1 # Retirement Process

2 ## v2

3 ## ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

4 ## 2018-05-03

5 *This document includes an automatically translated outline from Retirement*
6 *Process documentation version 2 copy 2.nm5.*

7 # 1 Retirement Process

8 ## 1.1 Removal of code element from ISO 3166 list of country names

9 Removal of code element from ISO 3166 list of country names is defined in terms of ISO
10 3166 standard as:

11 Code Element: The result of applying a code to an element of a coded set (ISO 3166- part
12 1 section 3.2) effectively the two ASCII letter code.

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

16 ### 1.1.1 Stakeholders?

17 ### 1.1.2 causes to date

18 See scenario documents:

19 • significant rename of country

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

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

32 • end of country/territory

33 Examples Scenario 2 document
34 Examples are:
35 SU, (Soviet Union) (1990)
36 NT, Neutral Zone (1993)
37 YU, Yugoslavia (2003)
38 CS, Serbia and Montenegro (2006)
39 AN, Netherlands Antilles (2010)

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

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

47   – fragments/no successor
48

49   – Discontinues, but replaced
50

51 • other?

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

53   * Results in continued role original manager
54

55   * Example: .YU -> CS -> RS
56

57   – "Brexit" / "SSxit"?

58   Scenario: Significant part of geopolitical entity exits geopolitical entity

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

64   This scenario should not be covered by the ccNSO Policy on retirement of ccTLDs.
65   Rationale:

66   1. Original Code Element is not affected. Hence triggering event as identified
67   does not manifests itself.
68

69   2. ccTLDs registration policy is out of scope of ccNSO policy remit (see Annex
70   C ICANN Bylaws)

1.2 Notifications

1.2.1 Who and how to inform?

- IANA

- ccTLD manager

- Admin and Tech Contact

1.2.2 Who is required to inform when?

1.3 Need for Specific arrangements/documentation?

1.3.1 No arrangement?

- What triggers TLD manager plan?

- Role of stakeholders?

1.3.2 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

o .YU: IANA report on the delegation of the .ME Domain

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:

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

102 that would see a stable transition to the new domains.
103 See:

104 .AN case
105 In January 2011, the University of the Netherlands Antilles presented its initial application
106 to ICANN for delegation of the .CW top-level domain. Subsequently, over the course of
107 the year the application was expanded and revised.
108 In March 2011, the University and SX Registry SA executed a "grand-father agreement".
109 In September 2011, the University entered into a revised agreement with SX Registry SA
110 B.V. in regards to the transitional arrangements concerning the .AN top-level domain,
111 o .AN: Delegation of the .CW domain representing Curacao and transitional arrangements
112 for the .AN domain representing the Netherlands Antilles

113 o .SX: Delegation of the .SX domain representing Sint Maarten

114 .ZR case
115 In June 2002, Key Systems and Interpoint SARL entered into a contract to take "measures
116 necessary" to transfer the registry data for the .CD and .ZR domains to Key Systems, and
117 to support redelegation of the domain to Key Systems.
118 See:

119 Given that "zr" was being removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, the manager performed a
120 transition, populating the .cd top-level domain and emptying the .zr top-level domain.
121 By an 11 March 2001 message to the IANA, the .zr manager stated that the .zr top-level
122 domain had been emptied in preparation for its deletion from the root zone. .Zr was
123 removed in 2001
124 See:

125 • Trigger for TLD manager plan
126
127 • Defines roles and responsibilities
128   – ccTLD manager
129
130   – PTI/IANA
131
132   – other Stakeholders
133
134 • Specific circumstances
135   – Examples
136   .AN Case
137   The .AN operator expressed that while the majority of domain registrants have
138   migrated to the new domains, there remains a minority of about 30 registrants

139   that need more time to complete their transition. The operator is concerned
140   that the current deadline is not achievable for the remaining registrants.

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

144   – Subtopic

1.4 TLD manager Plan

145

146 YU case:
147 content of the plan
148 The plan recognises the need to freeze registrations in the .YU zone so as not to disad-
149 vantage either existing or prospective registrants, and also charts a clear and predictable
150 process so that the Internet community is fully informed on how the transition is to occur.
151 All this is to be done on a schedule that provides reasonable time for registrants to prepare
152 and transition to the new domains.

153 Following the delegation of .RS, the registry took a staged approach to the decommis-
154 sioning of the .YU domain. In the first phase, all names registered within .YU had their
155 respective .RS domain reserved. This was conducted as part of a sunrise process that
156 involved other rights-based allocations prior to general availability.
157 During the first six months of .RS operations, only existing .YU domain holders were able
158 to obtain domains corresponding to the reservations. As the domains have a hierarchical
159 model (.CO.RS, .ORG.RS, etc.) rights were also awarded for domains directly under .RS on
160 a first-come first-served basis.
161 By September 2008, after the six month period, unredeemed .RS reservations expired,
162 and general availability started for .RS domains. The .YU registry was then curated, with
163 inactive and unused .YU domains being identified. 2,769 .YU domains deemed as still
164 active, and all remaining .YU domains were removed in March 2009. Between March and
165 May 2009, 1,236 domain holders appealed to have their domains re-instated.
166 See:

167 .AN case:
168 Transition plan was in place This included inter alia:
169 - to move registrations from the .AN domain to new domains .CW and .SX,
170 - the University of the Netherlands Antilles continuing to act as manager of the .AN domain
171 until transition is complete
172 See

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

177 From the rationale
178 The matter of the timeline for the transition from the .AN domain to its successor domains

179 is being addressed in conjunction with the evaluation of the delegation of the .CW and .SX
180 domains, in order to give clarity to the communities involved the timeline upon which the
181 transition will occur. This will allow the communities to prepare and plan appropriately for
182 the transition.

