ccNSO PDP3 Retirement Working Group

Proposed Policy for the Retirement of ccTLDs

Interim Paper

country code Names Supporting Organisation
May 2020

Contents

1. Background & Introduction

1.1. Background

At its meeting on 10 December 2015 the ccNSO Council discussed the launch of the formal ccNSO Policy Development Process to address the lack of policy with respect to the Retirement of ccTLDs as well as a review mechanism for decisions pertaining to the Delegation, Transfer, Revocation and Retirement of ccTLDs.

To increase the predictability and legitimacy of decisions pertaining to the Retirement of ccTLDs and in accordance with the recommendations of the ccNSO Delegation and Redelegation Working Group ("DRDWG") in 2011[1], the void or lack of policy relating to the Retirement of ccTLDs needs to filled by a Policy developed by the ccNSO. However, at the time the DRDWG also recommended that such a ccNSO Policy Development Process ("PDP") should be launched following the development of a Framework of Interpretation ("FoI") [5] of Request For Comment [18] ("RFC") 1591 [17].

Following initial discussions by the ccNSO Council, input and feed-back was sought from the ccTLD community at the Marrakesh (ICANN55) and Helsinki (ICANN56) meetings. At its meeting in Helsinki the ccNSO Council launched the ccNSO Policy Development Process 3.

On 9 March 2017, the Issue Manager submitted the Final Issue Report [1] to Council.

Following the discussions by the ccNSO Council, feed-back and input from the community and the drafting team, the Issue Manager recommended:

> *1. The ccNSO Council initiates one (1) ccNSO Policy Development Process to develop policy proposals for both a Review Mechanism and on the Retirement of ccTLDs.*
>
> *2. [...] [t]he initial focus needs to be on developing a Review Mechanism, which is considered the highest priority, particularly in light of the IANA Stewardship transition. Only then the focus should be on Retirement, and, if needed, revisit the Review Mechanism to include decisions relating to the Retirement of ccTLDs. To appoint two working groups each with its own charter, working method and schedule.*

However, at the meeting in Copenhagen (ICANN58, March 2017) the ccTLD community present suggested to change the order in which to address the topics. Analyses showed that alternating the order would save at least 3 months and simplify the process. Effectively this meant that by reversing the order, to first develop the Retirement Policy proposals and then those for the Review Mechanism, the potential Review Mechanism would be available sooner to the community.

The ccNSO Council initiated the 3rd ccNSO Policy Development Process ("ccPDP3") in March 2017 by adopting the Issue Report. Accordingly the ccPDP3 Working Group ("WG") to develop policy recommendations for the Retirement of ccTLDs was established by June 2017. The Charter of this WG [3] is included in the Issue Report [1].

The ccPDP3 Retirement WG was tasked to develop policy proposals to address at a minimum the following topics and issues identified in the Issue Report:

- Consistency of terminology.
- What triggers a Retirement?
- Who triggers the Retirement process?

[1] See DRDWG Final Report [13], page 19, and Council Decision 16 March 2011 [2]

- Additional conditions for Retirement of a ccTLD?

  What are the conditions for the actual Retirement of a ccTLD? Is the occurrence of a triggering event sufficient or should additional requirements be in place?

- Compliance with conditions?

  Assuming the Retirement of a ccTLD is conditional, who will monitor, and who will be held accountable, if at all, if requirements are not met?

As the activities of the WG are undertaken within the framework of the ccNSO Policy Development Process, the limitations with respect to the scope of a ccPDP, specifically by Article 10 and Annexes B and C to the ICANN Bylaws [11] limit the scope of the WG's work and proposals.

Further, the ccPDP3 Retirement WG was tasked to report to ccNSO Council on topics or issues which they identified and considered out of scope for the WG. Accordingly, the Chair of the WG informed the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager that the ccPDP3 Retirement WG identified two issues, which need to be addressed, but were considered out of scope of ccPDP3:

- The ccNSO membership definition (section 10.4 (a) of the ICANN Bylaws [11]). The membership definition was changed as part of the IANA Stewardship Transition process;
- the events that would trigger the Retirement of IDN ccTLDs. The Retirement WG advised Council that the events leading to a de-selection of IDN ccTLDs should be identified under a ccPDP that also defines the selection of IDN ccTLD strings.

