Overview discussion on Exceptionally reserved code elements

Update Staff summary & proposal

ISO 3166 section 7.5.4 Exceptionally reserved code elements states:

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

Based on discussions the following approach appears to be emerging:
- Some code elements corresponding to some ccTLDs are reserved by the ISO3166/MA and included in list of exceptionally reserved code elements. These code elements may be removed from that list by the ISO 3166/MA (paraphrasing section 7.5.4 of the Standard).
- Such removal should trigger the retirement process for the ccTLD, however triggering the removal process shall be decided on a case by case basis by IFO, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case. For example, if a code element is removed and ceases to be exceptionally reserved, but is assigned and associated with the same Country Name to which it refers in the list of exceptionally reserved code elements **the ccTLD should not be retired** (BB: emphasis added) (the GE and JJ cases).
-

Assigned and associated: "Assigned" refers to assigning code elements as defined in section 7.1 (a) and as "officially assigned" in the ISO On-Line Browsing Platform to distinguish it from "reserved" as defined through section 7.5.4

Overview of discussion
Eberhard Lisse 1 August

it meant that if AC for example was moved from Exceptionally Reserved to Assigned, no IFO intervention is required.

If AC was assigned to Cis-Antarctica, or EU to Eureka while .AC or .EU were delegated, I would agree we had a biiiiig problem.

I think we should not move off to purpose but stay straight on the lists.

Kim Davies (1 August)
I was not referring just to moving from one reserved state to another, I believe it is more pervasive than that. I also think it would leave a gap to not consider this situation.

To provide a more tangible example:

50   If "EU" moved from being reserved for "European Union", to be assigned for a speculative
51   country of "Eureka".
52
53   Eberhard indicated he though such an event "must not trigger any intervention by IFO", but
54   in my view this case appears very similar to retirement. The underlying basis upon which the
55   former delegation was made has been extinguished in much the same way as the more
56   typical retirement scenario. The code's purpose has changed and therefore its status should
57   be re-evaluated in light of its newly designated purpose, compared to the purpose against
58   which the original delegation in the root was assessed.
59
60   **Bart Boswinkel 1 August**
61   I interpret what you say as "reserved by the MA" for purpose A and then "reserved by the
62   MA" for purpose B i.e. the code element for a country name was reserved for
63   specific interchange requirement A and then the interchange requirement changes and
64   hence the reason the MA keeps the code element reserved. Whether a change of an
65   existing interchange requirement should trigger the retirement of a ccTLD is a question for
66   the group.
67
68   To further clarify, I used "assigned" to refer to assigning code elements as defined in section
69   7.1 (a) and as "officially assigned" in the ISO On-Line Browsing Platform to distinguish it
70   from "reserved" as defined through section 7.5.4 .
71
72   **Eberhard Lisse 1 August 2019**
73   I would propose that we are not in the business of deciding what a purpose is :-)-O
74
75   **Nick Wenban-Smith 31 July 2019**
76   That makes sense to me provided we can capture that essence in terms of policy wording
77
78   One question which was previously asked was what would happen around the purposes of
79   exceptional reservation changing (eg. EU not being reserved for all purposes) or if the MA
80   ceases to have an exceptional reservations categorisation at all …? Difficult to legislate here,
81   ditto if the standard were to be abandoned entirely at some future point in time.
82
83   I guess that's part of the benefit/ disadvantage of making a policy entirely around some
84   third party standard, but then the whole delegation and indeed basis for ccTLDs would have
85   to be revisited if the 3166 were to be abolished and disappear in a puff of smoke.
86
87   **Kim Davies, 31 July 2019**
88   I do not understand the second sentence of the second bullet point. I think you
89   want to capture a "move" from exceptionally reserved to assigned, which in my view
90   must not trigger any intervention by IFO.
91
92   What if the change of status (whatever it may be) is for a different purpose? i.e. It could be
93   exceptionally reserved for purpose "A", and then assigned for purpose "B"; or vice versa.
94
95
96

97 **Bart Boswinkel 31 July**
98 The purpose is exactly that:
99 To clarify that point:
100 · Some code elements corresponding to some ccTLDs are reserved by the
101 ISO3166/MA and included in list of exceptionally reserved code elements. These
102 code elements may be removed from that list by the ISO 3166/MA (paraphrasing
103 section 7.5.4 of the Standard).
104 · Such removal should trigger the retirement process for the ccTLD, however
105 triggering the removal process shall be decided on a case by case basis by IFO,
106 taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case. For example, if a code
107 element is removed and ceases to be exceptionally reserved, but is assigned and
108 associated with the same Country Name to which it refers in the list of exceptionally
109 reserved code elements **the ccTLD should not be retired** (BB: emphasis added) (the
110 GE and JJ cases).
111
112
113 **Eberhard Lisse, 31 July**
114
115 I do not understand the second sentence of the second bullet point. I think you want to
116 capture a "move" from exceptionally reserved to assigned, which in my view must not
117 trigger any intervention by IFO.
118
119
120 **Eberhard Lisse 30 July 2019**
121
122 So something like
123
124   If a 2-letter code element changes from exceptionally reserved to
125   transitionally reserved the corresponding ccTLD shall be retired
126   using a process that is a close to the letter and spirit of this
127   policy as can be negotiated between the ccTLD Manager and the IFO.
128
129 would work for me.
130
131 Transitionally reserved is where code elements go to die :-)-O, and using
132 something like this will allow for cases, of let's say AC, being
133 "properly" assigned.
134
135
136
137 **Nick Wenban-Smith 29 July**
138 > Thanks Peter, Eberhard
139 >
140 > I suppose (and if I recall right this is what I said in Marrakech):
141 >
142 > 1. Intellectually to bring the UK, SU, EU, AC ccTLDs within the
143 > retirement policy there needs to be an analogous triggering event as

