

# **WT 5 – Nombres geográficos en la próxima ronda de nuevos gTLDs**

**Olga Cavalli – Co-chair WT 5 Geo Names**

16 de abril 2018

# ToR highlights: Context and Objectives

---

1. The PDP WG Co-Chairs have established a fifth Work Track that focuses exclusively on the topic of geographic names at the top level. It is structured to encourage broad and balanced participation from different parts of the community and includes joint community Work Track leadership. WT5 leadership is coordinated by the PDP WG Co-Chairs.
2. While this PDP is already open for anyone to participate, like all GNSO PDPs, the PDP WG Co-Chairs are seeking to structure conversations about geographic names in a way that
  - (i) leads to predictable, reliable and sustainable subsequent procedures for the submission of new gTLD applications,
  - (ii) is sensitive to the needs and concerns of all community members, and
  - (iii) ensures that participants feel comfortable that the process is sufficiently inclusive.

# ToR highlights: Scope

---

- 1. Work Track 5 will focus on developing proposed recommendations regarding geographic names at the top level, including both ASCII and IDN forms. WT5 will
  - (i) consider what constitutes a geographic name in the specific context of the New gTLD Program;
  - (ii) analyze
    - (a) 2007 GNSO Policy Recommendations on the Introduction of New Generic Top-Level Domains; and
    - (b) relevant rules contained in the 2012 Guidebook, such as the Geographic Names Review procedure, Geographic Names Extended Evaluation, and Objection Procedures; and
  - (iii) take into account previous work related to geographic names that the community may have completed.
- 2. Broader discussions about the remit of SOs and ACs, as well as the allocation of second and third level geographic domains are specifically out of scope for this Work Track.

# ToR highlights: Deliverables

---

- ❑ Develop a work plan, including a timeline for activities and deliverables.
- ❑ Reach consensus on potential policy recommendations and/or implementation guidance regarding geographic names at the top level. Following the process set up for the existing Work Tracks, it will deliver proposed recommendations and related rationale (i.e., Initial Report) to the full Working Group for consideration and possible adoption as PDP WG recommendations.
- ❑ Consensus levels for all recommendations will be determined per the decision-making section established in the ToR.
- ❑ The full Working Group will publish the Initial Report for public comment. All comments received will be passed on to Work Track 5 for due consideration and any changes as appropriate.
- ❑ Work Track 5's Final Report and recommendation will be delivered to the full Working Group

# ToR highlights: Decision-making

---

- ◉ Full consensus: no one speaks against the recommendation
- ◉ Consensus: a position where only a small minority disagrees, but most agree.
- ◉ Strong support but significant opposition: a position where, there are a significant number of those who do not support it.
- ◉ Divergence (also referred to as No Consensus): a position where there isn't strong support for any particular position, but many different points of view.
- ◉ Minority View: refers to a proposal where a small number of people support the recommendation. This can happen in response to a Consensus, Strong support but significant opposition, and No Consensus; or, it can happen in cases where there is neither support nor opposition to a suggestion made by a small number of individuals.

## Definition and treatment of geographical names

<https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1FuPEq0y-cdSUQ1nvhWKhVnG8PLaC2RYXsCpQu91FDqo/edit#gid=358523414>