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

Status
ICANN Dublin, 19th October 2015

Scope and Work Method

> ISO 3166-1

> Review of existing framework

- AGB Module 2, 2.2.1.4

> Goal

- Develop framework all stakeholders can agree on
- If possible

> Teleconferences every other week

- F2F meeting at ICANN-meetings

.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

> Discussion tentatively "finished" in the WG

  – Moved on to the next step

> 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 and
    – Widely adopted in contexts outside of the DNS

.no

Present discussion – 3-letter strings

> ## What have been done?

  – Developed options in the WG
  – Engaging the community – letters to chairs of SO/ACs
  – Questionnaire

> ## What can you do?

  – Participate actively in the WG -
  – Encourage your stakeholder group to answer
    – What would be the advantage or disadvantage of the different policies suggested?
    – What would be a reasonable solution that all could live with?
    – What would you prefer?

.no

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

1. In future, should all three-character top-level domains be reserved as ccTLDs only and be ineligible for use as gTLDs?

2. In future, should all three-character top-level domains 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?

.no

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

3. In future, should three-character 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?

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

.no

Questions submitted to community

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

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?

7. Do you have any addition comments that may help the CWG-UCTN in its discussion on three-character strings as top-level domains?

.no

Pitfalls - Contradictons

> Different working methods in the communities

–   Time consuming

> The GAC situation

> Different priorities

> Competition issues

> Cementation from the past?

–   .com (Comores) – on the ISO 3166
–   .xyz – not on the ISO list, but 3-letters
–   AGB-rules: Not available today if on ISO-list

> Country representations above capitols/cities?

.no

Questions?