

財團法人台灣網路資訊中心因公出國人員報告書 101年3月20日

報告人姓名	劉靜怡	服務單位及職稱	國立台灣大學國家發展研究所教授、TWNIC 監察人
出國期間	March 11-March 18, 2012	出國地點	San Jose, Costa Rica
出國事由	參加 ICANN 第 43 次會議		
<p>報告書內容包含：</p> <p>一、 出國目的</p> <p>二、 會議行程</p> <p>三、 考察、訪問心得</p>			
授權聲明欄	<p>本出國報告書同意貴中心有權重製發行供相關研發目的之公開利用。</p> <p>授權人： 劉靜怡</p>		

附註二、請於授權聲明欄簽章，授權本中心重製發行公開利用。  
附一、請以「A4」大小紙張，橫式編排。出國人員有數人者，依會議類別或考察項目，彙整提出報告。

## 一、出國目的：

此次出國之目的，在於參加 Costa Rica 的 San Jose 舉行的 ICANN 第 43 次會議。尤其是 ccNSO 的 Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names 的會議。

## 二、考察、訪問過程：

本人三月初於美國東岸有其他學術研討會參訪行程，因此於 3 月 11 日晚間自洛杉磯國際機場出發，於 3 月 12 日清晨抵達會議舉辦地，開始參加會議，至 3 月 16 日中午搭機離開，並於 3 月 18 日清晨返抵台灣為止，實際參與會議議程的期間為 3 月 12 日至 3 月 15 日。

本人參加的第一場主要會議，即 ccNSO 的 Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names 在 3 月 12 日早上所舉行的會議，主要是針對目前的進度和草案內容，進行說明和討論，並且說明接下來即將執行的 UNESCO survey 的主要項目及其內容（請參見附件一文件內容和附件二投影片內容）。在 3 月 13 日和 3 月 14 日的行程中，主要則是參與 ccNSO 和 GAC 的相關會議，其中一場是由 ccNSO 的 Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names 進行報告，GAC 某些成員國代表對於 ccNSO 的 Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names 的工作內容與進度，也表達出相當程度的關切。3 月 15 日早上另有一場關於 ccNSO 的 Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names 的非正式會議，確認上述計畫的執行細節。當天下午 ICANN Public Forum 登場，各方代表與參與者對於 ICANN 目前進行中的計畫相關事務，均表達了不少不同的意見。

## 三、考察、訪問心得：

此次 ccNSO 的 Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names 會議所達成的初步結論，是透過進行 UNESCO survey 的方式，找出主要問題，以便確定下個階段的討論焦點，因此，survey 的結果如何，將左右未來政策走向，TWNIC 應該持續密切觀察。同時，在填答和回應 Survey 的過程中，也應該設法徵詢國內不同領域專家的意見，以便提出正確且有利於爭取我國權益的建議。

## 四、建議意見：

ICANN 的 President 改選在即，新任人選及其團隊在 ICANN 政策延續性和開拓性方面，將有哪些作為，值得密切觀察。

## 五、其他相關資料：

請參考附件一與附件二。

## Study Group on the use of Country and Territory Names

### Development of preliminary typology for UNESCO Survey – 28 February 2012

#### Chair's Preface:

Building upon previous drafts, this document aims to refine categories for a UNESCO-distributed survey.

The survey work is an important information-gathering exercise, to assist the Study Group in the completion of the second component of its formal Purpose and Scope. That is, to develop:

*A comprehensive overview of the types and categories of strings currently used or proposed to be used as TLDs that are either associated with Countries and Territories (i.e., by inclusion on the ISO 3166-1 list) and/or are otherwise considered representations of Country and Territory names.*

This draft has been developed to reflect input from Study Group members in advance of, and during, the group's 20 February teleconference.

For methodological purposes it has been suggested that a questionnaire may derive better responses than a simple table or check-box approach – hence, the format of this draft.

It must be noted that a survey of a small sample of UNESCO members is not only a test of the typology and the questions we are asking, but also of the survey process. We are trying to establish whether the “categories” we are identifying are meaningful in the real world, and whether the way we are asking for information makes sense to respondents.

It is, as with any credible study or research project, expansive in nature. It is therefore important to note the purposes of the survey up-front, so as not to raise expectations of respondents, nor concerns among SG members or the broader ICANN community.

