Retirement Process

v2.1

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

2018-05-14

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

1 Retirement Process

1.1 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.)

1.1.1 Stakeholders?

1.1.2 causes to date

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
29 a category of codes defined in the Standard. In addition, AI is now assigned to
30 Anguilla, HV is listed as unassigned (see Online Browsing Platform Country Codes,
31 ISO). Note 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
42　　Standard (section 7.5.4)

43　　The code elements NT, YU and AN were removed from the list of country names
44　　and included in the list of transitionally reserved code elements, which is a list
45　　published through the Online Browsing Platform, but which is not defined under
46　　the standard 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
60   Sudan.
61   Impact in terms of ISO 3166-1: No change in code element of original entity
62   (EU and SD remain to be listed).
63   Impact in terms of ccTLD: Depending on policy, a significant number of
64   registrations may need to be terminated.

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

68   1. Original Code Element is not affected. Hence triggering event as identi-
69   fied does not manifests itself.
70

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

73 1.2 Notifications

74 1.2.1 Who and how to inform?

75 • IANA

76

77 • ccTLD manager

78

79 • Admin and Tech Contact

80 1.2.2 Who is required to inform when?

81 1.3 Need for Specific arrangements/documentation?

82 1.3.1 No arrangement?

83 • What triggers TLD manager plan?

84

85 • Role of stakeholders?

86 1.3.2 Arrangement

87 .YU case

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

93 o YU: Delegation of RS Top Level Domain and redelegation of the YU domain
94 o .YU: IANA report on the delegation of the .ME Domain

95 In line with historical practice, and consistent with the principles of adherence to the
96 ISO 3166-1 standard, these (.ME and .RS) were delegated on the condition that the
97 ".YU" domain be retired.
98 See:

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

102 Also: the proposed operator of the .RS domain and the proposed operator of the .ME
103 domain have mutually agreed a transfer and decommissioning plan for the .YU domain

104 that would see a stable transition to the new domains.
105 See:

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

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

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

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

125 removed in 2001

126 See:

127 • Trigger for TLD manager plan

128

129 • Defines roles and responsibilities

130   – ccTLD manager

131

132   – PTI/IANA

133

134   – other Stakeholders

135

136 • Specific circumstances

137   – Examples

138   .AN Case

139   The .AN operator expressed that while the majority of domain registrants
140   have migrated to the new domains, there remains a minority of about 30
141   registrants that need more time to complete their transition. The operator

142 is concerned that the current deadline is not achievable for the remaining
143 registrants.

144 Granting the requested extension date helps maintain the security and stabil-
145 ity of the .AN domain name while ICANN works with the operator to remove
146 the domain name from the DNS Root Zone.

147 – Subtopic

1.4 TLD manager Plan

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

156 Following the delegation of .RS, the registry took a staged approach to the decommis-
157 sioning of the .YU domain. In the first phase, all names registered within .YU had their
158 respective .RS domain reserved. This was conducted as part of a sunrise process that
159 involved other rights-based allocations prior to general availability.

160 During the first six months of .RS operations, only existing .YU domain holders were
161 able to obtain domains corresponding to the reservations. As the domains have a hier-
162 archical model (.CO.RS, .ORG.RS, etc.) rights were also awarded for domains directly
163 under .RS on a first-come first-served basis.
164 By September 2008, after the six month period, unredeemed .RS reservations expired,
165 and general availability started for .RS domains. The .YU registry was then curated, with
166 inactive and unused .YU domains being identified. 2,769 .YU domains deemed as still
167 active, and all remaining .YU domains were removed in March 2009. Between March
168 and May 2009, 1,236 domain holders appealed to have their domains re-instated.
169 See:

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

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

180 From the rationale

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

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

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

199 .ZR Case

200 Given that "zr" was being removed from the ISO 3166-1 list, the manager performed a
201 transition, populating the .cd top-level domain and emptying the .zr top-level domain.

202 By an 11 March 2001 message to the IANA, the .zr manager stated that the .zr top-level
203 domain had been emptied in preparation for its deletion from the root zone.
204 See:

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

210 **1.4.1 Owner?**

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

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

215 Concept also used in context

216 1.4.2 Approval needed?

217 • By Whom?
218

219 • Documentation?
220

221 • When?

222 1.4.3 Stakeholders

223 • LIC
224

225 • IANA
226

227 • SIP

228 1.4.4 What in policy?

