

1 **Overview discussion on Exceptionally reserved code elements**

2  
3 **Staff summary & proposal**

4  
5 ISO 3166 section 7.5.4 Exceptionally reserved code elements states:

6  
7 *Code elements may be reserved, in exceptional cases, for country names*  
8 *which the ISO 3166/MA has decided not to include in this part of ISO*  
9 *3166, but for which an interchange requirement exists. Before such code*  
10 *elements are reserved, advice from the relevant authority must be*  
11 *sought.*

12 [...]

13  
14 Based on discussions the following approach appears to be emerging:

- 15 - Some code elements corresponding to some ccTLDs are reserved by the  
16 ISO3166/MA and included in list of exceptionally reserved code elements. These  
17 code elements may be removed from that list by the ISO 3166/MA (paraphrasing  
18 section 7.5.4 of the Standard).
- 19 - Such removal should trigger the retirement process for the ccTLD, however  
20 triggering the removal process shall be decided on a case by case basis by IFO, taking  
21 into account all relevant circumstances of the case. For example, a code element is  
22 removed and ceases to be exceptionally reserved, but is assigned and associated  
23 with the same Country Name to which it refers in the list of exceptionally reserved  
24 code elements (for example the GE and JJ cases).

25  
26 -----

27 **Overview of discussion**

28  
29 Eberhard 30 July 2019

30  
31 So something like

32  
33 If a 2-letter code element changes from exceptionally reserved to  
34 transitionally reserved the corresponding ccTLD shall be retired  
35 using a process that is a close to the letter and spirit of this  
36 policy as can be negotiated between the ccTLD Manager and the IFO.

37  
38 would work for me.

39  
40 Transitionally reserved is where code elements go to die :-)-O, and using  
41 something like this will allow for cases, of let's say AC, being  
42 "properly" assigned.

43  
44  
45  
46 On 29/07/2019 19:14, Nick Wenban-Smith wrote:

47 > Thanks Peter, Eberhard

48 >  
49 > I suppose (and if I recall right this is what I said in Marrakech):  
50 >  
51 > 1. Intellectually to bring the UK, SU, EU, AC ccTLDs within the  
52 > retirement policy there needs to be an analogous triggering event as  
53 > the removal from the 3166 list is for alpha 2 codes which correspond  
54 > to ccTLDs. My suggestion was that the trigger should be the ceasing  
55 > of UK etc as being classified as 'exceptionally reserved', assuming  
56 > that we can articulate such an event accurately and clearly in the  
57 > policy doc  
58 >  
59 > 2. In the alternative there is the option of making these exceptions  
60 > to the policy to be dealt with on a case by case basis. Whilst it's  
61 > not my preference, if these edge cases are not a good basis to draw up  
62 > policy, then that's obviously an option (and no worse than where we  
63 > currently are 😊)  
64 >  
65 > So without getting into the rights and wrongs of how the exceptional  
66 > reservations work within the ISO standard (not my specialism), that's  
67 > my view on things.  
68 >  
69 > Best wishes  
70 > Nick  
71  
72 Eberhard  
73 My copy of the standard reads  
74  
75 [...]  
76 7.5.4 Exceptional reserved code elements  
77  
78 Code elements may be reserved, in exceptional cases, for country names  
79 which the ISO 3166/MA has decided not to include in this part of ISO  
80 3166, but for which an interchange requirement exists. Before such code  
81 elements are reserved, advice from the relevant authority must be  
82 sought.  
83 [...]  
84  
85 so, I understand this as Nick does.  
86  
87 > Further, there might be changes that would not involve specific  
88 > governments, e.g. abandoning the "exceptionally reserved" list.  
89  
90 I believe the exact opposite to be true.  
91  
92 > Even further, the timeline available for retirement is based on our  
93 > assumption that any code removed from the standard will not be  
94 > re-assigned for 50 years (internally called "transitional

