Retirement Process

Removal of code element from ISO 3166 list of country names

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

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

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

Stakeholders?

causes to date

📝 See scenario documents:

significant rename of country

📝 Examples: Scenario 1:
AI (French Afar and Issas) to DJ (Djibouti) (1977)
HV (Upper Volta) to BF (Burkina Faso) (1984)
BU (Burma) to Myanmar (MM) (1989)
BY (Byelorussian SSR to Belarus, no change in code elements) (1992)
ZR (Zaire) to CD (Congo, Democratic Republic of) (1997)
TP (East Timor) to TL (Timor-Leste) (2002)

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

end of country/territory

📝 Examples Scenario 2 document
Examples are:
SU, (Sovjet Union) (1990)
NT, Neutral Zone (1993)
YU, Yugoslavia (2003)
CS, Serbia and Montenegro (2006)
AN, Netherlands Antilles (2010)

The code element SU was removed from the list of country names, it was later included in the list of exceptionally reserved code elements as defined in the Standard (section 7.5.4)

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

fragments/no successor

Discontinues, but replaced

- ▼ other?
  - ▼ Fragmentation, combined with significant rename of core part?
    - Results in continued role original manager
    - Example: .YU -> CS -> RS
  - "Brexit" / "SSxit"?
  - 📝 **Scenario: Significant part of geopolitical entity exits geopolitical entity**

    Example: Great Britain leaving European Union. Southern Sudan leaving Sudan.
    Impact in terms of ISO 3166-1: No change in code element of original entity (EU and SD remain to be listed).
    Impact in terms of ccTLD: Depending on policy, a significant number of registrations may need to be terminated.

    This scenario should not be covered by the ccNSO Policy on retirement of ccTLDs.
    Rationale:
    1. Original Code Element is not affected. Hence triggering event as identified does not manifests itself.
     2. ccTLDs registration policy is out of scope of ccNSO policy remit (see Annex C ICANN Bylaws)

- ▼ Notifications
  - ▼ Who and how to inform?
    - IANA
    - ccTLD manager
    - Admin and Tech Contact
  - Who is required to inform when?
- ▼ Need for Specific arrangements/documentation?
  - ▼ No arrangement?
    - What triggers TLD manager plan?
    - Role of stakeholders?

Arrangement

📝 .YU case

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

o   YU: Delegation of RS Top Level Domain and redelegation of the YU domain https://www.iana.org/reports/2007/rs-yu-report-11sep2007.html
o   .YU: IANA report on the delegation of the .ME Domain
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/van-den-hove-to-dengate-thrush-17feb11-en.pdf

In line with historical practice, and consistent with the principles of adherence to the ISO 3166-1 standard, these (.ME and .RS) were delegated on the condition that the ".YU" domain be retired.
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2010/yu-report-01apr2010.html

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

Also: the proposed operator of the .RS domain and the proposed operator of the .ME domain have mutually agreed a transfer and decommissioning plan for the .YU domain that would see a stable transition to the new domains.
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2007/rs-yu-report-11sep2007.html

.AN case

In January 2011, the University of the Netherlands Antilles presented its initial application to ICANN for delegation of the .CW top-level domain. Subsequently, over the course of the year the application was expanded and revised.
In March 2011, the University and SX Registry SA executed a "grand-father agreement".
In September 2011, the University entered into a revised agreement with SX Registry SA B.V. in regards to the transitional arrangements concerning the .AN top-level domain,
o   .AN: Delegation of the .CW domain representing Curacao and transitional arrangements for the .AN domain representing the Netherlands Antilles
https://www.iana.org/reports/2011/cw-report-20111003.html
o   .SX: Delegation of the .SX domain representing Sint Maarten
https://www.iana.org/reports/2011/cw-report-20111003.html

.ZR case

In June 2002, Key Systems and Interpoint SARL entered into a contract to take "measures necessary" to transfer the registry data for the .CD and .ZR domains to Key Systems, and to support redelegation of the domain to Key Systems.
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2011/cd-report-07jan2011.html

Given that "zr" was being removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, the manager performed a transition, populating the .cd top-level domain and emptying the .zr top-level domain. By an 11 March 2001 message to the IANA, the .zr manager stated that the .zr top-level domain had been emptied in preparation for its deletion from the root zone. .Zr was removed in 2001
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2001/zr-report-20jun01.html

Trigger for TLD manager plan

▼ Defines roles and responsibilities
    ccTLD manager
    PTI/IANA
    other Stakeholders
▼ Specific circumstances
    Examples
    📝 **.AN Case**
    https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en#1.d
    The .AN operator expressed that while the majority of domain registrants have migrated to the new domains, there remains a minority of about 30 registrants that need more time to complete their transition. The operator is concerned that the current deadline is not achievable for the remaining registrants.

