

Retirement Process

v3.2

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

2018-06-14

This document includes an automatically translated outline from Retirement Process Comparison version 3.nm5.

1 Retirement Process Steps

Steps identified in the retirement process based on scenario documentation. Each of the topics (including sub-steps) ,add the text that is currently in the scenario documents,

10 and also add the IANA reports and Board resolutions. This shows what is currently
11 happening. It does not go into the question: does this need to go into a new policy?
12 That question is the theme of the Panama Workshop.

13 **1.1 Removal of code element from ISO 3166 list of country names**

14 Removal of code element from ISO 3166 list of country names is defined in terms of
15 ISO 3166 standard as:

16 Code Element: The result of applying a code to an element of a coded set (ISO 3166-
17 part 1 section 3.2) effectively the two ASCII letter code.

18 List of country names: Part of the Clause 9 list
19 (Defined in ISO 3166- part 1 section 6, 6.1. In clause 6 of part 1 the content of the list
20 is enumerated in Clause 9.)

21 **1.1.1 Stakeholders?**

22 **1.1.2 causes to date**

23 See scenario documents:

- 24 • significant rename of country

25 Examples: Scenario 1:

26 AI (French Afar and Issas) to DJ (Djibouti) (1977)

27 HV (Upper Volta) to BF (Burkina Faso) (1984)

28 BU (Burma) to Myanmar (MM) (1989)

29 BY (Byelorussian SSR to Belarus, no change in code elements) (1992)

30 ZR (Zaire) to CD (Congo, Democratic Republic of) (1997)

31 TP (East Timor) to TL (Timor-Leste) (2002)

32 The codes ZR, TP and BU are included in the Online Browsing Platform (OBP) in
33 the list of transitionally reserved codes. Note that transitionally reserved is NOT
34 a category of codes defined in the Standard. In addition, AI is now assigned to
35 Anguilla, HV is listed as unassigned (see Online Browsing Platform Country Codes,
36 ISO). Note that unassigned is NOT a defined term.

- 37 • end of country/territory

38 Examples Scenario 2 document

39 Examples are:

40 SU, (Sovjet Union) (1990)

41 NT, Neutral Zone (1993)

42 YU, Yugoslavia (2003)

43 CS, Serbia and Montenegro (2006)

44 AN, Netherlands Antilles (2010)

45 The code element SU was removed from the list of country names. After a few
46 years it was included in the list of exceptionally reserved code elements.

47 The code elements NT, YU and AN were removed from the list of country names
48 and included in the list of transitionally reserved code elements, which is a list
49 published through the Online Browsing Platform, but which is not defined under
50 the standard itself.

51 – fragments/no successor

52

53 – Discontinues, but replaced

54

55 • other causes?

56 – Fragmentation, combined with significant rename of core part?

57 * Results in continued role original manager

58

59 * Example: .YU -> CS -> RS

60

61 – Brexit like scenario?

62 Scenario: Significant part of geopolitical entity exits geopolitical entity

63 Example: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland leaving Euro-
64 pean Union.

65 Impact in terms of ISO 3166-1: No change in code element of original entity
66 (EU remains to be listed).

67 This scenario should not be covered by the ccNSO Policy on retirement of
68 ccTLDs.

69 Rationale:

70 1. Original Code Element is not affected. Hence triggering event as identi-
71 fied does not manifest itself.

72 If there is an impact it manifests itself at level of local policy is out of scope
73 of ccNSO policy remit (see Annex C ICANN Bylaws)

74 **1.2 Notifications**

75 **1.2.1 Who and how to inform?**

76 • IANA Function Operator

77

- 78 • ccTLD manager
- 79
- 80 • Admin and Tech Contact

81 **1.2.2 Who is required to inform whom and when?**

82 To be addressed in follow-up discussion:

83 People that are going to need to be informed are the “significant interested parties”,
84 including from the old registry. The government is likely to have disappeared, if the
85 country no longer exist. ccTLD manager’s responsibility to keep it significant interested
86 parties informed, e.g. registrants, residual local administration, etc.

87 The registry operator, ccTLD manager has the duty to inform all its stakeholders, all
88 interested parties.

89 The policy should not go into details of how things will happen. A large number of
90 registrants might be affected, that are not necessarily aware.

91 **1.3 Need for Specific arrangements/documentation?**

92 This topic refers to the description of roles and responsibilities in the upcoming process
93 and acceptance of these roles and commitment to behave accordingly.