95 > reserved"). We do not know how codes that are currently  
96 > "exceptionally reserved" would be treated.  
97  
98 Besides that we could maybe ask Jaap to inquire what the current feeling  
99 there is, I would assume that they will proceed on the same principles.  
100  
101 > That said, I do not believe we should base any policy work on  
102 > "exceptionally reserved" and therefore we need to recognize that there  
103 > are a few ccTLDs where the trigger event considered in the draft  
104 > policy cannot apply.  
105  
106 I am not very keen on making excptions from the exceptions...  
107  
108 > Those cases need to be dealt with individually, case-by-case, in the  
109 > spirit of the policy and not putting undue burden on either those  
110 > ccTLDs (manager, community, ...) nor on any other party (that  
111 > includes a potential future user of that code point).  
112  
113 But if we could refine this so that wherever possible the letter and  
114 spirit of the policy should be abided, and/or its principles should be  
115 guiding, I can live with it.  
116  
117 greetings, el  
118  
119 Dear Nick, all,  
120  
121 On Tue, Jul 23, 2019 at 01:18:29PM +0000, Nick Wenban-Smith wrote:  
122 > How about this - I have attached as a redline for ease  
123  
124 while I'm reluctant to comment on or adjust others' obeservations,  
125 I'd like to suggest that  
126  
127       Noted that UK has been classified as exceptionally reserved  
128       within the standard at the request of UK government, so  
129       assumes that if the status were to change the UK government  
130       will be involved.  
131  
132 is not technically completely correct, because "exceptionally reserved"  
133 is not "within the standard". Further, there might be changes that would  
134 not involve specific governments, e.g. abandoning the "exceptionally reserved"  
135 list. Even further, the timeline available for retirement is based on our  
136 assumption that any code removed from the standard will not be re-assigned  
137 for 50 years (internally called "transitionally reserved"). We do not  
138 know how codes that are currently "exceptionally reserved" would be treated.  
139  
140 That said, I do not believe we should base any policy work on "exceptionally reserved"  
141 and therefore we need to recognize that there are a few ccTLDs where the

142 trigger event considered in the draft policy cannot apply. Those cases need to  
143 be dealt with individually, case-by-case, in the spirit of the policy and  
144 not putting undue burden on either those ccTLDs (manager, community, ...)  
145 nor on any other party (that includes a potential future user of that code point).  
146  
147 -Peter  
148  
149 Nick,  
150  
151 I like your first paragraph. After removing the orangelineing :-)-O  
152  
153 We are in agreement, external event triggers ISO removal (from either  
154 list), which has as one of the consequences retirement of the  
155 corresponding ccTLD.  
156  
157 I personally don't like individualizing exceptions so the second  
158 paragraph can go :-)-O  
159  
160 greetings, el  
161  
162 On 23/07/2019 15:18, Nick Wenban-Smith wrote:  
163 > How about this - I have attached as a redline for ease  
164 >  
165 > N  
166 >  
167 > -----Original Message-----  
168 > From: Ccpdp-ret <[ccpdp-ret-bounces@icann.org](mailto:ccpdp-ret-bounces@icann.org)> On Behalf Of Dr Eberhard W Lisse  
169 > Sent: 23 July 2019 13:30  
170 > Cc: [ccpdp-ret@icann.org](mailto:ccpdp-ret@icann.org)  
171 > Subject: Re: [Ccpdp-ret] ccPDP-RET: Overview of discussion & presentation Exceptionally  
172 Reserved Code elements Marrakesh in person meeting  
173 >  
174 > My view on this (even though that Terminology is Important (TM)) is:  
175 >  
176 > If the ISO code element UK were removed from the exceptionally  
177 > reserved list the cctLD .UK should be retired.  
178 >  
179 > If the ISO code element PR were removed from the assigned list the  
180 > cctLD .PR should be retired.  
181 >  
182 > I don't see the difference with regards to the ccTLDs here.  
183 >  
184  
185 Nick  
186 Noted that UK has been classified as exceptionally reserved within the standard at the  
187 request of UK government, so assumes that if the status were to change the UK government  
188 will be involved. So from practical point of view, if UK ceases to be classified as exceptionally

189 reserved, then that could be treated as a triggering event for retirement in a similar fashion  
190 as for when assigned codes are removed from the standard.

191  
192 Maybe alternative approach, treat them as what they are: exceptions and on a case-case by  
193 case basis at the point that they cease to be classified as exceptionally reserved under the  
194 standard.