    Granting the requested extension date helps maintain the security and stability of the .AN domain name while ICANN works with the operator to remove the domain name from the DNS Root Zone.

TLD manager Plan
📝 YU case:
content of the plan
The plan recognises the need to freeze registrations in the .YU zone so as not to disadvantage either existing or prospective registrants, and also charts a clear and predictable process so that the Internet community is fully informed on how the transition is to occur. All this is to be done on a schedule that provides reasonable time for registrants to prepare and transition to the new domains.

Following the delegation of .RS, the registry took a staged approach to the decommissioning of the .YU domain. In the first phase, all names registered within .YU had their respective .RS domain reserved. This was conducted as part of a sunrise process that involved other rights-based allocations prior to general availability.
During the first six months of .RS operations, only existing .YU domain holders were able to obtain domains corresponding to the reservations. As the domains have a hierarchical model (.CO.RS, .ORG.RS, etc.) rights were also awarded for domains directly under .RS on a first-come first-served basis.
By September 2008, after the six month period, unredeemed .RS reservations expired, and general availability started for .RS domains. The .YU registry was then curated, with inactive and unused .YU domains being identified. 2,769 .YU domains deemed as still active, and all remaining .YU domains were removed in March 2009. Between March and May 2009, 1,236 domain holders appealed to have their domains re-instated.
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2010/yu-report-01apr2010.html

.AN case:
Transition plan was in place This included inter alia:
-        to move registrations from the .AN domain to new domains .CW and .SX,
-        the University of the Netherlands Antilles continuing to act as manager of the .AN domain until transition is complete
See https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-11-en#1.3.rationale

From the decision
Whereas, there is a transition plan to move registrations from the .AN domain to new domains .CW and .SX, with the University of the Netherlands Antilles continuing to act as manager of the .AN domain until transition is complete,

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

The proposed sponsoring organisation for .CW intends to continue to operate the .AN domain while transitional arrangements are executed. These transitional arrangements include provisions for registrants in Curaçao to transfer registrations to .CW; and for registrants in Sint Maarten to transfer registrations to .SX. The applicant calls for a phased transition to be concluded over a period of three years, after which time the .AN domain will be fully retired.
(Delegation report .CW : https://www.iana.org/reports/2011/cw-report-20111003.html)

Scenario 1 cases
According to the IANA report on the removal of .TP top level domain: "The ISO 3166-1 code for Portuguese Timor was removed in the year 2002. When a ccTLD is no longer eligible due to the country or code's removal from the ISO 3166-1 standard …., the operator is expected to develop a transition plan to the successor ccTLD(s) and ultimately retire the domain. "

.ZR Case

Given that "zr" was being removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, the manager performed a transition, populating the .cd top-level domain and emptying the .zr top-level domain. By an 11 March 2001 message to the IANA, the .zr manager stated that the .zr top-level domain had been emptied in preparation for its deletion from the root zone.
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2001/zr-report-20jun01.html

.TP Case
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2015/tp-report-20150126.html
Following the successful delegation of the .TL domain, all new registrations within the .TP domain were disallowed, and the existing registry was maintained in a caretaker state to provide existing registrants time to transition to the new .TL domain.

Owner?

📝 YU. was re-delegated (transferred in terms of FoI) to RNIDS. RINDS:
See: 11 September 2007 Board Decision (*the .YU domain be redelegated to the Serbian National Registry of Internet Domain Names in a temporary caretaker capacity.*)

NOTE NEW CONCEPT THAT NEEDS TO BE DEFINED: TEMPORARY CARETAKER

Concept also used in context

▼ Approval needed?

By Whom?

Documentation?

When?

▼ Stakeholders

LIC

IANA

SIP

What to include in policy?

