

Scenario's

Peter Koch 11 September 2017

On Thu, Sep 07, 2017 at 10:53:02AM +0200, Dr Eberhard W Lisse wrote:

Will it be helpful if we define all possible states for an ISO Code (or rather the ones that can affect a corresponding ccTLD), and then define all possible scenarios of movement between these "states"?

from the perspective of ISO3166-1:2013, a code can be on the list - or not. That's two states. For those not on the list, section 8.1.3 lists 42 codes that are available for "users" (that is ICANN, or the global Internet community, in this case) to assign. Everything else is, as somebody else wrote in July, "behind the curtain" of the 3166/MA. Unless we receive advice that the "reserved list" as described in section 7.5 is openly available (i.e., intentionally and formally shared by the MA, with or without a fee), we should refrain from basing policy decisions on the contents of that list. The MA itself might not be the final authority in this regard, though.

Even if we were to receive such advice, the past experience and the sheer purpose of the reservations might still suggest to refrain from such move. We can try to ask for a clarification, but I assume that both phrasing the question and receiving the response would take some time, that should not block other work.

Regards,  
Peter

Allan,

I think you are missing almost every point you are making :-)-O

While the .SU case is fascinatinly interesting, and we have someone from the .SU ccTLD Manager on this Wg for in depth talk, it is irrelevant for our work.

While technically a Retirement, in practice it is an Addition to the Exceptionally Reserved. And come to think of it, we do not have a Policy for that. EU, UK, SU, AC are the most well known and the corresponding ccTLDs are delegated, but there are others.

I wonder if we are not approaching this from a wrong angle.

As far as this Wg's work is concerned, we don't need to be concerned with what hapopens to a country, or what triggers a change in the ISO code, but only what actually happens to it.

That said, an ISO code (AA to ZZ) can only be in one of 5 "states":

- 1 Assigned
- 2 Transitionally Reserved
- 3 Exceptionally Reserved
  
- 4 Unavailable for Assignment (eg ZZ)
- 5 Available for Assignment

So we only have to look at the possible "movements" of an ISO Code which may trigger a retirement of the corresponding ccTLD:

- 1a From Assigned to Transitionally Reserved  
New ISO code assigned at the same time, such as in a pure Name Change (for example ZR to CD) ie a 1-to-1 replacement
- 1b From Assigned to Transitionally Reserved  
No new ISO Code assigned
- 2 From Exceptionally Reserved to Transitionally Reserved
- 3 From Transitionally Reserved to Available
- 4 From Assigned to Exceptionally Reserved
- 5 From Exceptionally Reserved to Available
  
- 6 From Transitionally Reserved to Exceptionally Reserved  
Insofar as there is no ccNSO Policy for Adding to Exceptionally Reserved (as above)

Policy for these scenarios (other than perhaps 1a) would obviously also require how to deal with a Change in Manager if only because the Local Internet Community and Significantly Interested Parties (such as government) have under FoI input into the selection of a new Manager. Misconduct of incumbent ccTLD Managers is well sorted by the FoI Principles, and we just might need to note it in an eventual Policy.

EVERYBODY, please advise if there are more scenarios, that we need to have a look at.

With regards to your "Normal Policy" vs "Unilateral Retirement" I am looking at the water level in the ditch :-)-O

However, if we managed to develop Policy that covers all possible scenarios, preferably unanimously, and get broad consensus from the ccNSO or better, we can avoid even having to go there.

In short:

ICANN/PTI's interests are basically to have their house in order "as quickly as possible", while acting impartially.

The ccTLD Manager's interests are basically to protect their investments, if only human and other resources. That translates, for one into "as long as possible"

The client's interests are basically to protect their business, ie "as predictable and as possible".

We need to address all of these interests in a way that will be accepted as reasonable by most :-)-O

greetings, el

On 05/09/2017 17:36, Allan MacGillivray wrote:

Nigel - I thought that would take you up on your request for input and ideas for the working group. I would like to offer two, though the second is rather broad.

1. Presentation on the Background to the .SU Situation  
- We need to collect all of the facts surrounding this situation and put them on the record for the working group as a package. It seems that this is yet another request for Kim to help us. This will be important for the working group as it will illustrate the need for policy approaches that may have to deal with and uncooperative registry manager.

