Cross-Community WG on Use of Country & Territory Names and Codes as TLDs

Status
ccNSO – 8th March 2016
Annebeth B. Lange

Scope and Work Method

> Representations based on ISO 3166-1

> Review of existing framework

  – AGB Module 2, 2.2.1.4

> Develop definitional framework all stakeholders can agree on

  – If deemed possible, provide detailed advice as to the content of the framework

> Teleconferences every other week

  – F2F meeting at ICANN-meetings

> Not a PDP – only help to reach consensus if possible and give advice

.no

Methodology

> Identification of c & t representations listed on ISO 3166-1

> 2-letter strings

> 3-letter strings

> Country & Territory Names

  - Long form
  - Short form

> Latin letters and IDN

.no

2-letter strings
Preliminary Recommendation

> Discussion "finished" in the WG for now

> Preliminary Recommendation on 2-letter ASCII codes/strings

  - The WG so far recommends that the existing ICANN policy of reserving 2-letter codes for ccTLDs should be maintained, primarily on the basis of
    - the reliance of this policy is consistent with RFC 1591
    - on a standard established and maintained independently of and external to ICANN - it is not ICANN deciding what is a country and what is not - and
    - Widely adopted in contexts outside of the DNS

.no

Ongoing discussion – 3-letter strings

> ## What have been done so far?

- – Developed options
- – Engaged the community through a questionnaire
- – Analyzed the results

> ## Where do we stand now

- – The responses revealed huge difference in opinion
- – Extremes on both sides
- – GNSO responses – allow everything, no restrictions – all 3-letter combinations, on ISO 3166-1 or not should be allowed as gTLDs.
- – ccTLD and GAC responses – very diversified

.no

Questions submitted to community on the different options suggested by the WG

1. In future, should all 3-letter TLDs be reserved as ccTLDs only and be ineligible for use as gTLDs?

   - 62% no, 33% yes, 5% unsure

2. In future, should all 3-letter TLDs be eligible for use as gTLDs as long as they are not in conflict with the existing alpha-3 codes from the ISO 3166-1 list; i.e. the three-character version of the same ISO list that is the basis for current ccTLD allocation?

   - 59% no, 28% yes, 13% unsure

.no

Questions submitted to community on the different options suggested by the WG

3. In future, should 3-letter strings be eligible for use as gTLDs if they are not in conflict with existing alpha-3 codes from the ISO 3166-1 list and they have received documentation of support or non-objection from the relevant government or public authority?

    –   44% no, 23% yes, 33% unsure

4. In future, should there be unrestricted use of 3-letter strings as gTLDs if they are not conflict with any applicable string similarity rules?

    –   54% no, 28% yes, 18% unsure

.no

Questions submitted to community

5. In future, should all IDN 3-letter strings be reserved exclusively as ccTLDs and be ineligible as IDN gTLDs?

   – 31% no, 31% yes, 38% unsure

6. In future, should there be unrestricted use of IDN three-character strings if they are not in conflict with existing TLDs or any applicable string similarity rules?

   – 51% no, 31% yes, 18% unsure

.no

General observations

The responses can be categorized into 3 general camps:

1. No more future 3-letter gTLDs, only 3-letter ccTLDs based on ISO 3166-1

2. Maintain "status quo", cfr. AGB

3. Open all 3-letter codes, including ISO 3166 list as gTLDs

.no

Status quo – a compromise?

> Maintain all currently delegated 3-letter strings from ISO 3166-1 as having "grandfather status"

  – .com and more

> The rest on the ISO 3166-1 given "sovereign status" demanding "support or non-objection", such as capitols etc. are treated today according to AGB

> Any non-delegated and not on the ISO 3166-1 list to be available as gTLDs

.no

The way forward

> F2F meeting in Marrakech

  – Monday 7th March at 11 a.m.

> WG hoping to finish the discussion on 3-letter strings and move on

> Next issue - long and short forms of country and territory names

> Difficult discussions ahead

.no

A possible way forward

> **Starting Point for Possible Policy Framework**

> The Cross Community Working Group recommends that the existing guideline under the Applicant Guidebook with regards to alpha-3 codes on the ISO-3166-1 list evolve to make all alpha-3 codes for application as gTLDs in future new gTLD rounds. Tied to this recommendation are two conditions:

> The legal entity applying for a string comprising an ISO-3166-1 alpha-3 code must not market the TLD in competition with any existing two-character TLDs. This must be contractually enforceable through the relevant registry agreement between the successful applicant and ICANN.

> Existing string similarity rules, and existing rules regarding geographic names shall not be affected by this recommendation.

>

.no

Rational

> Consistent with CWG's 2-letter preliminary recommendation

> Prevents unfair competition between cc-TLD and 3-charcter gTLDs

> Avoids situation where ISO codes of some countries are protected and those of new countries are in operation

> Takes into consideration the precedent of .com

.no

"Please mind the GAC"

Questions?

Annebeth B. Lange

annebeth.lange@uninett.no