CWG on the use of country & territory names as TLDs (CWG UCTN)

Presentation in Hyderabad, ICANN 57

Annebeth B. Lange, co-chair for ccNSO

1. Scope and Work Method

- Only discussing TLDs at <u>first</u> level
- ☐ Codes and names based on ISO 3166-1
- ☐ Review existing framework
 - ☐ AGB Module 2, 2.2.1.4
- ☐ Could the CWG manage to develop a framework all could agree on?
- ☐ Teleconferences weekly and F2F meetings
- □ Not a PDP only help to reach consensus if possible and give advice to a later PDP



2. Background: ccNSO Study Group

- ☐ Create a ccWG with mandate to:
 - 1. Assess feasibility of a harmonized framework
 - 2. If feasible develop such a framework
- ☐ Letter to the ICANN Board from ccNSO Council to exclude country & territory names from second and consecutive rounds until harmonized framework would be developed



3. Current status of WG

☐ Interim conclusions 2-letter strings The WG 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, consistent with RFC 1591, on a standard established and maintained independently of and external to ICANN and widely adopted in contexts outside of the DNS (ISO 3166-1) ICANN does not decide what is a country and what is not ☐ No conclusion 3-letter codes Based on discussions, survey results Disagreement even cuts across our own community ☐ No discussion so far on country & territory names Short form Long form



4. No harmonized framework feasible

In and across Stakeholdergroups divergent views		
	Some ccTLDs issue with 3-letter codes as gTLDs others none Same in GAC.	
to	For some mandate harmonized framework to C&T is too limited: extended mandate needed include other geographical names	
Clo	Clearer link with policy development processes	
	Should c & t names as TLDs be treated in GNSO PDP? Should ccNSO have a PDP with this issue? Or, should we have a CWG with extended mandate with clear link into PDP?	



5. Suggestions presented during the discussions in the WG

- ☐ Status quo no solution
- ☐ Allow all codes and names as gTLDs with no restrictions
- ☐ 3-letter codes on ISO 3166 treated as ccTLDs
- ☐ 3-letter codes on ISO 3166 allowed as gTLDs
 - With some restrictions, e.g. support or non-objection from relevant public authority/ccTLD



6. Next steps

- Decide how the discussion should go forward
- ☐ Should the last recommendation from Study Group anyway be activated?
 - Should the Council now send the Letter to the ICANN Board from ccNSO Council to exclude country & territory names until harmonized framework has been developed?
- ☐ Where should the discussion take place?
 - Discussion on Geographic names + country & territory names initially part of Subsequent Procedures in GNSO
 - Overlap with IDN ccTLD definition meaningful representation may cause issues and overlap



Questions?

Annebeth B. Lange

Annebeth.lange@uninett.no