2. An Overall Framework for the Retirement Policy Itself  
- I know that this may sound ambitious so early in the process but I believe that if we start to outline the policy at this point, then it will help must to organize our work going forward, so let me kick this off without an awful lot of thought. My objective here is not to suggest the overall policy itself, but rather to suggest blocks of work that could be done and then assembled into the final policy - almost a work plan for the policy.

Main Elements of the Policy

'The Trigger'

- What is the event or action that causes the policy to be invoked, or triggers? A leading candidate would be a decision of the ISO 3166 Maintainer Agency to remove a country code from the 3122-1 list. Would there be a need for some form of communication between the MA and PTI?

The 'Normal Policy' (the approach where the registry manager is fully cooperating) - Elements of this could include the date, relative to the trigger, when new registrations would cease, the date of the removal of the TLD from the root, possibly the development of a 'retirement plan' by the manager including information that would be conveyed to registrants

Policy for 'Unilateral Retirement' (where the registry manager is not fully cooperating)

- The policy would need to allow for situations where the registry manager is not cooperating in the retirement of the TLD. It would need to specify when and how a process for removing the TLD from the root would commence. It could also include incentives for the

manager's cooperation, for example, allowing the maximum length for the process for a 'normal' retirement take longer than that of a unilateral retirement.

Perhaps the list could offer comments firstly on the merits of the two ideas as subjects and secondly on main elements of the policy that I have suggested.

All the best

Allan

> .... an ISO code (AA to ZZ) can only be in one of 5 "states":

>

> 1 Assigned

> 2 Transitionally Reserved

> 3 Exceptionally Reserved

>

> 4 Unavailable for Assignment (eg ZZ)

> 5 Available for Assignment

Note that the "states" you define are not excluding each other.

Codes on the reserved list are available for assignment.

The standard only mentions that codes can be "Officially Assigned" and if you look closely, the User-assigned code elements (Your state 5) are for all practical purposes also assigned, not by the ISO 3166/MA but defined (and thus one can say assigned or reserved) by the standard body (TC 46/WG 2). The MA is not at liberty to change the standard, it only maintains the codes tables (e.g. Section 9).

All other codes are potentially available to be assigned. You could call them "Unassigned" but it is not a term used in the standard.

Some of these unassigned codes are on a reserved list for various reasons. Peter Koch remarked correctly that this list is not part of the standard and if one reads Section 7.5, it is clear that codes on this list might become officially assigned.

Regards,

+1 @Nick. I fear we are heading off into the weeds by the distraction of the edge/exceptional cases, as interesting as they are.

/Stephen

Thanks Kim

In terms of process then, given the additional potential complications of the exceptional reserved codes which are ccTLDs, I would suggest it makes sense to focus initially on the bread and butter alpha-2 codes becoming unassigned, before considering whether any changes in terms of the policy recommendation(s) would be needed for the other four ccTLDs which don't fall into that bucket? I sense there is a danger in getting distracted by the edge/ exceptional cases here.

Best wishes  
Nick

Hi Nick,

Quoting Nick Wenban-Smith on Tuesday July 25, 2017:

However there aren't there only two scenarios we're looking at here.

1. Either a ccTLD code is removed from the ISO 3166 alpha 2 officially assigned codes list (and for completeness it is not then exceptionally reserved); or
2. For the four ccTLDs which are currently not on the ISO 3166 alpha 2 officially assigned list (.ac, .eu, .su and .uk) what to do if that code is removed from being exceptionally reserved (and for completeness does not become an officially assigned code). I don't think there are any others but pls correct me if I'm wrong here.

I think there are four scenarios:

1. The first case you describe, an assigned code being removed from ISO 3166-1
2. The case of two-letter codes that are not assigned but reserved, but whose use is effectively grandfathered (AC and UK)
3. The case of two-letter codes that are not assigned but reserved, but is in accordance with standing guidance (EU)
4. The case of two-letter codes that are not assigned but reserved, **and not in accordance with standing guidance (SU)**

There are a panoply of possible outcomes from this group that will inform cases 2-4. For example, Nigel has indicated his position that the Board had "no lawful policy-making role" in producing the guidance that allowed EU, if that was not appropriate that could move EU to category 4. On the converse, an expanded form of eligibility for delegating reserved codes could be established that moves SU from 4 to 3. It could be that rather than only grandfathering reservations prior to 2000, it is extended to present day, which moves 3 and 4 to 2. And so on.

