

1
2
3
4
5
6

Stakeholder Analysis

v2.1

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

2018-05-14

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

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

22 FOI WG defines Stakeholders in the context of the administration of ccTLDs to encom-
23 pass Significantly Interested Parties, “interested parties” and “other parties” refer-

24 ended in RFC1591.

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

29 1.2. The FOIWG 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
32 Operator 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 demon-
60 strable 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
63 defined in FoI
- 64 Transfer, or transfer of responsibilities
- 65 Needs to consent to transfer (1. process by which the IANA Operator trans-
66 fers responsibility from an incumbent manager to a new manager with the
67 consent of both parties.)
- 68 “Revocation” (section 3.5 of RFC1591)
- 69 to refer to the process by which the IANA Operator rescinds responsibility
70 for 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
84 the 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,
112 and adheres to the ISO 3166-1 standard for guidance on when to add, modify
113 and 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
118 to complete the transition of the .AN domain to the .CW domain, the .SX
119 domain, and any other relevant domain; so that it may be removed from the
120 DNS root zone no later than 31 October 2014.

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

124 See:

125 – Extension of retirement process

126 Example:

127 Extension removal date .AN

128 see:

129 – Decision on removal from root zone

130 Removal of .TP from root zone

131 **1.5 Other Interested Parties**

132 FOIWG interprets the requirement for “concerned” or “affected” parties in Transfers to
133 communicate with the IANA Operator (section 3.6 of RFC1591) to require applicants

134 to provide documentation of support by Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to
135 evaluate and document this input for Transfers.

136 **1.5.1 Registry Service Provider**

137 • Role: Do what instructed
138

139 • When and how to be to be involved?

140 **1.5.2 Users of domain name**

Draft, 2018-05-14