1.2. Introduction

RFC 1591 states:

> *4. Rights to Names*
>
> *[...]*
>
> > *2) Country Codes*
> >
> > *The IANA is not in the business of deciding what is and what is not a country. The selection of the ISO 3166 list as a basis for country code top-level domain names was made with the knowledge that ISO has a procedure for determining which entities should be and should not be on that list.*

In 2014 the ccNSO through its Framework of Interpretation confirmed that RFC 1591 applies to ccTLDs.

The ISO 3166-1 list is dynamic and country codes are added and removed on a regular basis. When a new ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 code element ("Alpha-2 code") is added, a ccTLD corresponding to that Alpha-2 code can be added to the Root by the IANA Naming Functions Operator ("IFO"). However, as was identified by the ccNSO Delegation and Redelegation Working Group in 2011, there is no formal Policy available for the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone when a country code is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list of country names.

It is important to note that ccTLDs are defined as those entries in the Root Zone database identified as such, these include:

- 2 letter ccTLDs corresponding to an Alpha-2 code (the majority of ccTLDs);

- 2 letter Latin ccTLDs not corresponding to an Alpha-2 code[2];
- IDN ccTLDs as approved by ICANN.

2. Policy Objective

The objective of the Policy is to provide clear and predictable guidance and to document a process that is orderly and reasonable up and to, but excluding the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone[3].

3. Applicability of the Policy

This Policy applies to all entries in the Root Zone database which are identified as ccTLDs, and are subject to a Retirement Triggering Event ("Trigger").

Retirement Triggering Events are defined as follows:

- For 2 letter ccTLDs which correspond to an Alpha-2 code
  - the Trigger is the removal of the corresponding Alpha-2 code from the ISO 3166-1 Standard by the ISO 3166-1 Maintenance Agency ("ISO 3166/MA") [16];
- for 2 letter Latin ccTLDs which do not correspond to an Alpha-2 code
  - the Trigger is the ISO 3166-1/MA making a change (other than making that code an Alpha-2 code) to any of these. For each such Triggering Event the IFO will consider if the change requires retiring that ccTLD. If the ccTLD Manager disagrees with the IFO's decision to initiate the Retirement process it can appeal the decision using the ccTLD Review mechanism;
- for IDN ccTLDs
  - the Triggering Event will be identified in the Policy which applies to IDN ccTLDs.

For the purposes of this Policy a "Functional Manager" is the entity listed as "ccTLD Manager" in the IANA Root Zone database or any later variant, who is active with respect to the management of the ccTLD or with whom the IFO can officially and effectively communicate.

If a ccTLD is to be retired but does not have a Functional Manager the IFO cannot transfer responsibility to a new Manager according to its standard process. This set of circumstances would create a deadlock situation which would prevent the IFO from ever retiring the ccTLD. To avoid such a deadlock, and only under these specific conditions, this Policy allows the IFO to proceed with a transfer of responsibility for the ccTLD to establish a Functional Manager and insure the ccTLD can be retired. Such a transfer should follow the standard IFO Transfer process where possible.

[2]The ccTLDs .UK and .AC which refer to exceptionally reserved codes UK and AC are grandfathered as ccTLDs and .EU, which corresponds to the exceptionally reserved code EU, was delegated under the relevant ICANN Board resolution from September 2000 [12].
[3]The removal of a (cc)TLD by the IFO is excluded from the Policy, as this is outside of the policy scope of the ccNSO.

4. Retirement Process

4.1. Expectations

There is a good faith obligation for both the IFO and the Manager of the retiring ccTLD to ensure an orderly shutdown of the retiring ccTLD which takes into consideration the interests of its registrants and the stability and security of the DNS.

Note: Given the importance and exceptional nature of the ccTLD Retirement process, the IFO should, prior to sending a Notice of Removal (see Subsection 4.2), contact the ccTLD Manager and confirm who the IFO should be dealing with regarding the Retirement process. The person or role identified by the ccTLD Manager to deal with the Retirement process is referred to as the Retirement Contact and in the remainder of this document the use of the term ccTLD Manager should be understood to mean ccTLD Manager or Retirement Contact if one has been formally identified to the IFO by the ccTLD Manager.