That is, we are trying to **understand** the very broad **scope** and **complexity** regarding the representation of C&T names (and map them back to ICANN policies), and **not** define rules about how these names may be used by particular community as a cc/g TLD. It is also important to note that the survey attempts to capture as many C&T representations as possible, and no inference is to be derived that the categories in it necessarily reflect the types and categories of strings that are currently used, or proposed to be used, as TLDs.

Noting the comments received on the 20 February teleconference, it is proposed that the survey, once finalised, could be communicated to the ALAC and other relevant stakeholders, to facilitate circulation to NGOs that have the relevant experience and authority to provide meaningful input. As with UNESCO respondents, the research-only nature of the survey should be noted to all.

## Country and Territory Names Study Group / UNESCO Survey

### *About ICANN*

The Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)<sup>1</sup> is a not-for-profit corporation responsible for the global co-ordination of the Internet's systems of unique identifiers. Most prominently, this includes the coordination of Internet Protocol addresses (the numerical identifiers used by computers and network-enabled devices to navigate the Internet) and the Domain Name System (DNS) that translates IP addresses into human-friendly domain names (such as [www.example.com](http://www.example.com)).

ICANN's responsibilities include ensuring the stability and security of these systems, their technical management, and engagement of the broader Internet community to facilitate consultative, "bottom-up" multi-stakeholder policy development processes.

Reflective of this need for input from all stakeholders, ICANN's structure is divided into a number of Supporting Organizations (SOs) and Advisory Committees (ACs). These constituencies provide advice, guidance and policy input, with the assistance of the segments of the Internet community that they represent.

These are:

- The Address Supporting Organization (ASO) that reviews and develops recommendations on IP address policy.
- The At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC), which represents the interests of individual users of the Internet.
- The country code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO), which represents the managers of over 120 country code Top Level Domains (ccTLDs - e.g. .uk, .za, .de)
- The Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) that provides advice to the ICANN Board reflective of the interests of sovereign governments.
- The Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) that develops policy related to generic Top Level Domains (gTLDs - such as .com, .net and .org)

### *About the Country and Territory Names Study Group*

Within the ICANN environment, country and territory names have traditionally been reflected as ccTLDs: in accordance with a list of two-letter codes maintained by the International Organization for Standardization (ISO)<sup>2</sup>. In addition, in 2009, ICANN approved the introduction of Internationalized Domain Name (IDN) ccTLDs that reflect country names in non-Latin scripts<sup>3</sup>.

However, the way in which country and territory names may be treated as Top Level Domains (both as ccTLDs and gTLDs) is a topic that has been discussed by the ccNSO, GAC, GNSO and the ICANN Board for a number of years.

This discussion intensified when ICANN embarked on the process of introducing of a potentially-unlimited number of new gTLDs.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.icann.org/>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.iso.org/iso/country\\_codes.htm](http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes.htm)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.icann.org/en/topics/idn/fast-track/>

<sup>4</sup> <http://newgtlds.icann.org/en/>

The ICANN Board determined that country and territory names will not be available in the first round of the introduction of new gTLDs, pending consideration of the issue by the ccNSO.

Noting this, at its meeting on 8 December 2010, the ccNSO Council resolved to establish a study group (the C&TNSG) to provide the ccNSO Council, ccTLD community and other interested stakeholders, including the GAC and GNSO Council, an overview of the scope and issues associated with the use of Country and Territory names as TLD strings and the scope and impact of alternative action paths on IDN ccTLD and new gTLD processes.

The group is scheduled to provide its Final Report to the ccNSO Council at the end of 2012.

#### *About this survey*

This survey has been designed to assess the scope and complexity of issues surrounding the use of Country and Territory names as ccTLDs and gTLDs. It is meant to gather data upon which the C&TNSG will base its deliberations. As such, it is useful, for study purposes, to assess the full range of ways in which Country and Territory names are represented.

Aside from existing policies, such as ISO3166-1 list being the basis for ccTLD codes, no inferences should be drawn regarding the development of greater protections based upon the categories and questions within this survey. Such policy expansion is beyond the mandate of the study group.

A number of the questions in this survey are open-ended in nature and seek as many examples of C&T name representations as possible. To assist in the validity and accuracy of this study, it would be appreciated if respondents could provide source information or references that support claims about how, and where, these representations are used. Such references may include official documents or listings by international bodies.

