**Community Responses on 3-character TLD questionnaire**

Staff Summary and Overview v1.1 (15 December 2015) [[1]](#footnote-1)

**Introductory Comment**

The remit of the CWG-UCTN is to develop a policy framework for the use of country and territory names as top-level domains. Staff notes that any such framework ought to rely on key principles, such as consistency, transparency, ease of understanding and use, as well as effectiveness.

**General observations**

* There were some misunderstandings about questions and purpose of questionnaire but this did not impact the understanding of the respondents’ general viewpoints.
* The responses can be categorized into three general camps:

1. No more future 3-characters gTLDs, only 3-character ccTLDs based on ISO-3166-2.
2. Maintain the status quo.
3. Open all top-level 3-character codes, including ISO-3166 list, as gTLDs.

* gTLD stakeholders unanimously favored option three (of the list above), ccTLD providers – including GAC members – are spilt between all three.

**Suggested to-dos for the CWG-UCTN**

* How to develop an underlying set of principles for building a coherent and country and territory names as top-level domains policy framework?
* One starting point might be to define, for the purpose and remit of this Group, key terms such as
  + User confusion
  + Government non-objection
  + ‘ownership’ of 2- and 3-character codes of the ISO (and other) list(s)
* Discuss government/country ‘rights’ to codes v. private entities’ ‘rights’: .fra = France; .fra = Frankfurt Airport – what legal basis is there for either (or neither) to ‘claim’ the code for use as a TLD?
* Are there any components from the draft recommendation on 2-character codes, and its accompanying reasoning and principles, on which those for 3-character codes could be built?

**Viewpoints provided by community feedback on 3-character codes[[2]](#footnote-2)**

*Listed in no particular order*

**Supporting to open all 3-character codes as gTLDs.**

* There is no government sovereignty or recognized legal ownership of ISO list – and so there cannot be a government veto power on allocation as gTLDs.
* RFC-1591 – on which the allocation of 2-character codes as ccTLDs is based – does not refer to 3-letter codes, so there is no precedent of basis for 3-character codes to be as ccTLDs.
* Precedent of .com
* gTLD space was built initially on 3-character codes
* Banning 3 character codes would have impact on e-commerce and consumer choice
* Adding ISO-3 list as ccTLDs would blur the line between ccTLDs (so far exclusively 2 letters and gTLDs (so far 3 letters and more).

**Supporting the status quo**

* Ensures governments can protect ‘their country’s’ ISO code.
* Avoid user confusion of which TLD represents a country and which is generic; i.e. if .no is a ccTLD and .nor is a gTLD.
* Allocation of 3-character codes to ccTLDs might lead to cannibalization of the 2-character ccTLDs.
* Interest of a country’s ccTLD provider and its government (in case of non-objection requirement) are not always aligned.

**Supporting extension of ccTLDs to 3-letter ISO lists**

* Providing new business streams for ccTLD providers, especially smaller ones or those that have so far run ‘their’ ccTLD as an effective gTLD.
* There are other reference lists for country codes - they should/could be taken into consideration when protecting governments and countries.
* Protection of ccTLDs, especially smaller ones, in a continuously growing TLD market, in which gTLDs have an almost unlimited choice of options to offer registrants.

**Outlier positions**

* 3-character codes should not be allocated at all in future rounds - not as ccTLDs nor as gTLDs.

**Graphics representing broad viewpoints on 3-characater questionnaires**
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**Question 4**
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**Question 5**
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**Question 6**

1. This summary is based on the submissions made by ICANN stakeholders and submitted to the CWG-UCTN in response to its questionnaire. This summary is not authoritative and readers are strongly encouraged to also consult the full-length submissions available on the CWG-UCTN Wiki [https://community.icann.org/x/4xXxAg]. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This summary is based on the submissions made by ICANN stakeholders and submitted to the CWG-UCTN in response to its questionnaire. This summary is not authoritative and reader are strongly encouraged to also consult the full-length submissions available on the CWG-UCTN Wiki [https://community.icann.org/x/4xXxAg]. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. ccTLD: 30; GNSO: 4; GAC/ALAC: 5 [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. ccTLD: 30; GNSO: 4; GAC/ALAC: 5 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
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7. ccTLD: 30; GNSO: 4; GAC/ALAC: 5 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
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