4.2. Notice of Removal

Once the IFO confirms that a ccTLD should be retired and has a Functional Manager, it shall promptly notify the Manager of the ccTLD that the ccTLD shall be removed from the Root Zone 5 years ("Default Retirement Date") from the date of this notice ("Notice of Removal") unless a Retirement Plan (see following sections for details) which is agreed to by the Manager and the IFO and is in accordance with this Retirement Policy stipulates otherwise.

The IFO shall include with the Notice of Removal a document describing the reasonable requirements ("Reasonable Requirements Document") it expects of a Retirement Plan and note that the IFO will make itself available to the Manager to assist in the development of such a plan should the Manager request it.

4.3. Setting a Date for Retirement

The IFO cannot require that a retiring ccTLD be removed from the Root Zone less than 5 years from the date the IFO has sent the Notice of Removal (Subsection 4.2) to the retiring ccTLD Manager unless an alternate Retirement Date is mutually agreed to by both the ccTLD Manager and the IFO. If the Manager wishes to request an extension to the Default Retirement Date it must request this from the IFO as part of a Retirement Plan.

The IFO must remove a retiring ccTLD from the Root Zone no later than 10 years after having sent a Notice of Removal to the ccTLD Manager ("Maximum Retirement Date").

4.4. Retirement Plan

After receiving a Notice of Removal the Manager must decide if it wishes to request an extension to the Default Retirement Date.

If the Manager of the retiring ccTLD does not wish an extension to the Default Retirement Date stated in the Notice of Removal it is expected, but not mandatory, that the Manager produce a Retirement Plan for the ccTLD which would typically include:

- A copy of the Notice of Removal;

- the date when the ccTLD is expected to stop taking registrations, renewals and transfers that exceed the date of removal from the Root Zone. It is important to note that there is a reasonable expectation that the date provided is the earliest practical date for implementing this; and
- details of a Communication Plan to advise the registrants of the Retirement of the ccTLD.

If the manager of the retiring ccTLD wishes to request an extension beyond the Default Retirement Date stated in the Notice of Removal it must produce a Retirement Plan which is acceptable to the IFO and is in accordance with the conditions listed below.

Granting an extension to the Default Retirement Date is at the discretion of the IFO and shall not be unreasonably withheld. The Reasonable Requirements Document that the IFO will have included with the Notice of Removal will describe the factors it will consider when evaluating a request for an extension to the Default Retirement Period.

A Retirement Plan which requests an extension shall include, in addition to the previously listed items, the following:

- The length of the extension requested (a maximum 5 additional years) including the proposed date of the removal of the ccTLD from the Root Zone;
- the reasons for requesting an extension; and
- an impact analysis which supports the reasons for making the extension request.

If the ccTLD Manager wishes to produce a Retirement Plan it must do so within 12 months of the IFO having sent the Notice of Removal to the Manager of the retiring ccTLD. At its discretion the IFO can extend the 12 month limit to a maximum of 24 months in total upon receiving a request for such an extension from the Manager. If the IFO grants such an extension it shall promptly notify the Manager of this.

If the ccTLD Manager submits a Retirement Plan to the IFO, the IFO shall provide a definitive response to the Manager regarding the request for an extension within 90 days of such a request having been received by the IFO.

The response by the IFO, if positive, shall state the length of the extension which has been granted. If the response is negative, the IFO shall include the specific reasoning for the refusal. The approval of an extension request shall not be unreasonably withheld.

If the request for an extension is rejected and the ccTLD Manager believes that the rejection is unreasonable or is inconsistent with the Reasonable Requirements Document it may appeal the decision by the IFO (see Subsection 5.2).

If the Manager of the retiring ccTLD and the IFO cannot agree on a Retirement Plan within 12 months, or up to a maximum of 24 months, if the IFO has granted such an extension, of the IFO having sent the Notice of Removal to the Manager, then the IFO shall promptly advise the Manager that the ccTLD shall be removed from the Root Zone 5 years from the date the IFO having sent the Notice of Removal to the Manager of the retiring ccTLD.

4.5. Exception Conditions

If the Manager becomes non-functional after a Retirement Plan is accepted, the IFO can use the same procedure outlined in the Requirements section to transfer the ccTLD to a new manager. In such cases the original timeline for retiring the ccTLD shall not change.

If the Manager breaches the Retirement Plan the IFO should work with the Manager to reinstate the Retirement Plan. If this is not possible the IFO can advise the Manager that it will maintain the Default Retirement Date from the Notice of Retirement.