Finally, the Study Group would welcome feedback regarding whether any of the questions or categories in the survey are unclear or confusing, as this will assist in the refinement of the questionnaire for future consultations.

### **1. ISO-3166-1 Alpha 2 code.**

What is your country's / territory's two-letter representation in the International Organization for Standardization's (ISO) 3166-1 list?

#### **Explanation:**

Within ICANN, the ISO-3166-1 alpha2 list is the basis upon which two-letter ccTLD codes are determined (for example, au, .nz and .de). That is, countries and territories cannot randomly nominate the two letter code that will represent their ccTLD.

For further guidance see: [http://www.iso.org/iso/country\\_codes.htm](http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes.htm)

### **2. ISO-3166-1 Alpha 3 code.**

What is your country's / territory's three-letter representation in the International Organization for Standardization's (ISO) 3166-1 list? For further guidance see:

[http://www.iso.org/iso/country\\_codes.htm](http://www.iso.org/iso/country_codes.htm)

#### **Explanation:**

ISO-3166-1 Alpha 3 codes have no formal status in ICANN processes. However, three letter codes (such as AUS, NZL or DEU) are commonly used within a range of activities – for example international sporting events and postal and transport industries, and have been included in this survey to assess the range of possible three-letter representations.

*Noting comments received from SG members expressing concern regarding the inclusion of three-letter codes, 2- and 3-letter codes have been split into two questions.*

*Question 2 is included as a straight-forward, factual information-gathering exercise. Context provided in the survey introduction will make explicit that no rights should be inferred, not expectations raised, in relation to any of the identified categories. It is outside of the scope of the SG to recommend protections for .BRA, or .CAN, .GEO or .CYM (Cayman Islands vs Welsh-based applications through the new gTLD process). The new gTLDs process already has early warning mechanisms and governmental support provisions established to deal with such eventualities – but the inclusion of three-letter codes here adds to the depth of our methodology.*

*In fact, it could lead logically to the observation that three-letter gTLDs have co-existed with the ISO3166-1 alpha 3 list for many years. Colombia, Comoros, .co and .com have survived. The Study group MAY end up noting, in its final report, that this is an established circumstance of note.*

### **3. Other common abbreviations**

Are there any other commonly-used abbreviations for your country or territory? Please provide examples and cite references.

#### **Explanation:**

Although the ISO list is commonly used in a range of activities and industries, it does not capture all abbreviations. For example, Angola is represented as AGO on the ISO list, however ANG is used by the International Olympic Committee (IOC). Further examples can be found at: <http://www.statoids.com/wab.html> and

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List\\_of\\_NATO\\_country\\_codes](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_NATO_country_codes)

*Note: I had previously posed the question: "Can anyone in the Study Group think of a commonly-used abbreviation / acronym that is NOT covered by the above questions?" I have included "other common abbreviations" in this draft because there ARE inconsistencies between the ISO list and other sources.*

*I note the concerns expressed by Avri and Jaap and hope that the contextualisation provided will allay these. However, it was the link Jaap provided that illustrated inconsistencies.*

*Aside from the included example of Angola, I would cite Barbados as another pertinent example – BRB in the ISO list, but BAR within the IOC. I could certainly see a group promoting bars and nightclubs applying for such a new gTLD. How this would / could be handled under current provisions of the Applicant Guidebook, how the rules would be applied, whether the issue of government support is triggered if it is used as a representation of Barbados (particularly if the Government asserts so) may well be the types of issues worth observing in our study.*

*Also, Belize is abbreviated by the IOC as "BIZ" – a point that actually helps strengthen the argument that gTLDs and country abbreviations already co-exist harmoniously.*

#### **4. Official / formal Long-form Name**

What is your country's / territory's "official" long-form name?

This may also be referred to as a "formal" name, "principal" name or "name used for administrative purposes".

If this is in multiple "designated" languages or scripts, please include all examples and cite references.

#### **Explanation:**

This question seeks to identify the commonly-used long-form names of countries or territories. An example is: "Commonwealth of Australia". The survey is attempting to capture the common names, used by – for example - either the majority of the local population or by administrative / governmental bodies.

This may be the name, as codified in national statutes or laws, recognised as "official" or as commonly used in international fora, such as the United Nations.