94 Assumption is that such an arrangement is needed if no policy is in place.

95 Question for future discussion should such an arrangement be required under the
96 policy?

97 **1.3.1 No arrangement?**

98 No examples, however rudimentary there always appears to have been a kind of ar-
99 rangement involving at a minimum, the ccTLD manager of the cc removed and IFO

100 • What triggers TLD manager plan?

101

102 • Role of stakeholders?

103 1.3.2 Arrangement

- 104 • Trigger for TLD manager plan?

105 Not clear from documentation to date

- 106 • Defines roles and responsibilities

107 – Case ZR

108 .ZR case

109 In June 2002, Key Systems and Interpoint SARL entered into a contract to
110 take “measures necessary” to transfer the registry data for the .CD and .ZR
111 domains to Key Systems, and to support redelegation of the domain to Key
112 Systems.

113 See:

114 Given that “zr” was being removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, the manager
115 performed a transition, populating the .cd top-level domain and emptying
116 the .zr top-level domain. By an 11 March 2001 message to the IANA, the .zr
117 manager stated that the .zr top-level domain had been emptied in preparation
118 for its deletion from the root zone. .Zr was removed in 2001

119 See:

120 – Case YU
121 .YU case
122 The anticipated future ccTLD managers for .ME and .RS and IANA developed
123 a transition plan. This plan from .YU to .RS and .ME involved an MOU between
124 the two entities and would see that .YU is assigned to the proposed .RS ccTLD
125 manager, which was effectively the same operator as the .YU ccTLD manager.
126 The .RS ccTLD manager would act as caretaker for .YU for two years to allow
127 for a stable transition.

- 128 o YU: Delegation of RS Top Level Domain and redelegation of the YU domain
- 129 o .YU: IANA report on the delegation of the .ME Domain

130 In line with historical practice, and consistent with the principles of adher-
131 ence to the ISO 3166-1 standard, these (.ME and .RS) were delegated on the
132 condition that the “.YU” domain be retired.
133 See:

134 The discussion centered around reporting on the issues concerning timely
135 implementation of retirement of .YU such that any concerns that may re-
136 sult in delaying the decommissioning date could be adequately shared and
137 considered well in advance.

138 Also: the proposed operator of the .RS domain and the proposed operator of
139 the .ME domain have mutually agreed a transfer and decommissioning plan

140 for the .YU domain that would see a stable transition to the new domains.
141 See:

- 142 – Case NA
- 143 .AN case
- 144 In January 2011, the University of the Netherlands Antilles presented its
- 145 initial application to ICANN for delegation of the .CW top-level domain. Sub-
- 146 sequently, over the course of the year the application was expanded and
- 147 revised.
- 148 In March 2011, the University and SX Registry SA executed a “grand-father
- 149 agreement”.
- 150 In September 2011, the University entered into a revised agreement with SX
- 151 Registry SA B.V. in regards to the transitional arrangements concerning the
- 152 .AN top-level domain,
- 153 o .AN: Delegation of the .CW domain representing Curacao and transitional
- 154 arrangements for the .AN domain representing the Netherlands Antilles
- 155 o .SX: Delegation of the .SX domain representing Sint Maarten
- 156 • Specific circumstances
- 157 – Case NA
- 158 .AN Case

159 The .AN operator expressed that while the majority of domain registrants
160 have migrated to the new domains, there remains a minority of about 30
161 registrants that need more time to complete their transition. The operator
162 is concerned that the current deadline is not achievable for the remaining
163 registrants.

164 Granting the requested extension date helps maintain the security and stabil-
165 ity of the .AN domain name while ICANN works with the operator to remove
166 the domain name from the DNS Root Zone.

167 **1.4 TLD manager Plan**

168 Included is description of TLD manager plan to date and to the extend publicly avail-
169 able.

170 **1.4.1 Examples to date**

171 • Scenario 1 cases

172 Scenario 1 cases

173 According to the IANA report on the removal of .TP top level domain: “The ISO

174 3166-1 code for Portuguese Timor was removed in the year 2002. When a ccTLD
175 is no longer eligible due to the country or code's removal from the ISO 3166-1
176 standard, the operator is expected to develop a transition plan to the successor
177 ccTLD(s) and ultimately retire the domain. “

178 .ZR Case

179 Given that “zr” was being removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, the manager per-
180 formed a transition, populating the .cd top-level domain and emptying the .zr
181 top-level domain. By an 11 March 2001 message to the IANA, the .zr manager
182 stated that the .zr top-level domain had been emptied in preparation for its dele-
183 tion from the root zone.