5. Oversight & Review Mechanism

5.1. Oversight

This Policy is directed at ICANN and the IFO as the entity that performs the IANA Naming Functions with respect to ccTLDs.

This Policy is not intended and shall not be interpreted to amend the way in which ICANN interacts with the IFO and the delineation of their roles and responsibilities.

This Policy will not change or amend the role of the ICANN Board of Directors has with respect to individual cases of ccTLD Delegation, Transfer and Revocation, which is understood to be limited to a review to ensure that the IFO (staff) has followed its procedures properly. It is important to note that the IFO's decisions to:

- notify the ccTLD manager of the Retirement; and/or
- remove a ccTLD from the Root Zone

are of out scope for this Policy (see Section 2).

5.2. Review Mechanism

In this Policy on Retirement decisions have been identified which shall be subject to a review mechanism.

6. Stress Testing

6.1. Definition of Stress Testing

Stress testing is defined as:

- Test the process as developed by applying the process to "corner case" situations and understand whether such a case results in an unwanted outcome or side effects.
- If the outcome of that situation results in an unwanted outcome or side effects, adjust the Policy/Process if needed.

After completion of the draft process the stress testing was conducted through answering the following questions:

- What is outcome of this situation when the process is invoked?
- Is the outcome of that situation/the result unwanted or are side effects unwanted/unacceptable?
- Does the Policy/Process need to be adjusted/refined?

6.2. Identified situations where adjustment/additional work may be needed

The Working Group identified the following 16 situations:

1. Significant name change of a country (resulting in a change of ccTLD).

   Examples are:

   - ZR (Zaire) to CD (Congo, Democratic Republic of) (1997);
   - TP (East Timor) to TL (Timor-Leste) (2002)

2. Domain Names under management at removal date.

   At the agreed end-date (date of removal from the Root Zone), Second Level Domain Names ("SLD") are still under management of the ccTLD Manager, despite reasonable efforts from the ccTLD Manager to end registrations.

3. Breach of Retirement Agreement.

   Various situations:

   - The ccTLD Managers continues to promote the ccTLD and accepts registrations during the Retirement process.

     Does it make a difference if at removal date there are no SLDs under management or the number of registrations under management has not declined or has even increased compared to the number at the date of Retirement Notification?

   - The ccTLD Manager stops all activities i.e. goes off-line.
   - The ccTLD Managers takes no action resulting in serious deterioration of the zone.

4. The ccTLD Manager goes bankrupt after Notification of Retirement.
5. Request for Transfer after the Retirement Notice has been sent.
   - Retirement is the result of significant name change;
   - Retirement is the result of dissolution of a country, significantly interested parties cannot be identified.
6. The ccTLD Manager ends membership of the ccNSO and claims policies (for example Retirement and/or RFC1591/FoI) are therefore not applicable.

   Note: The ccNSO Council recently established that membership of ccNSO ends by definition when the entity listed as ccTLD Manager is no longer listed as such in the IANA Root Database, implying that for the duration of the Retirement process the membership of the ccNSO does not end, unless it is actively terminated by the Manager.

7. The Country Code was removed from the list of Assigned Codes because the country dissolved and the Code was re-assigned shortly afterwards (within 10 years) to another country added to the list.
8. There is uncertainty about authoritativeness of lines of communication between the ccTLD Manager and IFO.

   The identity of authoritative entities are not clear during the process.

9. Breach of Agreement due to conflicts of laws.
   - Due to Court Injunction;

- due to applicable National Law/Court Order.

10. Breach of Agreement during extension period.
11. Island state disappears, but interests intend to keep ccTLD “alive”.
12. Unforeseen technical consequences, significant consequences or other affecting other TLDs or the DNS in general.
13. Country disappears, however there is a clear successor state
14. A decision by the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency to remove a Country Code is completely out of line, in breach of ISO 3166 or ISO rules.
15. Assets of the ccTLD go to another party during the Retirement process.
16. Does the Retirement Policy apply to pending Retirement cases?

Each of these situations (1-16) was extensively discussed, and the discussion resulted in the need to include a specific mechanism of Transfer of a ccTLD post Retirement notice, for an expedient and “administrative” Transfer in order to ensure an orderly Retirement process. The results of the discussion and reference to the relevant section in the proposed Policy or other relevant policy document is included in the table *Result of Stress Test per Identified Situation* (see Annex A).

