

Discussion document on

ccNSO-GAC IDN Working Group
DRAFT FOR DISCUSSION (Version 2)

ISSUES PAPER

Selection of IDN ccTLDs associated
with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes

June 26, 2007

ccNSO meeting in San Juan

Which 'territories' are eligible for an IDN ccTLD?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- ????? (no discussion has been made on this new question)

Should an IDN ccTLD string be "meaningful"?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- Yes.

<reason>

- What a TLD string represents may be learned in the long term. However, one of the primary motivations for the introduction of IDN ccTLD is to make the ccTLD string "easy-to-understand" for those who use the script of the string. Therefore, an IDN ccTLD string should be meaningful from the beginning of its life.

How many IDN ccTLDs per script per territory?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- One IDN per Territory per script.

<reason>

- If a territory corresponding to a ccTLD has two languages that share a script, and the names of the territory are different in those languages, the territory may want to have two IDN TLD strings in that script.
- However, since the above situation is assumed to be rare, the number of IDN ccTLDs per script is proposed to be one.
- This limitation may be revisited after initial deployment of IDN ccTLDs has occurred.
- Investigation is needed as to whether IDN ccTLD strings with homographs/variants are regarded as one string.

How many scripts per territory?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- One (in the initial phase)

<reason>

- It is not easy to define a definite number of scripts for each territory.
- Limiting the variety of the IDN ccTLDs in the initial phase will help to avoid a delay with non-productive discussion.
- This limitation may be revisited after initial deployment of IDN ccTLDs has occurred.

Number of characters in the string?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- The number of characters should not be pre-defined. It should be decided for each territory.

<reason>

- Limitation of the length of a string may damage the "meaningfulness of the IDN ccTLD" which is one of the primary motivations of introducing IDN ccTLDs.
- Abbreviations are not used on a global basis in all scripts.

Are there any 'rights' attached to a given script?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- No rights should be attached to any script.

<reason>

- Language communities may not be able to be formally defined (especially "predefined") in many cases, at least in a reasonable timeframe.
- Therefore, no formal approval by language groups should be expected in IDN ccTLD introduction.
- A public review/challenge/objection process in approving an IDN ccTLD may allow input from the relevant language community.

Should a list of IDN ccTLD strings be mandated?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- No. Each territory can define the ccTLD string it likes.

<reason>

- Making a mandated list will take a long time.
- An IDN TLD version of a ccTLD is a local matter and its usefulness and meaningfulness is specific to the local community.
- Each territory may choose an appropriate string if it goes through a consultation process with the local community in deciding the string.
- Public review/challenge/objection process may be necessary to find possible issues for the proposed ccTLD strings.

Who picks a string for a territory in the absence of a mandated list?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- Same discussion as the previous Q/A

<reason>

- This issue is closely related to the previous one and the same answer should apply.

What coordination between the different actors?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- No predefined formal global coordination should be mandated.

<reason>

- Formal global coordination cannot be defined in the short term.
- Local coordination will be made through a consultation process in deciding the IDN ccTLD string at least for the first phase launch.
- Public review/challenge/objection process may complement such global coordination at a certain level.
- After the initial phase, the necessity of more formal cooperation will be investigated for further phases.

Who can apply to have the IDN ccTLD delegated or
to be the delegate for that ccTLD
and,
who decides on the delegation?

(Corresponding to 3.a)and 3.b))

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- It should be decided locally.

<reason>

- The simplest way is that in the initial phase the current ccTLD manager is the one that manages the corresponding IDN ccTLD.
- This is because the current ccTLD manager can be assumed to know the demand of registrants and users better than any other organisation does.

Should there be an agreement between ICANN and the IDN ccTLD operator on the operation of the IDN ccTLD string?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- ????? (no discussion has been made on this new question)

Is the operation and management of an IDN ccTLD different to that of an existing ccTLD such that there be specific global technical requirements related to running the IDN ccTLD?

ccNSO IDN WG suggestion:

- No.

<reason>

- There seem to be no other technical requirements / guidelines other than those from IETF and ICANN.