***Comments on “Preliminary issue report on New gTLD subsequent procedures”***

This document is presented by the Governments of Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela, Paraguay and Argentina.

Considering that the lists of names that were not be eligible for new gTLDs in the Applicant Guide Book (AGB) for the first round of new gTLDs were not enough to avoid conflicts, these actions and ideas described in this document should be considered by ICANN staff and those SO and AC involved in the definition of the rules for the next round of new gTLDs.

The objectives of these proposed actions and ideas are:

* Lower uncertainty for the applicant, for countries, regions and communities.
* Prevent / Avoid misuse of names which are relevant for communities, regions, countries, etc.
* Lower the conflicts once the results of new round of new gTLDs will be announced.

**Proposed actions and ideas:**

1. **Find ways of enforcing in the rules of the second round of new gTLDs the GAC principles for new gTLDs agreed in 2007:**

* New gTLDs should respect national sensitivities regarding terms with national, cultural, geographic and religious significance.
* New gTLDs should not prejudice the application of the principle of national sovereignty.
* Internet naming system is a public resource and it must be administered in the public and common interest.
* ICANN should avoid country, territory or place names, and country, territory or regional language or people descriptions, unless in agreement with the relevant governments or public authorities.

1. **Define easier ways for government and communities to express concerns related with community, geographic, religious or other scripts requested as new gTLDs**

Objection processes included in the first round AGB (early warning, GAC advice, independent objector, others) resulted difficult to achieve by many countries and communities, expensive in some cases, and in practice they were limited to those participating in the ICANN community.

1. **Consider as relevant background information a compilation of conflicts during the first round of new gTLDs**

There were sseveral conflicts during the first round of new gTLS, mainly related with the use of geographic and community names which were not included in the lists of the AGB.

Information related with conflicting applications of new gTLDs in the first round should be considered as background information about what should be avoided or enhanced in the second round of new gTLDs.

1. **Best practices for future rounds of new gTLDs**

These are suggested best practices for future rounds of new gTLDs, that were prepared based on the experience of the first round.

These best practices should be “enforceable” in future rounds of new gTLDs:

**- For the applicant:**

* Once a sting is selected to be requested as a new gTLD, a thorough search should be undertaken to determine whether the string is a geographic or a community name, including but not limited to cities, countries, regions, subregions, and communities.
* If the selected string is directly related with a country, city, region, subregion or a community, the relevant authorities or communities related with the selected string should be contacted.
* Previous research and investigation about different meanings of the applied for string, should consider also the notion of protection of a name even if it is being translated to another language.
* In the case of any doubts, the applicant should establish contact previous to the application with the relevant authorities of the country – city – region – subregion-community representatives.

**- For ICANN:**

* Enhance outreach efforts to all countries and regions of the world previous to the next new gTLD round.
* Governments should have an appropriate way to raise concerns about the use of geographic and community names associated with their territories.