7. Process to Date

After the call for volunteers and appointment by the ccNSO Council of the members (see Annex C for the list of members, observers, experts and staff support) the ccPDP3 Retirement Working Group held its first conference call and commenced its work in June 2017. Since then the WG has met 61 times, of which 8 times were in person during ICANN meetings starting at the Johannesburg meeting in June 2017 (ICANN59) and 53 times through conference calls.

In the course of its work the original timeline and schedule as included in the Issue Report, was updated twice (March & December 2019).

The first work item the WG completed were the Rules of Engagement i.e the internal procedures for interaction and decision-making, which guided the activities of the WG members [4].

As of ICANN60 (in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates) and at every following meeting the ccPDP3 Retirement WG informed the ccTLD community and members of the Governmental Advisory Committee present at the respective ICANN meetings about its progress.

At the Kobe meeting (ICANN64), the ccTLD Managers present expressed their initial support for the proposed method and process, including its proposed duration. At the Montreal meeting (ICANN66) the ccTLDs present expressed their support for the proposals with respect to the decisions that should be subject to oversight and the Review Mechanism.

At the Montreal meeting, the chair and vice-chair of ccPDP3 Retirement WG also conducted an extensive on-boarding session for members of the Governmental Advisory Committee.

A. Result of Stress Test Per Identified Situation

#	Situation	Result	Policy / Source	Adjustment
1	Significant name change of country	No need to adjust the Policy. Significant name change as defined through ISO 3166 Standard is one of the causes to remove country code.	ISO 3166 Standard [16]	None
2	Domain Names under management at removal date	Whether there is a significant number under management or only a limited set is not relevant. There is a need to avoid gaming the system. Rationale for Retirement process is to accommodate new ccTLDs per RFC 1591.	Subsection 4.3 RFC 1591 [17]	None
3	Breach of Retirement Agreement (ccTLD Manager promotes SLD post Retirement notice, ccTLD stops all activities, ccTLD Manager does not take any action).	Process continues as if agreed. Compliance is not enforceable. However, IFO may invoke Revocation.	Subsection 4.3 Section 4 FoI Report [5]	None
4	The ccTLD Manager goes bankrupt after Notification of Retirement.	May become a Security and stability issue: IFO assess on case-by case basis. substantively it is responsibility of operator. Revocation may be warranted if threshold for revocation is met.	Section 4 FoI Report [5]	None
5	Request for Transfer after the Retirement Notice is sent.	There is a gap in current policy (RFC 1591 and section 3 FoI). No specific mechanisms for expedient and “administrative” Transfer specifically targeted at orderly Retirement process.	RFC 1591 [17] Section 3 FoI Report [5]	Need to include specific mechanism targeting Retirement
6	ccTLD Manager ends membership of the ccNSO.	Policy is by definition only targeted at ICANN see Annex C of the ICANN Bylaws).It is up to ICANN to decide whether membership of the ccNSO is relevant in individual cases.	ICANN Bylaws Section 3, Annex C (on scope of ccNSO Policy Development Process) [11]	None
7	Country Code is reassigned shortly after removal (within 10 years) to another country added to the list.	Currently considered impossible.	ISO 3166 Standard [16]	None
8	Uncertainty about authoritativeness of lines of communication between ccTLD Manager and IFO. Is ccTLD manager or its administrative contact authoritative and authorized to take the decision.	The IFO deals with a Functional Manager, and if required may transfer to a new entity The IFO deals with a Functional Manager, and if required may transfer to a new entity which is Functional. In addition, section 3.1 of the FoI provides a sensible basis to expect that the IFO seeks contact with the ccTLD Manager and relevant decision-making entity of the ccTLD Manager.	Section 3 Section 3.1 FoI Report [5]	None
9	Breach of Agreement/Plan, resulting from conflict of laws: Court Injunction to applicable Law/ Court order	The Retirement plan must be subject to legally binding court order in the jurisdiction.		None
10	Breach of agreement during extension period			None

