



4 August 2017

Dr. Hartmut Glaser
Executive Secretary to the Board of CGI.br
Comitê Gestor da Internet no Brasil

Dear Dr. Hartmut Glaser:

Thank you for your [correspondence](#) of 16 May 2017. We note the Comitê Gestor da Internet no Brasil (CGI.br) resolutions you provided make reference to the current round of new gTLDs and the release of geographic names at the second level as well as policy development regarding future treatment of geographic names including three-letter labels.

As you may recall, the policy development process for the current round of new gTLDs took years of community work that resulted in the Applicant Guidebook and the New gTLD registry agreement which the ICANN organization continues to implement. In particular, with respect to the release of all two-character labels at the second level, the ICANN Board and organization have been engaging with the GAC and various governments on this topic following the [Board resolution of 8 November 2016](#). The ICANN Board and organization have continued this dialogue with the GAC and the concerned governments, including the government of Brazil, to provide added clarity and information related to the process that was undertaken, as well as the measures implemented by the registries prior to the release of two-character country codes at the second level. Additionally, ICANN executives have conducted a number of Webinars and provided publicly available registration information of all relevant two-character labels in various country code top-level domains, including .br. This dialogue included a discussion at a recent GAC session at ICANN59 in Johannesburg and is ongoing.

With respect to country and territory names reserved at the lower levels by Specification 5 Section 4 of the Registry Agreement, the Board adopted a [resolution](#) on 18 May 2017 directing the ICANN organization to grant ICANN approvals for the release of country and territory names at the second-level only to the extent the relevant government has indicated its approval in the GAC's database.

In regard to future treatment of geographic names, we have outlined the various work streams taking place in the ICANN community below. We encourage you to participate and bring forward your points and recommendations to the various community discussions that are taking place.

Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) Geographic Names Working Group

Regarding geographic names in general, we are aware of ongoing work in the GAC, in particular in its Geographic Names Working Group whose objective is to examine the protection of Geographic Names in any Future Expansion of gTLDs and to review and consider any necessary

improvements to the existing protections. We look forward to this work feeding into ICANN community's consideration of the matter.

New gTLD Subsequent Procedures Policy Develop Process Working Group (PDP WG)

The PDP WG's [charter](#) identifies geographic names as a topic for discussion within the PDP. The working group has not yet begun its deliberations on this topic independently. Instead, the PDP WG is seeking to consolidate the various community efforts related to geographic names and collaborate to develop a consensus-driven solution. Towards this purpose, the PDP WG held a pair of [webinars](#) on 25 April, open to any presenters within the community that wished to provide input to the topic. These webinars were intended to serve as the basis for a set of moderated cross community sessions at ICANN59, dedicated to geographic names at the top level. See the ICANN59 schedule here: <https://schedule.icann.org/>.

Cross Community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names (CWG-UCTN)

With respect to the work being done in the CWG-UCTN, the working group was chartered to consider three areas: 2-character top-level domains (TLDs); 3-character TLDs; and full name country and territory name TLDs. The CWG-UCTN has produced an [Interim Report](#) that includes extensive background information on the issue area, a full summary of the group's activities and accomplishments, and a series of recommendations. The recommendations acknowledge that the working group was unable to achieve a harmonized framework given its limited scope and that the CWG should therefore be closed and future efforts be consolidated, coordinated, and collaborative. Their report was [published](#) for public comment and the working group is working to finalize its Final Report for consideration by the Chartering Organizations, the GNSO and ccNSO.

We hope this information is helpful to you. Thank you for your participation in the ICANN multi-stakeholder model, and we look forward to further engagements with you in the ICANN community discussions.

Sincerely,



Dr. Stephen D. Crocker
Chair, ICANN Board of Directors