144 > the removal from the 3166 list is for alpha 2 codes which correspond
145 > to ccTLDs. My suggestion was that the trigger should be the ceasing
146 > of UK etc as being classified as 'exceptionally reserved', assuming
147 > that we can articulate such an event accurately and clearly in the
148 > policy doc
149 >
150 > 2. In the alternative there is the option of making these exceptions
151 > to the policy to be dealt with on a case by case basis. Whilst it's
152 > not my preference, if these edge cases are not a good basis to draw up
153 > policy, then that's obviously an option (and no worse than where we
154 > currently are ☺)
155 >
156 > So without getting into the rights and wrongs of how the exceptional
157 > reservations work within the ISO standard (not my specialism), that's
158 > my view on things.
159 >
160 > Best wishes
161 > Nick
162
163 **Eberhard Lisse**
164 My copy of the standard reads
165
166 [...]
167 7.5.4 Exceptional reserved code elements
168
169 Code elements may be reserved, in exceptional cases, for country names
170 which the ISO 3166/MA has decided not to include in this part of ISO
171 3166, but for which an interchange requirement exists. Before such code
172 elements are reserved, advice from the relevant authority must be
173 sought.
174 [...]
175
176 so, I understand this as Nick does.
177
178 > Further, there might be changes thet would not involve specific
179 > governments, e.g. abandoning the "exceptionally reserved" list.
180
181 I believe the exact opposite to be true.
182
183 > Even further, the timeline available for retirement is based on our
184 > assumption that any code removed from the standard will not be
185 > re-assigned for 50 years (internally called "transitionall
186 > reserved"). We do not know how codes that are currently
187 > "exceptionally reserved" would be treated.
188
189 Besides that we could maybe ask Jaap to inquire what the current feeling
190 there is, I would assume that they will proceed on the same principles.

191
192   > That said, I do not believe we should base any policy work on
193   > "exceptionally reserved" and therefore we need to recognize that there
194   > are a few ccTLDs where the trigger event considered in the draft
195   > policy cannot apply.
196
197   I am not very keen on making exceptions from the exceptions...
198
199   > Those cases need to be dealt with individually, case-by-case, in the
200   > spirit of the policy and not putting undue burden on either those
201   > ccTLDs (manager, community, ...) nor on any other party (that
202   > includes a potential future user of that code point).
203
204   But if we could refine this so that wherever possible the letter and
205   spirit of the policy should be abided, and/or its principles should be
206   guiding, I can live with it.
207
208   greetings, el
209
210
211   **Peter Koch**
212   Nick Wenban-Smith wrote:
213   > How about this - I have attached as a redline for ease
214
215   while I'm reluctant to comment on or adjust others' obeservations,
216   I'd like to suggest that
217
218   Noted that UK has been classified as exceptionally reserved
219   within the standard at the request of UK government, so
220   assumes that if the status were to change the UK government
221   will be involved.
222
223   is not technically completely correct, because "exceptionally reserved"
224   is not "within the standard". Further, there might be changes thet would
225   not involve specific governments, e.g. abandoning the "exceptionally reserved"
226   list. Even further, the timeline available for retirement is based on our
227   assumption that any code removed from the standard will not be re-assigned
228   for 50 years (internally called "transitionally reserved"). We do not
229   know how codes that are currently "exceptionally reserved" would be treated.
230
231   That said, I do not believe we should base any policy work on "exceptionally reserved"
232   and therefore we need to recognize that there are a few ccTLDs where the
233   trigger event considered in the draft policy cannot apply. Those cases need to
234   be dealt with individually, case-by-case, in the spirit of the policy and
235   not putting undue burden on either those ccTLDs (manager, community, ...)
236   nor on any other party (that includes a potential future user of that code point).
237