#	Situation	Result	Policy / Source	Adjustment
11	Island state disappears, but interests (was: commercial Interests" intend to keep ccTLD "alive"	If the Code Element is removed, the ccTLD is eligible for Retirement. Reason for removal is not of relevance.	RFC 1591: *"IANA is not in business of deciding what is and what is not a country"* [17]	None
12	Unforeseen technical consequences/significant consequences or other affecting other TLDs/DNS in general. Name Servers for Domain Names not under ccTLD, are still under ccTLD to be removed.	Communication to customers is part of the Retirement Plan. In addition the removal of a ccTLD is a predictable and foreseeable process. There should be no surprises. Customers should know where their essential services are hosted.	Section 4.4	None
13	Country disappears/ however there is a clear successor state.	Countries do not disappear overnight. Takes some time before ISO-code is removed. In addition decision to remove country code is not part of the Policy.	ISO 3166 Standard [16]	None
14	Decision by ISO 3166 MA to remove country code is completely out of line, in breach of ISO 3166 or ISO rules.	Decision to remove country code is not part of the Policy and ICANN should not be involved in the process of removal of country code, independent of merits of decision. Reasonably predictable decisions over the past years. This is not an issue for the Policy, but an issue for the ISO3166 MA and ISO itself. No need to adjust the Policy.	RFC 1591: *"IANA is not in the business to decide what is and what is not a country. [...] ISO has a ISO has a procedure for determining which entities should be and should not be on that list."* [17]	None
15	Assets of the ccTLD go to other party during removal process.	Receiving end will be aware of the issues: Retirement of the ccTLD. No surprises for them. Even if ccTLD manager would go bankrupt. People in the country will know about the removal and Retirement process.	Section 4.4	None
16	Does the Retirement Policy apply to pending Retirement case?	The WG believes the applicability of the Policy to existing situations or those emerging before the proposed Policy becomes effective is out of scope of its mandate. For situations prior to this Policy coming into force, responsibility lies with the IFO to create a suitable procedure. The WG suggests that such a procedure could be based on and anticipates the proposed Policy.	Item 2 (page 9) Section 3	

B. Overview of Terminology Used in the Context of Retirement of ccTLDs

B.1. IANA Naming Function terminology

Notes with respect to terminology in context of IANA Naming Function:

The column "Used in" refers to the ICANN Board and IANA reports relating to the ccTLD mentioned

Term/Practice	Definition/Description	Used in	Comment
Not Assigned		.UM (2007) [7]	Needs to be defined.
Retired	Term *retired* is listed as such in IANA Reports	.AN (2010) [6]	Process concluded in 2015.
Retired	Not included in IANA Root Zone Database, no record in [10]	.YU (2007) [8] .TP (2002) [9]	.YU Process concluded in 2009, .TP process concluded in 2015.
Unallocated (ccTLDs)		.UM (2007) [7]	Needs to be defined.
Disposition of Top Level Domain		.AN (2010) [6]	
Removal of ccTLDs		.UM (2007) [7]	
Retirement of (cc)TLD			Not defined in FoI nor by DRD WG in its final report.
Revocation	The process by which the IANA Operator rescinds responsibility for management of a ccTLD from an incumbent manager.	Section 3.5 of RFC1591 [17]	FoI note: Section 3.5 of RFC1591 explicitly contemplates Revocation *"in cases of persistent problems with the proper operation of a domain"*.

B.2. Specific terminology derived from the ISO 3166 Standard

Notes with respect to the terminology in context of ISO 3166 Standard:

- In this overview a distinction is made between terminology defined in the Standard and the ISO Online Browsing Platform. The terminology defined in the Standard is included in the table in normal font. The terminology used in the Online Browsing Platform is *emphasized*.
- The PDP WG considers the Standard to be paramount. Terminology from the Online Browsing Platform is only included for informational purposes. It is strongly advised not to use or refer to the informational terms in Policy and policy related documents.