184 See:

185 .TP Case

186 See:

187 Following the successful delegation of the .TL domain, all new registrations within
188 the .TP domain were disallowed, and the existing registry was maintained in a
189 caretaker state to provide existing registrants time to transition to the new .TL
190 domain.

191 • Scenario 2 cases

192 YU case:

193 content of the plan

194 The plan recognises the need to freeze registrations in the .YU zone so as not to
195 disadvantage either existing or prospective registrants, and also charts a clear and
196 predictable process so that the Internet community is fully informed on how the
197 transition is to occur. All this is to be done on a schedule that provides reasonable
198 time for registrants to prepare and transition to the new domains.

199 Following the delegation of .RS, the registry took a staged approach to the decom-
200 missioning of the .YU domain. In the first phase, all names registered within .YU
201 had their respective .RS domain reserved. This was conducted as part of a sunrise
202 process that involved other rights-based allocations prior to general availability.
203 During the first six months of .RS operations, only existing .YU domain holders
204 were able to obtain domains corresponding to the reservations. As the domains
205 have a hierarchical model (.CO.RS, .ORG.RS, etc.) rights were also awarded for
206 domains directly under .RS on a first-come first-served basis.

207 By September 2008, after the six month period, unredeemed .RS reservations
208 expired, and general availability started for .RS domains. The .YU registry was
209 then curated, with inactive and unused .YU domains being identified. 2,769 .YU
210 domains deemed as still active, and all remaining .YU domains were removed in
211 March 2009. Between March and May 2009, 1,236 domain holders appealed to
212 have their domains re-instated.

213 See:

214 .AN case:

215 Transition plan was in place This included inter alia:

216 -
217 to move registrations from the .AN domain to new domains .CW and .SX,
218 -
219 the University of the Netherlands Antilles continuing to act as manager of the
220 See
221 From the decision
222 Whereas, there is a transition plan to move registrations from the .AN domain
223 to new domains .CW and .SX, with the University of the Netherlands Antilles
224 continuing to act as manager of the .AN domain until transition is complete,
225 From the rationale
226 The matter of the timeline for the transition from the .AN domain to its successor
227 domains is being addressed in conjunction with the evaluation of the delegation
228 of the .CW and .SX domains, in order to give clarity to the communities involved
229 the timeline upon which the transition will occur. This will allow the communities
230 to prepare and plan appropriately for the transition.
231 The proposed sponsoring organisation for .CW intends to continue to operate the
232 .AN domain while transitional arrangements are executed. These transitional
233 arrangements include provisions for registrants in Curaçao to transfer registra-
234 tions to .CW; and for registrants in Sint Maarten to transfer registrations to .SX.

235 The applicant calls for a phased transition to be concluded over a period of three
236 years, after which time the .AN domain will be fully retired.
237 (Delegation report .CW :)

238 **1.4.2 What to include in policy?**

239 Limited by scope of ccNSO policies

240 Role of ccTLD manager is defined in delegation and retirement process. It looks at the
241 initial registration policy (transition from the retiring ccTLD to new ccTLD)

242 Needs to be flushed. In terms of principles, suggestions other?

243 • Owner?

244 YU. was re-delegated (transferred in terms of FoI) to RNIDS. RINDS:

245 See: 11 September 2007 Board Decision (the .YU domain be redelegated to the
246 Serbian National Registry of Internet Domain Names in a temporary caretaker
247 capacity.)

248 NOTE NEW CONCEPT THAT NEEDS TO BE DEFINED: TEMPORARY CARETAKER

249 Concept also used in context

250 Notes from discussion:

251 Temporary Caretaker needs to be included in Glossary.

252 Has been mentioned in different documents.
253 First used in case .VI.
254 Registry/caretaker: needs to be voluntary
255 Can not be mandatory. Why is a caretaker needed? Need to find a way that is
256 voluntary.
257 Do you believe that some language that addresses it along lines described.
258 Eberhard: Should ccTLD manager
259 Caretaker can be appointed. Technically can be difficult
260 In case .CW and .AN, it was done manually. If it is voluntary offer in favor

- 261 • Approval needed?
 - 262 – By Whom?
 - 263
 - 264 – Documentation?
 - 265
 - 266 – When?
 - 267
- 268 • Stakeholders
 - 269 – LIC
 - 270

271 – IANA

272

273 – SIP

274 **1.5 Execution manager Plan**

275 **1.5.1 Reporting**

276 **1.5.2 Execute**

277 **1.5.3 Notification progress Transition Plan**

278 .YU case:

279 ICANN received a short status update from RNIDS in early 2008, however nothing
280 further was reported according to the reporting protocol regarding the transition, or
281 any difficulties that had been encountered.