📝 **Limited by scope of ccNSO policies**
Role of ccTLD manager is defined in delegation and retirement process. It looks at the initial registration policy (transition from the retiring ccTLD to new ccTLD)

▼ Execution manager Plan

Reporting

Execute

Notification progress Transition Plan

📝 **.YU case:**
ICANN received a short status update from RNIDS in early 2008, however nothing further was reported according to the reporting protocol regarding the transition, or any difficulties that had been encountered.
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2010/yu-report-01apr2010.html

.ZR case.
https://www.iana.org/reports/2001/zr-report-20jun01.html

▼ Removal TLD from RZ database

PTI/IANA report

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

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

.ZR case

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

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

See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2001/zr-report-20jun01.html

.TP CAse

See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2015/tp-report-20150126.html

ICANN Board decision

📝 Board confirrms and takes decision on 30 September 2009, to allow IANA to remove YU from rootzone database on 1April 2010
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2010/yu-report-01apr2010.html

.AN Case

.TP case

Notifications

📝 Progress reporting by ccTLD manager
.YU case

IANA was informed on 30 March that RNIDS informed the community that it had effectively switched off the .YU domain, independent of the removal of the .YU delegation from the DNS root zone.
https://www.iana.org/reports/2010/yu-report-01apr2010.html

.AN case

The .AN domain operator and the Netherlands' Ministry of Economic Affairs have sought a nine month extension of the deadline in order to provide additional opportunity for the remaining registrants to conclude their transition away from the .AN domain.
See: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2014-10-16-en#1.d

Execution of removal

▼ Process Management

▼ Overall process management

Assessment of transition plan

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

See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2007/rs-yu-report-11sep2007.html

Monitoring of process

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

.AN case: **Resolved** (2011.10.11.04), that the University of Netherlands Antilles be instructed to report their progress on decommissioning the .AN domain every six months to ICANN against a relevant set of metrics,
(See: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-11-en#1.3.rationale)

Timing

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

▼ Duration of process

Anticipated duration
📝 . YU case:
26 September 2006. This revision removed the "CS" code, and added an "ME" code for Montenegro, and an "RS" code for Serbia. Once the standard was revised it became possible for ICANN to consider applications for delegation of these two new codes in the DNS root zone.

In December 2006, the Government of Montenegro submitted a delegation application for the .ME domain.

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

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

.AN Case
From the rationale
The matter of the timeline for the transition from the .AN domain to its successor domains is being addressed in conjunction with the evaluation of the delegation of the .CW and .SX domains, in order to give clarity to the communities involved the timeline upon which the transition will occur. This will allow the communities to prepare and plan appropriately for the transition.
See: https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-11-en#1.3.rationale

Decision to execute process intitiated by the Board decision to delegate .CW 25 August 2011.

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

.ZR Case

.TP case
In **2002,** the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste was established. The ISO 3166-1 standard removed the TP
On 23 March 2005, the .TL top-level domain was delegated

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

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

The removal date is currently scheduled for 28 February 2015.

See: Board resolution (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-en#1.c) and related IANA report
https://www.iana.org/reports/2015/tp-report-20150126.html

Effective duration
📝 .ZR-> .CD case

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

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

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

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

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

ICANN responded that as the .ZR domain is to be retired, it could not be redelegated in this fashion.

n June 2002, Key Systems and Interpoint SARL entered into a contract to take "measures necessary" to transfer the registry data for the .CD and .ZR domains to Key Systems, and to support redelegation of the domain to Key Systems.

▼ Removal from ISO 3166

Effective date of removal

📝 .AN case: .AN was removed at or around 10-10-2010, with chage of Statute of Kingdom of Netherlands

Anticipated date of removal

Anticipated Timing of decisions/actions

▼ Oversight

Remedies?

▼ Direct oversight

Board Decisions

📝 Board decisions conforming
Intiuatation of process

Conclusion of process;\
.TP case
.YU. case
.AN case

Oversee of planning of process

📝 Board decision 11 September 2007, re .YU

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

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

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

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

Resolved (07.76), that the proposed delegation of the .RS domain to the Serbian National Register of Internet Domain Names is approved.

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

Whereas, ICANN has delegated the .RS domain for use in Serbia, and the .ME domain for use in Montenegro,
Whereas, the ISO 3166-1 standard has removed the "YU" code, and the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency recommends its use be discontinued,

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

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

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

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

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

Removal of ccTLD from root zone

📝 Board confirrms and takes decision on 30 September 2009, to allow IANA to remove YU from rootzone database on 1April 2010
See: https://www.iana.org/reports/2010/yu-report-01apr2010.html

.AN Case

.TP case

▼ Decision review

PDP 3 part 2

Include principles in this part?

Not mentioned yet, but to be defined in policy?