183 The proposed sponsoring organisation for .CW intends to continue to operate the .AN
184 domain while transitional arrangements are executed. These transitional arrangements
185 include provisions for registrants in Curaçao to transfer registrations to .CW; and for
186 registrants in Sint Maarten to transfer registrations to .SX. The applicant calls for a phased
187 transition to be concluded over a period of three years, after which time the .AN domain
188 will be fully retired.
189 (Delegation report .CW :)

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

196 .ZR Case

197 Given that "zr" was being removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, the manager performed a
198 transition, populating the .cd top-level domain and emptying the .zr top-level domain.
199 By an 11 March 2001 message to the IANA, the .zr manager stated that the .zr top-level
200 domain had been emptied in preparation for its deletion from the root zone.
201 See:

202 .TP Case
203 See:
204 Following the successful delegation of the .TL domain, all new registrations within the .TP
205 domain were disallowed, and the existing registry was maintained in a caretaker state to
206 provide existing registrants time to transition to the new .TL domain.

207 **1.4.1 Owner?**

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

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

212 Concept also used in context

213   1.4.2 Approval needed?

214   • By Whom?

215

216   • Documentation?

217

218   • When?

219   1.4.3 Stakeholders

220   • LIC

221

222   • IANA

223

224   • SIP

225   1.4.4 What in policy?

226   Limited by scope of ccNSO policies

227   Role of ccTLD manager is defined in delegation and retirement process. It looks at the

228   initial registration policy (transition from the retiring ccTLD to new ccTLD)

229   1.5 Execution manager Plan

230   1.5.1 Reporting

231   1.5.2 Execute

232   1.5.3 Notification progress Transition Plan

233   .YU case:

234   ICANN received a short status update from RNIDS in early 2008, however nothing further

235   was reported according to the reporting protocol regarding the transition, or any difficulties

236   that had been encountered.

237   See:

238   .ZR case.

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

1.6 Removal TLD from RZ database

1.6.1 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:

.TP CAse
See:

1.6.2 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:

.AN Case

.TP case

1.6.3 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.

275 .AN case

276 The .AN domain operator and the Netherlands' Ministry of Economic Affairs have sought a
277 nine month extension of the deadline in order to provide additional opportunity for the
278 remaining registrants to conclude their transition away from the .AN domain.

279 See:

280 **1.6.4 Execution of removal**

281 # 2 Process Management

282 ## 2.1 Overall process management

283 ### 2.1.1 Assessment of transition plan

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

286 See:

287 ### 2.1.2 Monitoring of process

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

291 .AN case: Resolved (2011.10.11.04), that the University of Netherlands Antilles be in-
292 structed to report their progress on decommissioning the .AN domain every six months to
293 ICANN against a relevant set of metrics,
294 (See:)

295 ## 2.2 Timing

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

2.2.1 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:

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.

336   See: Board resolution (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-
337   2015-02-12-en#1.c) and related IANA report

338   • Effective duration

339   .ZR-> .CD case

340   The .CD domain was initially delegated in 1997 to Interpoint SARL, a Switzerland-
341   based registry provider that has also provided service for a number of other African
342   countries such as Burundi and Rwanda. Interpoint was the operator of the .ZR
343   domain for Zaire.
344   When the country was renamed to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it was
345   issued with a replacement ISO 3166-1 code of "CD" on 14 July 1997.
346   Interpoint approached ICANN to replace .ZR with .CD, and was delegated the .CD
347   domain shortly thereafter.

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

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

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

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

358   • Removal from ISO 3166

359   – Effective date of removal

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

362   – Anticipated date of removal

363 ### 2.2.2 Anticipated Timing of decisions/actions

364 # 3 Oversight

365 ## 3.1 Remedies?

366 ## 3.2 Not mentioned yet, but to be defined in policy?

367 ## 3.3 Direct oversight

368 ### 3.3.1 Board Decisions

369 Board decisions conforming
370 Intiuatation of process

371 Conclusion of process; .TP case
372 .YU. case
373 .AN case

374 ### 3.3.2 Oversee of planning of process

375 Board decision 11 September 2007, re .YU

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

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

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

380 Whereas, ICANN has reviewed the request, and has determined that the proposed delega-
381 tion would be in the best interest of the local and global Internet communities,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

405 3.3.3 Removal of ccTLD from root zone

406 3.4 Decision review

407 3.4.1 PDP 3 part 2

408 3.4.2 Include principles in this part?