282 See:

283 .ZR case.

284 <https://www.iana.org/reports/2001/zr-report-20jun01.html>

285 **1.6 Removal TLD from RZ database**

286 **1.6.1 ICANN Board decision**

287 Board confirms and takes decision on 30 September 2009, to allow IANA to remove YU
288 from rootzone database on 1 April 2010

289 See:

290 .AN Case

291 .TP case

292 **1.6.2 Notifications**

293 Progress reporting by ccTLD manager

294 .YU case

295 IANA was informed on 30 March that RNIDS informed the community that it had effec-
296 tively switched off the .YU domain, independent of the removal of the .YU delegation
297 from the DNS root zone.

298 .AN case

299 The .AN domain operator and the Netherlands' Ministry of Economic Affairs have sought
300 a nine month extension of the deadline in order to provide additional opportunity for

301 the remaining registrants to conclude their transition away from the .AN domain.

302 See:

303 **1.6.3 Execution of removal**

304 **1.6.4 Cases to date**

305 Cases and events to date as recorded in documents publicly available

306 .YU case

307 According to the IANA report on Removal of the .YU domain formerly representing
308 Yugoslavia, there were 4,266 .YU domains still delegated in June 2009. This is down
309 from 32,772. In June 2009, there were 26,294 domains registered in .RS. IANA staff
310 noted that of the remaining 4,266 domains (under .YU), approximately 200 did not also
311 have the matching .RS domain.

312 When an alpha-2 code for a country is changed on the ISO 3166-1 list, the IANA's
313 historical practice has been to set up a top-level domain with the new code and to
314 delegate it to the same manager as the existing top-level domain, with the expectation
315 that a transition will occur and that the deprecated top-level domain will be deleted
316 once the migration is completed.

317 .ZR case

318 When an alpha-2 code for a country is changed on the ISO 3166-1 list, the IANA's
319 historical practice has been to set up a top-level domain with the new code and to
320 delegate it to the same manager as the existing top-level domain, with the expectation
321 that a transition will occur and that the deprecated top-level domain will be deleted
322 once the migration is completed.

323 The migration of .zr has been completed, with all sub-domains within .zr having been
324 removed. Accordingly, deletion of the .zr top-level domain is now appropriate.

325 See:

326 .TP CAse

327 See:

328 • Recorded Board decision .YU removal and delegation of .ME and .RS

329 Delegation of the .ME (Montenegro) Domain

330 Delegation of the .RS (Serbia) Domain

331 Redelegation of the .YU (former Yugoslavia) Domain

332 Kim Davies advised that the delegation of .ME (Montenegro) and .RS (Serbia) and

333 the redelegation of .YU (Yugoslavia) were interrelated. At the time that Serbia

334 and Montenegro became new countries, the ISO 3166-1list was altered to give

335 the two countries individual codes .RS and .ME respectively. To date, the coun-

336 tries covered have been using the .YU domain. The YU code is no longer in the

337 ISO 3166-1 list and has been replaced with .ME and .RS and as such should be

338 decommissioned in a responsible way. The transition plan from .YU to .RS and .ME
339 involves an MOU between the two entities and would see that .YU is assigned to
340 the proposed .RS sponsoring organization, which is effectively the same operator
341 as today. They would act as caretaker for .YU for two years to allow for a stable
342 transition. ICANN's proposed resolution language is consistent with this plan
343 however a three-year transition period is proposed to allow for contingencies.
344 The proposed resolutions support the two new delegations and acknowledge the
345 two parties involved in de-commissioning of the .YU domain, and state it is to be
346 retired in three years time.

347 In addition to explaining the ICANN evaluation of the delegation applications,
348 the board was also advised of last-minute correspondence IANA had received in
349 relation to the delegation of the .ME domain.

350 Steve Goldstein asked if there is any provision in the agreement to restrict new
351 registrations in .YU. Kim Davies advised that he would have to check to be certain,
352 but as soon as new registrations are allowed in .RS and .ME it was his understand-
353 ing that it would not be possible to register new domains in .YU.