Term/Practice	Definition/Description	Defined in	Comment
Assigned (or allocated) code elements	The result of applying the principle of visual association between the country names (in English or French, or sometimes in another language) and their corresponding code elements.	ISO Standard Section 5.1 [16]	
Unassigned	NOT DEFINED IN THE STANDARD		
Unassigned	*Code Elements that have not been assigned to country names.*	ISO Online Browsing Platform [15]	Defined in [14]. As this is not defined in the Standard it is only included for informational purposes and use in Policy rules should be avoided.
Deletions from the list of country names	Deletions from the list of country names shall be made on the basis of information from the United Nations Headquarters, or upon the request of a member of ISO 3166/MA. The ISO 3166/MA shall decide upon deletion, on the basis of the information given. ISO3166-3 provides the list of country names deleted in this part of ISO 3166 since its first edition in 1974.	ISO Standard Section 7.3 [16]	
Reservation of Code Elements	Some code elements are reserved. For a limited period when their reservation is the result of the deletion or alteration of a country name. For an indeterminate period when the reservation is the result of the application of international law or of exceptional requests.	ISO Standard Section 7.5 & 7.5.1 [16]	
Reallocation Period	Code elements that the ISO3166/MA has altered or deleted should not be reallocated during a period of at least fifty years after the change. The exact period is determined in each case on the basis of the extent to which the former code element was used.	ISO Standard Section 7.5.2 [16]	
Transitionally Reserved	NOT DEFINED IN THE STANDARD		
	Codes that are reserved during a transitional period while new code elements that may replace them are taken into use. This results from changes in the standard.	ISO 3166 Online Browsing Platform Glossary. Defined in [14]	This description is not included in the Standard. It is only included in this document for informational purposes and use in Policy rules should be avoided.
Period of Non-Use	Certain code elements existing at the time of the first publication of the ISO 3166 country codes and differing from those in this part (ISO 3166-1) should not be used for an indeterminate period to represent other country names. These code elements should be included in the list of reserved code elements and should not be reallocated during a period of at least fifty years after the date the countries or organizations concerned have discontinued their use.	ISO Standard [16] 7.5.3	

Term/Practice	Definition/Description	Defined in	Comment
Exceptionally Reserved	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 ISO3166, but for which an interchange requirement exists. Before such code elements are reserved, advice from the relevant authority must be sought.		
Exceptionally Reserved	*Codes that have been reserved for a particular use at special request of a national ISO member body, governments or international organizations.*	ISO 3166 Online Browsing Platform Glossary. Defined in [14].	This description is not included in the Standard. It is only included in this document for informational purposes and use in Policy rules should be avoided. For example, the code UK has been reserved at the request of the United Kingdom so that it cannot be used for any other country.
Reallocation	Before reallocating a former code element or a formerly reserved code element, the ISO3166/MA shall consult, as appropriate, the authority or agency on whose behalf the code element was reserved, and consideration shall be given to difficulties which might arise for the reallocation.	ISO Standard [16] Section 7.5.5	
Indeterminately Reserved	NOT DEFINED IN THE STANDARD		
Indeterminately Reserved	A code element that has been indeterminately reserved for use in a certain way. Usually this is justified by their presence in other coding systems.	ISO 3166 Online Browsing Platform glossary. Defined in [14]	This description is not included in the Standard. It is only included in this document for informational purposes and use in policies should be avoided. For example, several codes have been reserved by the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) because they have been used in its Standard ST.3.
Country Name	Name of country, dependency, or other area of particular interest	ISO Standard [16] Part 1 Section 3.4	
Country Code	Listing of country names with their representations by code elements	ISO 3166 [16] Part 1 Section 3.3	
Code Element	The result of applying a code to an element of a coded set	ISO 3166 [16] Part 1 Section 3.2	
Code	Set of data	ISO 3166 [16] Part 1 Section 3.1	
List of Country Names	Part of the Clause 9 list	ISO 3166 [16] Part 1 Section 6, 6.1. In clause 6 of part 1 the content of the list is enumerated in Clause 9.	
Formerly Used Codes	NOT DEFINED IN THE STANDARD		
Formerly Used Codes	*Codes that used to be part of the standard but that are no longer in use. See alpha-4 codes.*	ISO 3166 Online Browsing Platform [15]	As this is not described in the Standard it is only included for informational purposes and use in Policy rules should be avoided.