195  
196 -----Original Message-----

197 From: Ccpdp-ret <[ccpdp-ret-bounces@icann.org](mailto:ccpdp-ret-bounces@icann.org)> On Behalf Of Dr Eberhard W Lisse

198 Sent: 23 July 2019 13:30

199 Cc: [ccpdp-ret@icann.org](mailto:ccpdp-ret@icann.org)

200 Subject: Re: [Ccpdp-ret] ccPDP-RET: Overview of discussion & presentation Exceptionally  
201 Reserved Code elements Marrakesh in person meeting

202

203 My view on this (even though that Terminology is Important (TM)) is:

204

205 If the ISO code element UK were removed from the exceptionally  
206 reserved list the cctLD .UK should be retired.

207

208 If the ISO code element PR were removed from the assigned list the  
209 cctLD .PR should be retired.

210

211 I don't see the difference with regards to the ccTLDs here.

212

213 el

214

215 On 23/07/2019 14:23, Jaap Akkerhuis wrote:

216 > Bart Boswinkel writes:

217 >

218 > >

219 > > Could you be so kind to check whether the summary of your >

220 > presentations / observations at the in person meeting in Marrakesh >

221 > is correct?

222 >

223 > I saw one small minor mistake but let it slide. But now, since you

224 > ask, the last sentence of Nicks observation is kind of incorrect.

225 >

226 > >

227 > > Observation Nick Wenban-Smith

228 > >

229 > > Noted that UK is included at request of UK government, so >

230 > assumes that if to be removed the UK government will be involved. So

231 > > from practical point of view, when UK gets removed, should could be

232 > > treated in similar fashion as assigned codes.

233 > >

234 > > Maybe alternative approach, treat them as what they are: exceptions

235 >

236 > I think it is better to say: "exceptional reservations".  
237 >  
238 > > and on a case-case by case basis as soon as removed from the >  
239 > standard.  
240 > >  
241 >  
242 > The exceptions are not part of the standard, the standard only says  
243 > that the MA some codes can be reserved. That is why you see on the OBP  
244 > there is the different code types listed: "Official assigned" and  
245 > "other Codes". And under the last one the various exceptional codes  
246 > are listed.  
247 >  
248 > So, to be utterly correct, the last three words should be replaced  
249 > with "from the list of reservations" or something like that.  
250 >  
251 > Regards,  
252 >  
253 > jaap  
254 >  
255 > PS. I cannot help noticing that there is a general rule in Nicks  
256 > observation. One only deals with the case by case basis after the  
257 > exceptional reservation is taken way.  
258 >[...]  
259  
260 Original note Bart Boswinkel 18 July 2019  
261 Overview of discussion & presentation Exceptionally Reserved Code elements  
262  
263 Summary of Presentation Jaap Akkerhuis  
264  
265 General: Expect by Montreal meeting standard to be replaced by new version.  
266 Small overhaul of different parts of the standard. In future (post 2020) new  
267 round of review, could be major one, including merge of the different parts.  
268 Terminology may change and reference inclusion of code elements for WIPO /  
269 road signs may disappear In general current rules are subject to discussion and  
270 possible change in future, including rules with respect to different categories  
271 of not officially assigned codes, like the exceptionally reserved code elements  
272  
273  
274 Exceptionally Reserved Codes  
275 As a reminder: Exceptionally reserved is an exception to the rules; it does not  
276 fit anywhere.  
277  
278 Currently 12 exceptionally reserved code elements listed: see OBP  
279 (<https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#sear>).

280 Each of these codes reserved for specific reason and/or by entity which is  
281 listed in OBP. Only 4 out of 12 are used as ccTLD (AC, EU, SU, and UK).

282

283 Observation Nick Wenban-Smith

284 Noted that UK is included at request of UK government, so assumes that if  
285 to be removed the UK government will be involved. So from practical point of  
286 view, when UK gets removed, should be treated in similar fashion as  
287 assigned codes.

288

289 Maybe alternative approach, treat them as what they are: exceptions and on a  
290 case-by-case basis as soon as removed from the standard.

291

292