354 Steve Goldstein asked why the preference for a three-year transition rather than
355 two. Kim Davies advised they didn't want to propose something that was too
356 aggressive. The applicants had proposed a two-year transition period, but the
357 Board could consider a different length.

358 The Chair proposed that the language in the resolution could be changed to be up
359 to and no more than three years.

360 Steve Crocker acknowledged that some transitions have taken a long time. An

361 additional suggestion would be to ask for regular reports with metrics measuring
362 progress towards the outcome.

363 Kim Davies noted that the resolution proposed does suggest that the .YU registry
364 report every 6 months to ICANN Staff on progress. The proposed resolution also
365 makes it clear the domain must be removed no later than 2010, which was consid-
366 ered a responsible timeframe that was neither too aggressive, nor unnecessarily
367 prolonged. If the community felt it could transition quicker there is nothing to
368 stop that from happening.

369 Paul Twomey suggested that the wording be slightly amended asking that they
370 report progress against appropriate metrics.

371 There were no objections to the suggested amendments.

372 Dave Wodelet asked if it mattered if they take till 2008, 2009 or even 2010 and
373 the Chair responded that we do want a certain end date.

374 Kim Davies advised that there is no strong precedent for how long transition will
375 take from one to the other. There have only been a small number of transitions
376 of country codes in the history of ccTLDs. In trying to determine what they con-
377 sidered a reasonable timeframe for transition the closest comparable situation
378 that IANA was aware of is when telephone-numbering systems change. These
379 transitions generally take place in one-to-two years.

380 The Chair noted that the language proposed by Paul Twomey seems acceptable,
381 an alternative to an extra year would be to stick with two years to 2009 and if the
382 party needs more time they could come back and explain why, which may be the
383 best option. Putting in a two-year timeframe provides them with leverage to help

384 their community to promptly perform the transition. The Chair recommended the
385 alternative on the basis it was made clear to them that if they have a problem
386 with two years they can come back with an explanation to ICANN as to why they
387 need more time.

388 Susan Crawford noted that she understands the direction and appreciates the
389 conservative approach, but asked what mechanism should be used if the transi-
390 tion moves too slowly.

391 The Chair reflected that if they come back and have a reasonable explanation,
392 then this should be okay. He believed you would help them with a shorter deadline
393 as they can point to that as a mandate to move ahead and transition to other the
394 domain.

395 Janis Karklins noted that human nature suggests they will take as much time as
396 they are given for transitioning. He suggested that the resolution should include
397 a point that ICANN Staff should keep the Board informed of the progress of the
398 transition.

399 In summation, the Chair suggested that the Board approves all three requests,
400 and that ICANN Staff is expected to keep the Board informed on the retirement of
401 .YU domain. Paul Twomey added that they communicate according to appropriate
402 metrics.

403 Steve Goldstein moved and Vanda Scartezini seconded the following resolution:
404 Delegation of .ME
405 Whereas, the .ME top-level domain is the designated country-code for
406 Montenegro ,

407 Whereas, ICANN has received a request for delegation of .ME to the Government
408 of Montenegro,
409 Whereas, ICANN has reviewed the request, and has determined that the proposed
410 delegation would be in the best interest of the local and global Internet communi-
411 ties,
412 Resolved (07.75), that the proposed delegation of the .ME domain to the Govern-
413 ment of Montenegro is approved.

414 Delegation of .RS
415 Whereas, the .RS top-level domain is the designated country-code for Serbia,
416 Whereas, ICANN has received a request for delegation of .RS to the Serbian Na-
417 tional Register of Internet Domain Names,
418 Whereas, ICANN has reviewed the request, and has determined that the proposed
419 delegation would be in the best interest of the local and global Internet communi-
420 ties,
421 Resolved (07.76), that the proposed delegation of the .RS domain to the Serbian
422 National Register of Internet Domain Names is approved.