C. Membership of RET WG

C.1. Members

1. Stephen Deerhake, .as (Chair)
2. Dr Eberhard W Lisse, .na (Vice Chair)
3. Patricio Poblete, .cl
4. Peter Van Roste, CENTR
5. Danko Jevtović, .rs
6. Mirjana Tasić, .rs
7. Tom Barrett, EnCirca
8. Wafa Dahmani, .tn
9. Abibu Ntahigiye, .tz
10. Svitlana Tkachenko, .ua
11. Barrack Otieno, AFTLD
12. Annebeth Lange, .no
13. Nick Wenban-Smith, .uk
14. Barbara Povše, .si
15. Brent Carey, .nz
16. Allan MacGillivray, .ca
17. Peter Koch, .de
18. Garth Miller, .cc
19. Ann-Cathrin Marcussen, .no
20. Liz Williams, .au
21. Sean Copeland, .vi
22. Alyssa Moore, .ca
23. Teddy Affan Purwadi, .id

C.2. Participants

1. Olévié Kouami, INTEC4DEV
2. Theo Geurts, Realtime
3. Michele Neylon, Blacknight
4. Nenad Orlić
5. Rasheed Tamton
6. Vadim A. Mikhaylov

C.3. Observers and Experts

C.3.1. IFO

1. Naela Sarras
2. Kim Davies

C.3.2. GAC

1. Olivier Girard

C.3.3. ISO3166 Expert

1. Jaap Akkerhuis, NLnet Labs
   ICANN: ISO 3166 MA member

C.3.4. Staff Support:

1. Joke Braeken
2. Kimberly Carlson
3. Bart Boswinkel
4. Bernard Turcotte

References

[1] Boswinkel, Bart: *ISSUE REPORT country code Policy Development Process 3*. https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/2017-05/issue-report-pdp-rrm-10apr17-en.pdf, Last Accessed: 2020-04-12

[2] ccNSO Council: *ccNSO Council Meeting San Francisco*. https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_23715/minutes-council-16mar11-en.pdf, Last Accessed: 2020-04-12

[3] ccNSO Council: *Charter Working Group Retirement of ccTLD*. https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/charter-wg-retirement-cctlds-10apr17-en.pdf, Last Accessed: 2020-04-12

[4] ccNSO Council: *Policy Development Process (PDP) Retirement Working Group*. https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=64081623&preview=/64081623/89981518/roe.draft.2017-08-17%20closed.pdf, Last Accessed: 2020-04-12

[5] Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG): *Framework of Interpretation of current policies and guidelines pertaining to the delegation and redelegation of country-code Top Level Domain*. Version: 2015. https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_46435/foi-final-07oct14-en.pdf, Last Accessed: 2019-10-07

[6] IANA: *Delegation Record for .AN*. https://www.iana.org/domains/root/db/an.html, Last Accessed: 2018-01-17

[7] IANA: *IANA Report on the Revocation of the .UM Top-Level Domain*. https://www.iana.org/reports/2007/um-report-10jan2007.html, Last Accessed: 2020-04-15

[8] IANA: *Removal of the .YU domain formerly representing Yugoslavia*. https://www.iana.org/reports/2010/yu-report-01apr2010.html, Last Accessed: 2018-01-17

[9] IANA: *Report on the Removal of the .TP top-level domain representing Portuguese Timor*. https://www.iana.org/reports/2015/tp-report-20150126.html, Last Accessed: 2020-04-15

[10] IANA: *Root Zone Database*. https://www.iana.org/domains/root/db, Last Accessed: 2020-04-16

[11] ICANN: *Bylaws for Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers*. https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en, Last Accessed: 2020-04-12

[12] ICANN Board of Directors: *Special Meeting of the Board Minutes*. https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2000-09-25-en, Last Accessed: 2020-04-12

[13] ICANN ccNSO Delegation, Redelegation Working Group: *Report on the Delegation of ccTLDs*. https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_22607/drd-wg-final-report-07mar11-en.pdf, Last Accessed: 2020-04-12

[14] International Standards Organization: *Glossary For ISO 3166*. https://www.iso.org/glossary-for-iso-3166.html, Last Accessed: 2020-04-16

[15] International Standards Organization: *Online Browsing Platform (OBP)*. https://www.iso.org/obp/ui, Last Accessed: 2018-02-13

[16] INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS ORGANIZATION: *International Standard ISO 3166-1, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions – Part 1: Country codes*. Version: 2013. https://www.iso.org/iso-3166-country-codes.html, Last Accessed: 2019-10-21

[17] POSTEL, Jon: *Domain Name System Structure and Delegation*. Version: March 1994. http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1591.txt, Last Accessed: 2019-10-21. Internet Requests for Comments. – RFC

[18] WIKIPEDIA: *Request for Comments*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Request_for_Comments, Last Accessed: 2019-02-08