It is noted that the concepts of "official" names, or "official" languages are not universal. Therefore, additional descriptors have been included for the purpose of clarity.

The term "designated language" has been used previously in ICANN processes in order to avoid confusion<sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/final-progress-report-idn-ccpdp-wg1-29nov10-en.pdf> (note pages 5 and 6 for working definition of "designated language").

*Note: With the addition of these clarifications, do SG members now feel that cases where there may be confusion, or where an "official" language does not exist, are now adequately covered / explained? The reference to "designated language", as used by IDN ccPDP WG1 may confuse, but at least provides consistency of terminology across processes.*

*I have removed reference to "conventional" name, as many lists use the term to describe the country name in English (captured in Q6 anyway) as distinct from "local name" (which we are seeking here).*

### **5. Official / formal short-form Name**

What is your country's / territory's "official" short-form name?

This may also be referred to as a "formal" name, "principal" name or "name used for administrative purposes".

If this is in multiple "designated" languages or scripts, please include all examples and cite references.

#### **Explanation:**

This question seeks to identify the commonly-used short-form names of countries or territories. An example is: "Australia".

### **6. Country and territory name in the six official languages of the UN.**

Please provide both the long and short form name of your country / territory in the six official languages of the United Nations - Arabic, Chinese (Mandarin), English, French, Russian, Spanish.

#### **Explanation:**

Given the borderless, internationalised nature of the Internet and Domain Name System, representations of country and territory names are often found in languages and scripts other than those used within that territory. For the purposes of developing a thorough evidentiary basis for its deliberations, the Study Group would seek to gather as many of these representations as possible. The six official languages of the UN are being used as a starting point and guidance from the UNGEEN may prove useful to respondents.

It should be noted that, beyond these six languages, a more comprehensive list of representations is sought in the next question.

### **7. Names of other respondents in official / administrative language/s**

Please provide the long and short form names of the other participants in this survey (listed below <to be inserted>) in your designated language/s.

#### **Explanation:**



This survey has been circulated to a small sample of UN Member States. Building upon Question 6, this question aims to capture as significant a number of representations of country and territory names as possible.

Please refer to explanation for Q4 for a definition of “designated language/s”.

### **8. Examples of other commonly used or local names**

Please provide examples of any other commonly-used or local representations of your country / territory name. For example: “Holland”. If possible, please provide references or citations for these representations.

### **9. Examples of country / territory name in minority or indigenous languages**

Please provide examples of indigenous or minority representations of your country / territory name. If possible, please provide references or citations for these representations.

#### **Explanation:**

This question seeks to identify representations of country names that are used by local populations. The Study Group is seeking to gather responses that reflect the languages of local or regional communities, or significant migrant populations. These names may also be “official” names – such as Aotearoa in New Zealand’s Maori language, or names without official name status.

### **10. Examples of name in non-official languages**

Please provide examples of any other representations of your country / territory name that may not have been captured by the above categories. If possible, please provide explanation and references or citations for these representations.

#### **Explanation:**

This is a “catch all” question that seeks to identify representations of country names that have not been identified in any of the previous responses.

*I am attempting to make this as open-ended and clear as possible. That is, any other representations of Country Names that can be submitted that have possibly not been captured elsewhere. This is not meant to be “open slather”, generating an extensive, unverified list of names – hence the importance of the need for references and citations.*

## **QUESTIONS / CATEGORIES NOT INCLUDED IN THIS DRAFT**

### **1. Historical names:**

Noted from SG discussions that this is a sensitive, politicised area, with dubious immediate benefit to our methodology. In addition, appropriate time-frames are difficult to identify. Proposed to include both historical and "possible future names" as a general discussion in the SG's Final Report.

### **2. Primary / simplex names:**

See "conventional short-form name". Omitted as it is conceptually difficult to explain in a survey environment.

### **3. Composite Name**

This usually refers to a composition of a generic term and a specific element (I used Mount Cook as an example). This is more commonly found as a construct for the names of locations and landmarks. The example Bart gave - Koninkrijk der Nederlanden - would be captured elsewhere in responses.

### **4. Local name**

Merged into Q8.

### **10. Exonyms**

Difficult to explain - name in languages not used in that territory. Captured under Q10.

# Proposed process for the preparation of survey and typology on use of country and territory names for UNESCO's action