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

232 1.5 Execution manager Plan

233 1.5.1 Reporting

234 1.5.2 Execute

235 1.5.3 Notification progress Transition Plan

236 .YU case:
237 ICANN received a short status update from RNIDS in early 2008, however nothing
238 further was reported according to the reporting protocol regarding the transition, or
239 any difficulties that had been encountered.
240 See:

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

243 1.6 Removal TLD from RZ database

244 1.6.1 PTI/IANA report

245 According to the IANA report on Removal of the .YU domain formerly representing
246 Yugoslavia, there were 4,266 .YU domains still delegated in June 2009. This is down
247 from 32,772. In June 2009, there were 26,294 domains registered in .RS. IANA staff
248 noted that of the remaining 4,266 domains (under .YU), approximately 200 did not also
249 have the matching .RS domain.
250 When an alpha-2 code for a country is changed on the ISO 3166-1 list, the IANA's
251 historical practice has been to set up a top-level domain with the new code and to
252 delegate it to the same manager as the existing top-level domain, with the expectation
253 that a transition will occur and that the deprecated top-level domain will be deleted
254 once the migration is completed.

255 .ZR case
256 When an alpha-2 code for a country is changed on the ISO 3166-1 list, the IANA's
257 historical practice has been to set up a top-level domain with the new code and to
258 delegate it to the same manager as the existing top-level domain, with the expectation

259 that a transition will occur and that the deprecated top-level domain will be deleted
260 once the migration is completed.

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

264 .TP CAse
265 See:

266 **1.6.2 ICANN Board decision**

267 Board confirrms and takes decision on 30 September 2009, to allow IANA to remove
268 YU from rootzone database on 1April 2010
269 See:

270 .AN Case

271 .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.

.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:

283 ### 1.6.4 Execution of removal

284 # 2 Process Management

285 ## 2.1 Overall process management

286 ### 2.1.1 Assessment of transition plan

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

289 See:

290 ### 2.1.2 Monitoring of process

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

294 .AN case: Resolved (2011.10.11.04), that the University of Netherlands Antilles be
295 instructed to report their progress on decommissioning the .AN domain every six months

296 to ICANN against a relevant set of metrics,

297 (See:)

298 2.2 Timing

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

301 2.2.1 Duration of process

302 • Anticipated duration

303 . YU case:
304 26 September 2006. This revision removed the "CS" code, and added an "ME"
305 code for Montenegro, and an "RS" code for Serbia. Once the standard was revised
306 it became possible for ICANN to consider applications for delegation of these two
307 new codes in the DNS root zone.

308 In December 2006, the Government of Montenegro submitted a delegation appli-
309 cation for the .ME domain.

| 310 | This was followed by the applications for the delegations of the .RS domain, and |
| 311 | the redelegation of the .YU domain |

312	Board discussion about the appropriate timeline for decommissioning — and the
313	Board ultimately believed it was more appropriate to have a relatively short time-
314	line. The final resolution that was adopted by the ICANN Board on 11 September
315	2007 is that the .YU domain should be retired within two years:

316	.AN Case
317	From the rationale
318	The matter of the timeline for the transition from the .AN domain to its successor
319	domains is being addressed in conjunction with the evaluation of the delegation
320	of the .CW and .SX domains, in order to give clarity to the communities involved
321	the timeline upon which the transition will occur. This will allow the communities
322	to prepare and plan appropriately for the transition.
323	See:

| 324 | Decision to execute process intitiated by the Board decision to delegate .CW 25 |
| 325 | August 2011. |

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

330   .ZR Case

331   .TP case

332   In 2002, the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste was established. The ISO 3166-

333   1 standard removed the TP

334   On 23 March 2005, the .TL top-level domain was delegated

335   IANA staff and .TP contacts continued discussions on the removal of the .TP

336   top-level domain. In August 2013, the IANA Department received a letter

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

338   The removal date is currently scheduled for 28 February 2015.

339   See: Board resolution (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-

340   2015-02-12-en#1.c) and related IANA report

341   • Effective duration

342   .ZR-> .CD case

343   The .CD domain was initially delegated in 1997 to Interpoint SARL, a Switzerland-

344   based registry provider that has also provided service for a number of other African

345   countries such as Burundi and Rwanda. Interpoint was the operator of the .ZR

346   domain for Zaire.

347   When the country was renamed to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it was

348   issued with a replacement ISO 3166-1 code of "CD" on 14 July 1997.

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

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

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

357 ICANN responded that as the .ZR domain is to be retired, it could not be redele-
358 gated in this fashion.

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

362 • Removal from ISO 3166

363   – Effective date of removal

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

366   – Anticipated date of removal

367 **2.2.2 Anticipated Timing of decisions/actions**

368 3 Oversight

369 3.1 Remedies?

370 3.2 Not mentioned yet, but to be defined in policy?

371 3.3 Direct oversight

372 3.3.1 Board Decisions

373 Board decisions conforming
374 Intiuatation of process

375 Conclusion of process; .TP case
376 .YU. case
377 .AN case

378 3.3.2 Oversee of planning of process

379 Board decision 11 September 2007, re .YU

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

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

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

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

386 Resolved (07.76), that the proposed delegation of the .RS domain to the Serbian Na-
387 tional Register of Internet Domain Names is approved.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

409 ### 3.3.3 Removal of ccTLD from root zone

410 ## 3.4 Decision review

411 ### 3.4.1 PDP 3 part 2

412 ### 3.4.2 Include principles in this part?