423 Redelegation of .YU
424 Whereas, the .YU top-level domain is currently used by the citizens of both Serbia
425 and Montenegro,
426 Whereas, ICANN has delegated the .RS domain for use in Serbia, and the .ME
427 domain for use in Montenegro,
428 Whereas, the ISO 3166-1 standard has removed the “YU” code, and the ISO 3166
429 Maintenance Agency recommends its use be discontinued,

430 Whereas, ICANN is not responsible for deciding what is or is not a country, and
431 adheres to the ISO 3166-1 standard for guidance on when to add, modify and
432 remove country-code top-level domains,
433 Whereas, there is a transition plan to move registrations in .YU to the new domains
434 .RS and .ME, with the operator of .RS acting as the temporary caretaker of .YU
435 until the transition is complete,
436 Resolved (07.77), that the .YU domain be redelegated to the Serbian National
437 Registry of Internet Domain Names in a temporary caretaker capacity.
438 Resolved (07.78), that the Serbian National Registry of Internet Domain Names
439 be instructed to report their progress on decommissioning the .YU domain every
440 six months to ICANN against a relevant set of metrics.
441 Resolved (07.79), that the Serbian National Registry of Internet Domain Names,
442 and the Government of Montenegro, work to complete the transition from the .YU
443 domain to the .RS and .ME domains, so that it may be removed from the DNS root
444 zone no later than 30 September 2009.
445 A voice vote was taken of all Board Members present and all three motions were
446 approved by a vote of all members present 13-0, with one abstention from Peter
447 Dengate Thrush.
448 Peter Dengate Thrush explained that his reservation was associated with his belief
449 that such policy decisions concerning delegation should rest with the ccNSO as
450 specifically provided under the bylaws. He noted that he has raised this issue
451 on a number of occasions suggesting that this matter should be referred to the
452 ccNSO but to no avail.

453 The Chair noted that these practices have been in existence prior to the formation
454 of the ccNSO, and that if policy is required in this area that the ccNSO work on a
455 policy proposal, that might be properly considered.

456 See: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2007-09-11-en>

457 **2 Process Management**

458 **2.1 Overall process management**

459 **2.1.1 Assessment of transition plan**

460 IANA has assessed the transfer plan that has been developed for the transition of usage
461 from the .YU to .RS and .ME and has found it to be appropriate and responsible.

462 See:

463 **2.1.2 Monitoring of process**

464 The discussion centered around reporting on the issues concerning timely implemen-
465 tation of retirement of .YU such that any concerns that may result in delaying the
466 decommissioning date could be adequately shared and considered well in advance.

467 .AN case: Resolved (2011.10.11.04), that the University of Netherlands Antilles be
468 instructed to report their progress on decommissioning the .AN domain every six months
469 to ICANN against a relevant set of metrics,
470 (See:)

471 **2.2 Timing**

472 Timing looks at duration of retirement process & schedule of milestones (determining
473 the length in time of the different steps in the process)

474 **2.2.1 Duration of process**

- 475 • Anticipated duration

476 . YU case:
477 26 September 2006. This revision removed the “CS” code, and added an “ME”
478 code for Montenegro, and an “RS” code for Serbia. Once the standard was revised
479 it became possible for ICANN to consider applications for delegation of these two
480 new codes in the DNS root zone.

481 In December 2006, the Government of Montenegro submitted a delegation appli-
482 cation for the .ME domain.

483 This was followed by the applications for the delegations of the .RS domain, and
484 the redelegation of the .YU domain

485 Board discussion about the appropriate timeline for decommissioning – and the
486 Board ultimately believed it was more appropriate to have a relatively short time-
487 line. The final resolution that was adopted by the ICANN Board on 11 September
488 2007 is that the .YU domain should be retired within two years:

489 .AN Case

490 From the rationale

491 The matter of the timeline for the transition from the .AN domain to its successor
492 domains is being addressed in conjunction with the evaluation of the delegation
493 of the .CW and .SX domains, in order to give clarity to the communities involved
494 the timeline upon which the transition will occur. This will allow the communities
495 to prepare and plan appropriately for the transition.

496 See:

497 Decision to execute process initiated by the Board decision to delegate .CW 25
498 August 2011.

499 Expected to be completed by 31 October 2014.

500 Board decision Resolved (2011.10.11.06), that the .AN domain be removed from
501 the DNS root zone on 31 October 2014, if not requested earlier by the manager of
502 the domain.