To be clear, I am not suggesting what the answer here is, but I am pointing out not all exceptionally reserved codes are equal given our current guidance is the ICANN Board resolution of 2000<sup>1</sup> which spells out when and when they can't be delegated. This means they fall into three buckets: those that meet the criteria, those that don't, and those delegated as exceptionally reserved before the criteria was set in 2000 (i.e. grandfathered).

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2000-09-25-en>

kim

Very interesting thread and discussion.

The experiences of the past plus the operation in practice of the MA are essential in understanding scenarios in which any policy produced by this group will likely come about.

However there aren't there only two scenarios we're looking at here.

1. Either a ccTLD code is removed from the ISO 3166 alpha 2 officially assigned codes list (and for completeness it is not then exceptionally reserved); or
2. For the four ccTLDs which are currently not on the ISO 3166 alpha 2 officially assigned list (.ac, .eu, .su and .uk) what to do if that code is removed from being exceptionally reserved (and for completeness does not become an officially assigned code).

I don't think there are any others but pls correct me if I'm wrong here.

The options (and quite possibly the recommendation) might be the same for both questions, but it's probably easier to think about what I have called question 1 above first since that is the vast majority of ccTLDs, and I don't think there is any history of a ccTLD NOT on the ISO 3166 alpha 2 officially assigned list being retired. Obviously from the .uk perspective I'm more interested in the second question in the situation that Eberhard describes below :)

Best wishes  
Nick

Jaap,

while fully agreeing that we should not be second guessing the ISO/MA and while also agreeing that stopping to use a code for a ccTLD ASAP would be the ideal, it does conflict with the real world.

We need to find a way of balancing PTI's views with that of the ccTLD Manager and/or its clients.

Let's do a Hypothetical and assume that Puerto Rico became the 52nd State of the US (ie two countries/territories merge)

There is a case to be made for the ISO code to go to the transitionally reserved list as it would be comparable to Hawaii which does not have its own ISO code.

If Congress decided to treat all 52 States the same, drop the PR ISO (and move it into Transitionally Reserved) it would trigger Retirement of the ccTLD

Let's assume .PR has anywhere from 50000 to 200000 domain names which would probably not be too impressed with having to stop using it, especially not Cold Turkey.

So they would probably apply pressure on the USG to retain the ISO code on the main list (as a subdivision?) so it would most likely not even look at retirement, but if that was not happening, and a retirement would be triggered, how would a (our) Policy look like that would be fair to all?

For the fun of it, let's do a Hypothetical and assume the United Kingdom fell apart after Brexit (ie a country split):-)-O

Being on the Exceptionally Reserved List it would probably not trigger retirement, per se.

They would figure out a way of moving the 10 Million domain names into the respective (new) ccTLDs, though I don't think the DNS could auto-forward the .UK names into the corresponding ccTLD Name unless you do some very serious cloudflaring :-)-O

However it could very well happen that the devolving countries agree to do away with the UK code, ie move it to Transitionally Reserved and than it would trigger Retirement in my view.

So what would a (our) Policy look like that would be fair to all?

If the ccTLD Manager decided to go fishing (while there were still names) it would probably need a revocation and transfer under FoI, independently of retirement.

Let's hypotheticalize the .UM case to one without hard feelings of anyone involved:

Because the Local Internet Community is only a few penguins glowing in the dark the ccTLD Manager not wanting to manage (market) the ccTLD (for whatever reason) approaches IANA to have it removed from the root. Everybody involved agrees and IANA removes from the root, while the ISO remains in the assigned list.

That's certainly not a retirement, probably a revocation (without transfer). I think even covered by the FoI, as the ccTLD Manager agrees.

And, if someone wants to apply for it, that's most certainly not an issue for this PDP.

Any other scenario?

el