238   -Peter
239
240   **Eberhard Lisse**
241   Nick,
242
243   I like your first paragraph. After removing the orangelining :-)-O
244
245   We are in agreement, external event triggers ISO removal (from either
246   list), which has as one of the consequences retirement of the
247   corresponding ccTLD.
248
249   I personally don't like individualizing exceptions so the second
250   paragraph can go :-)-O
251
252   greetings, el
253
254   On 23/07/2019 15:18, Nick Wenban-Smith wrote:
255   > How about this - I have attached as a redline for ease
256   >
257   > N
258   >
259   > -----Original Message-----
260   **Eberhard W Liss 23 July 2019 13:30**
261   > Cc: ccpdp-ret@icann.org
262   > Subject: Re: [Ccpdp-ret] ccPDP-RET: Overview of discussion & presentation Exceptionally
263   Reserved Code elements Marrakesh in person meeting
264   >
265   > My view on this (even though that Terminology is Important (TM)) is:
266   >
267   >   If the ISO code element UK were removed from the exceptionally
268   >   reserved list the cctLD .UK should be retired.
269   >
270   >   If the ISO code element PR were removed from the assigned list the
271   >   cctLD .PR should be retired.
272   >
273   > I don't see the difference with regards to the ccTLDs here.
274   >
275
276   Nick
277   Noted that UK has been classified as exceptionally reserved within the standard at the
278   request of UK government, so assumes that if the status were to change the UK government
279   will be involved. So from practical point of view, if UK ceases to be classified as exceptionally
280   reserved, then that could be treated as a triggering event for retirement in a similar fashion
281   as for when assigned codes are removed from the standard.
282

283 Maybe alternative approach, treat them as what they are: exceptions and on a case-case by
284 case basis at the point that they cease to be classified as exceptionally reserved under the
285 standard.
286
287 -----Original Message-----
288 **Behalf Of Dr Eberhard W Lisse**
289 Sent: 23 July 2019 13:30
290 Cc: ccpdp-ret@icann.org
291 Subject: Re: [Ccpdp-ret] ccPDP-RET: Overview of discussion & presentation Exceptionally
292 Reserved Code elements Marrakesh in person meeting
293
294 My view on this (even though that Terminology is Important (TM)) is:
295
296   If the ISO code element UK were removed from the exceptionally
297   reserved list the cctLD .UK should be retired.
298
299   If the ISO code element PR were removed from the assigned list the
300   cctLD .PR should be retired.
301
302 I don't see the difference with regards to the ccTLDs here.
303
304 el
305
306 **On 23/07/2019 14:23, Jaap Akkerhuis wrote:**
307 > Bart Boswinkel writes:
308 >
309 > >
310 > > Could you be so kind to check whether the summary of your >
311 > presentations / observations at the in person meeting in Marrakesh >
312 > is correct?
313 >
314 > I saw one small minor mistake but let it slide. But now, since you
315 > ask, the last sentence of Nicks observation is kind of incorrect.
316 >
317 > >
318 > > Observation Nick Wenban-Smith
319 > >
320 > > Noted that UK is in included at request of UK government, so >
321 > assumes that if to be removed the UK government will be involved. So
322 > > from practical point of view, when UK gets removed, should could be
323 > > treated in similar fashion as assigned codes.
324 > >
325 > > Maybe alternative approach, treat them as what they are: exceptions
326 >
327 > I think it is better to say: "exceptional reservations".
328 >
329 > > and on a case-case by case basis as soon as removed from the >

330 > standard.
331 > >
332 >
333 > The exceptions are not part of the standard, the standard only says
334 > that the MA some codes can be reserved. That is why you see on the OBP
335 > there is the different code types listed: "Official assigned" and
336 > "other Codes". And under the last one the various exceptional codes
337 > are listed.
338 >
339 > So, to be utterly correct, the last three words should be replaced
340 > with "from the list of reservations" or something like that.
341 >
342 > Regards,
343 >
344 >   jaap
345 >
346 > PS. I cannot help noticing that there is a general rule in Nicks
347 >   observation. One only deals with the case by case basis after the
348 >   exceptional reservation is taken way.
349 >[...]
350
351 **Original note Bart Boswinkel 18 July 2019**
352 Overview of discussion & presentation Exceptionally Reserved Code elements
353
354 **Summary of Presentation Jaap Akkerhuis**
355
356 General: Expect by Montreal meeting standard to be replaced by new version. Small
357 overhaul of different parts of the standard. In future (post 2020) new round of review, could
358 be major one, including merge of the different parts. Terminology may change and
359 reference inclusion of code elements for WIPO / road signs may disappear In general
360 current rules are subject to discussion and possible change in future, including rules with
361 respect to different categories of not officially assigned codes, like the exceptionally
362 reserved code elements
363
364
365 Exceptionally Reserved Codes
366 As a reminder: Exceptionally reserved is an exception to the rules; it does not fit anywhere.
367
368 Currently 12 exceptionally reserved code elements listed: see OBP
369 (https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#sear).
370 Each of these codes reserved for specific reason and/or by entity which is listed in
371 OBP. Only 4 out of 12 are used as ccTLD (AC, EU, SU, and UK).
372
373 **Observation Nick Wenban-Smith**
374 Noted that UK is in included at request of UK government, so assumes that if to be removed
375 the UK government will be involved. So from practical point of view, when UK gets removed,
376 should could be treated in similar fashion as assigned codes.

377
378 Maybe alternative approach, treat them as what they are: exceptions and on a case-case by
379 case basis as soon as removed from the standard.
380
381