

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6

# Title

## Subtitle

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

2018-05-03

*This document includes an automatically translated outline from [Stakeholders analysis.nm5](#).*

Draft, 2018-05-03

## 7 **1 Stakeholders**

8 FOI WG definition

9 Stakeholders in the context of the administration of ccTLDs to encompass Significantly

10 Interested Parties, “interested parties” and “other parties” referenced in RFC1591.

### 11 **1.1 Significantly Interested parties (FoI)**

12 Definition from FoI ( October 2014:

13 “Significantly Interested Parties” (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to include, but not be limited to:

14 a) the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the  
15 ccTLD and b) any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational  
16 institutions, or others that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demon-  
17 strable interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s) including the incumbent manager. To  
18 be considered a Significantly Interested Party, any party other than the manager or the  
19 government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD  
20 must demonstrate that it has a direct, material and legitimate interest in the operation  
21 of the ccTLD(s).

22 FOI WG defines Stakeholders in the context of the administration of ccTLDs to encompass  
23 Significantly Interested Parties, “interested parties” and “other parties” referenced in  
24 RFC1591.

25 1.1. The FOI WG interprets the requirement for “interested parties” to have “some voice”  
26 (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to require applicants to provide documentation of support by  
27 Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for Delega-  
28 tions.

29 1.2. The FOI WG interprets the requirement for “concerned” or “affected” parties in  
30 Transfers to communicate with the IANA Operator (section 3.6 of RFC1591) to require  
31 applicants to provide documentation of support by Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator  
32 to evaluate and document this input for Transfers.

#### 33 **1.1.1 Role(s) ?**

#### 34 **1.1.2 Entities**

35 • Government(s)

36 FOI

37 The government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with  
38 the ccTLD

39 What is government of territory in case of scenario 2 cases?

40 SU, (Sovjet Union) (1990)

41 NT, Neutral Zone (1993)

42 YU, Yugoslavia (2003)  
43 CS, Serbia and Montenegro (2006)  
44 AN, Netherlands Antilles (2010)  
45 – When and how to be involved  
46  
47 – Which government(s)  
48 In Scenario 2 cases different governments could be involved.  
49 Or in other words: what is country or territory associated with the ccTLD?  
50 In following cases:  
51 SU, (Sovjet Union) (1990)  
52 NT, Neutral Zone (1993)  
53 YU, Yugoslavia (2003)  
54 CS, Serbia and Montenegro (2006)  
55 AN, Netherlands Antilles (2010)  
56 • Other SIP  
57 FOIWG definition  
58 any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institu-  
59 tions, or others that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable  
60 interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s) including the incumbent manager.  
61 – Incumbent ccTLD manager  
62 With respect to transfers and revocation roles of Incumbent Manager are defined  
63 in FoI  
64 Transfer, or transfer of responsibilities  
65 Needs to consent to transfer (1. process by which the IANA Operator transfers  
66 responsibility from an incumbent manager to a new manager with the consent  
67 of both parties.)  
68 “Revocation” (section 3.5 of RFC1591)  
69 to refer to the process by which the IANA Operator rescinds responsibility for  
70 management of a ccTLD from an incumbent manager.  
71 Part of SInificantly Interested Parties  
72 – Registrars  
73 \* Role: Open new TLD ( registration to?)  
74 Supplier registrants  
75 \* When and how to be to be involved?  
76  
77 – Registrants  
78 \* Role?  
79

80 \* When and how to be involved

81 **1.1.3 LIC**

82 Local Internet Community

83 This term has been in use for a very long time, however was never defined. Through the  
84 work of the FOIWG it has been replaced by another set of terminology

85 **1.2 ccTLD manager**

86 **1.2.1 Transition arrangement**

87 **1.2.2 Transition Plan**

88 • Develop Plan

89

90 • Role: Implementing Executive/operational

91

92 • When and how to be to be involved?

93 **1.2.3 Temporary Caretaker or Incumbent?**

94 **1.3 IANA/PTI**

95 See respective IANA reports about role

96 **1.3.1 Role: Guardian of process**

97 • Coordinate with Incumbent or caretaker

98

99 • Propose actions

100

101 • Monitor progress

102 **1.3.2 When and how to be to be involved?**

103 **1.3.3 Counterpart transition arrangement**

104 **1.4 ICANN Board**

105 **1.4.1 Oversight?**

- 106 • How and when involved

107

- 108 • Decisions

- 109 – certify start retirement process

110 Start of the .AN retirement process Board resolution 11 October 2011

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

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

117 Resolved (2011.10.11.05), that the University of Netherlands Antilles work to  
118 complete the transition of the .AN domain to the .CW domain, the .SX domain,  
119 and any other relevant domain; so that it may be removed from the DNS root  
120 zone no later than 31 October 2014.

121 Resolved (2011.10.11.06), that the .AN domain be removed from the DNS root  
122 zone on 31 October 2014, if not requested earlier by the manager of the domain.  
123 See:

- 124 – Extension of retirement process

125 Example:

126 Extension removal date .AN

127 see:

- 128 – Decision on removal from root zone

129 Removal of .TP from root zone

130 **1.5 Other Interested Parties**

131 FOIWG interprets the requirement for “concerned” or “affected” parties in Transfers to  
132 communicate with the IANA Operator (section 3.6 of RFC1591) to require applicants to  
133 provide documentation of support by Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate  
134 and document this input for Transfers.

**135 1.5.1 Registry Service Provider**

**136**     • Role: Do what instructed  
**137**

**138**     • When and how to be to be involved?

**139 1.5.2 Users of domain name**

Draft, 2018-05-03