503 .ZR Case

504 .TP case

505 In 2002, the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste was established. The ISO 3166-
506 1 standard removed the TP

507 On 23 March 2005, the .TL top-level domain was delegated

508 IANA staff and .TP contacts continued discussions on the removal of the .TP
509 top-level domain. In August 2013, the IANA Department received a letter

510 In July 2014, IANA staff was notified that the new point of contact for this request

511 The removal date is currently scheduled for 28 February 2015.

512 See: Board resolution ([https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-en#1.c)
513 [2015-02-12-en#1.c](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-en#1.c)) and related IANA report

514 • Effective duration

515 .ZR-> .CD case

516 The .CD domain was initially delegated in 1997 to Interpoint SARL, a Switzerland-
517 based registry provider that has also provided service for a number of other African
518 countries such as Burundi and Rwanda. Interpoint was the operator of the .ZR
519 domain for Zaire.

520 When the country was renamed to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it was
521 issued with a replacement ISO 3166-1 code of “CD” on 14 July 1997.

522 Interpoint approached ICANN to replace .ZR with .CD, and was delegated the .CD
523 domain shortly thereafter.

524 In February 2001, the Government executed an agreement with Key Systems
525 GmbH, a German provider of domain registry systems, to establish a company
526 “Key-Systems Congolais” to be responsible for the administration of the .CD and
527 .ZR domains.

528 After this agreement, Key Systems wrote to ICANN seeking to obtain redelegation
529 of these domains.

530 ICANN responded that as the .ZR domain is to be retired, it could not be redele-
531 gated in this fashion.

- 532 n June 2002, Key Systems and Interpoint SARL entered into a contract to take
533 “measures necessary” to transfer the registry data for the .CD and .ZR domains to
534 Key Systems, and to support redelegation of the domain to Key Systems.
- 535 • Removal from ISO 3166
 - 536 – Effective date of removal
 - 537 .AN case: .AN was removed at or around 10-10-2010, with change of Statute
538 of Kingdom of Netherlands
 - 539 – Anticipated date of removal

540 **2.2.2 Anticipated Timing of decisions/actions**

541 **3 Oversight**

542 **3.1 Remedies?**

543 **3.2 Not mentioned yet, but to be defined in policy?**

544 **3.3 Direct oversight**

545 **3.3.1 Board Decisions**

546 Board decisions conforming

547 Initiation of process

548 Conclusion of process; .TP case

549 .YU. case

550 .AN case

551 3.3.2 Oversee of planning of process

552 Board decision 11 September 2007, re .YU

553 On September 11, 2007 the Board of ICANN passed the following resolutions:

554 Whereas, the .RS top-level domain is the designated country-code for Serbia,

555 Whereas, ICANN has received a request for delegation of .RS to the Serbian National
556 Register of Internet Domain Names,

557 Whereas, ICANN has reviewed the request, and has determined that the proposed
558 delegation would be in the best interest of the local and global Internet communities,

559 Resolved (07.76), that the proposed delegation of the .RS domain to the Serbian Na-
560 tional Register of Internet Domain Names is approved.

561 Whereas, the .YU top-level domain is currently used by the citizens of both Serbia and
562 Montenegro,

563 Whereas, ICANN has delegated the .RS domain for use in Serbia, and the .ME domain
564 for use in Montenegro,

565 Whereas, the ISO 3166-1 standard has removed the “YU” code, and the ISO 3166
566 Maintenance Agency recommends its use be discontinued,

567 Whereas, ICANN is not responsible for deciding what is or is not a country, and adheres
568 to the ISO 3166-1 standard for guidance on when to add, modify and remove country-
569 code top-level domains,

570 Whereas, there is a transition plan to move registrations in .YU to the new domains .RS
571 and .ME, with the operator of .RS acting as the temporary caretaker of .YU until the
572 transition is complete,

573 Resolved (07.77), that the .YU domain be redelegated to the Serbian National Registry
574 of Internet Domain Names in a temporary caretaker capacity.

575 Resolved (07.78), that the Serbian National Registry of Internet Domain Names be
576 instructed to report their progress on decommissioning the .YU domain every six months
577 to ICANN against a relevant set of metrics.

578 Resolved (07.79), that the Serbian National Registry of Internet Domain Names, and
579 the Government of Montenegro, work to complete the transition from the .YU domain
580 to the .RS and .ME domains, so that it may be removed from the DNS root zone no later
581 than 30 September 2009.

582 **3.3.3 Removal of ccTLD from root zone**

583 Board confirms and takes decision on 30 September 2009, to allow IANA to remove
584 YU from rootzone database on 1April 2010

585 See:

586 .AN Case

587 .TP case

588 **3.4 Decision review**

589 **3.4.1 PDP 3 part 2**

590 **3.4.2 Include principles in this part?**

Draft, 2018-06-14