have expressed that there should be additional protections in subsequent procedures for certain types of terms that were not included in the 2012 Applicant Guidebook.
- ⦿ **Principles discussed:** The WT has previously discussed several principles that may apply -- the program should allow for the introduction of new gTLDs; predictability should be enhanced for all parties; likelihood of conflicts should be reduced; solutions should be simple.
- ⦿ Initial questions for discussion:
 - What are the problems that we are trying to solve? Please share examples of problems experienced or observed in the 2012 round.
 - Cases referenced from the 2012 round where different parties had different perspectives on whether a term was geographic in nature, resulted in uncertainty and increased costs: .Thai, .GCC, .PersianGulf, .Amazon, and .Patagonia. What are the specific problems here or otherwise (e.g., problem in the AGB itself, adherence to the AGB, lack of clarity around GAC Advice, etc.?)
 - How could these problems be addressed or mitigated in the future?

Non-AGB Terms – Types of Strings

- ⊙ Should additional types of strings have special treatment/rules in the Applicant Guidebook?
 - If so, which ones and on what basis? Can the scope of the category be effectively established and limited? Boundaries of the category?
 - If not, why not?
 - As opposed to preventative restrictions, would any changes to objections, post-delegation mechanisms, contractual requirements, etc. mitigate issues?

- ⊙ Categories previously mentioned:
 - Geographical features, such as mountains and rivers
 - Sub-national and regional terms not included in the 2012 AGB
 - What are some examples of names included in this proposed category?
 - Non-ASCII geographic terms not included in the 2012 AGB
 - What are some examples of names included in this proposed category?
 - **Note: Geographical Indications will be addressed as a separate issue.**

Proposals (1/2)

Given the problems we have identified, what treatment/rules would be proportionate?

Some proposals may be helpful to revisit in the context of discussion on non-AGB terms.

- ⦿ **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.

Proposals (2/2)

- ⦿ **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.
 - ⦿ **Applicant Contact Requirement:** If the applied-for string is a geographic term, the applicant is required to contact/consult with the relevant government authority.
 - ⦿ **Support/Non-Objection Requirement for Non-AGB Terms:** Require letter for additional types of terms.
 - ⦿ **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.
 - ⦿ **Support/Non-Objection Deadline:** In any circumstance where a letter of support/non-objection is required from a relevant government authority, establish a deadline by which the government must respond to the request. If no response is received, this is taken as non-objection.
-

Non-AGB Terms – Geographical Indications

- ⦿ Work Track members have provided several arguments in support of additional rules for Geographic Indications:
 - It is a category with clear boundaries. From this perspective, the boundaries of the category can be clearly documented, therefore increasing predictability.
 - Geographical Indications are an important component of the economy in many regions, and therefore their protection and use affects the livelihoods of many Internet users.
 - Geographic Indications are generally protected by applicable local laws.

- ⦿ Additional perspectives?

- ⦿ This will be discussed further on a future call.

Any Other Business

Agenda Item #4