**Executive Summary**

Deliverables 3: Issues Arising or likely to arise in connection with applying policies to current or proposed strings.

Full text: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/unct-final-08sep12-en.pdf> (pp.25-33)

As a starting point, it should be reiterated that no authoritative list exists for the definition, application or use of country names as TLDs.

**2 letter strings**

* The ISO 3166-1 alpha 2 list determines the eligibility of a two-letter code as a ccTLD and / or IDN ccTLD. This list is not managed by ICANN or the SOs and ACs.
* the ISO 3166-1 alpha 2 code list is not static and subject to changes as new countries/territories are recognized and other cease to exist.
* the Applicant Guidebook (AGB) states: Applied-for gTLD strings in ASCII must be composed of three or more visually distinct characters. Two character ASCII strings are not permitted, to avoid conflicting with current and future country codes based on the ISO 3166-1 standard. (p.66)

**3 letter strings**

* Once again, three-letter country codes are defined by ISO 3166-1 (alpha 3). This is expressly acknowledged in the Applicant Guidebook: A string shall be considered to be a country or territory name\* ‘if it is an alpha-3 code listed in the ISO 3166-1 standard.’ (p.67)
* The alpha 3 list is also dynamic – as it is derived from changes to the alpha 2 code list.
* Historical anomalies exist:
	+ .com is part of the alpha 3 list (Comoros)
	+ some alpha 3 strings are protected in the applicant guidebook for reasons other than their appearance in the ISO list (.nic)
* there is no consistency between ASCII and IDN three-letter strings

**Long and short form names of countries and territories**

* Currently the AGB prohibits applications for country/territory names in “all languages”.
* Although definitions vary, there are approximately 7000 languages and over 250 ccTLDs, – making this rule un-enforceable except through case-by-case examination.
* Different organizations have different definitions of the world’s country and territories – and therefore maintain different lists. Which one is authoritative?
* This results in unpredictability for both applicants and national stakeholders. Outcomes are not consistent, depending upon the language and script used, and current limitations of policy and definition.
* Country short forms and local names add to the overall number and make it difficult to define what makes a country/territory name – e.g. combined Armenia has 10 current and historical names.

\* Applications for strings that are country or territory names will not be approved, as they are not available under the New gTLD Program in this application round (AGB p. 67)