

Oversight Retirement Process

The WG has spoken about need to introduce a process to oversee the retirement of a ccTLD. Basically, the design of the oversight process is an attempt to document:

- the sequence of decisions/timeline with respect to the retirement of a ccTLD
- who takes the decisions,
- which decision, if any, is subject to review
- if decision is subject to a review and by whom (details will need to be addressed in second part of this PDP).
- Transparency / confidentiality of decisions and material

Staff proposes to start discussion of the oversight design after the removal process and its steps are developed.

To date, in the historical cases (see below) the following decisions can be identified

- Decision on starting the “decommissioning” process
- Approval decision of plan for decommissioning
- Extension of Timelines
- Decision that the Decommissioning plan is completed
- Decision for Removal from Root zone database

Background material

Role of the ICANN Board of Directors

Recorded Decision .YU case

Delegation of the .ME (Montenegro) Domain Delegation of the .RS (Serbia) Domain Redelegation of the .YU (former Yugoslavia) Domain

Kim Davies advised that the delegation of .ME (Montenegro) and .RS (Serbia) and the redelegation of .YU (Yugoslavia) were interrelated. At the time that Serbia and Montenegro became new countries, the ISO 3166-1 list was altered to give the two countries individual codes .RS and .ME respectively. To date, the countries covered have been using the .YU domain. The YU code is no longer in the ISO 3166-1 list and has been replaced with .ME and .RS and as such should be decommissioned in a responsible way. The transition plan from .YU to .RS and .ME involves an MOU between the two entities and would see that .YU is assigned to the proposed .RS sponsoring organization, which is effectively the same operator as today. They would act as caretaker for .YU for two years to allow for a stable transition. ICANN’s proposed resolution language is consistent with this plan however a three-year transition period is proposed to allow for contingencies. The proposed resolutions support the two new delegations and acknowledge the two parties involved in de-commissioning of the .YU domain, and state it is to be retired in three years time.

In addition to explaining the ICANN evaluation of the delegation applications, the board was also advised of last-minute correspondence IANA had received in relation to the delegation of the .ME domain.

Steve Goldstein asked if there is any provision in the agreement to restrict new registrations in .YU. Kim Davies advised that he would have to check to be certain, but as soon as new registrations are allowed in .RS and .ME it was his understanding that it would not be possible to register new domains in .YU.

Steve Goldstein asked why the preference for a three-year transition rather than two. Kim Davies advised they didn't want to propose something that was too aggressive. The applicants had proposed a two-year transition period, but the Board could consider a different length.

The Chair proposed that the language in the resolution could be changed to be up to and no more than three years.

Steve Crocker acknowledged that some transitions have taken a long time. An additional suggestion would be to ask for regular reports with metrics measuring progress towards the outcome.

Kim Davies noted that the resolution proposed does suggest that the .YU registry report every 6 months to ICANN Staff on progress. The proposed resolution also makes it clear the domain must be removed no later than 2010, which was considered a responsible timeframe that was neither too aggressive, nor unnecessarily prolonged. If the community felt it could transition quicker there is nothing to stop that from happening.

Paul Twomey suggested that the wording be slightly amended asking that they report progress against appropriate metrics.

There were no objections to the suggested amendments.

Dave Wodelet asked if it mattered if they take till 2008, 2009 or even 2010 and the Chair responded that we do want a certain end date.

Kim Davies advised that there is no strong precedent for how long transition will take from one to the other. There have only been a small number of transitions of country codes in the history of ccTLDs. In trying to determine what they considered a reasonable timeframe for transition the closest comparable situation that IANA was aware of is when telephone-numbering systems change. These transitions generally take place in one-to-two years.

The Chair noted that the language proposed by Paul Twomey seems acceptable, an alternative to an extra year would be to stick with two years to 2009 and if the party needs more time they could come back and explain why, which may be the best option. Putting in a two-year timeframe provides them with leverage to help their community to promptly perform the transition. The Chair recommended the alternative on the basis it was made clear to them that if they have a problem with two years they can come back with an explanation to ICANN as to why they need more time.

Susan Crawford noted that she understands the direction and appreciates the conservative approach, but asked what mechanism should be used if the transition moves too slowly.

The Chair reflected that if they come back and have a reasonable explanation, then this should be okay. He believed you would help them with a shorter deadline as they can point to that as a mandate to move ahead and transition to other the domain.

Janis Karklins noted that human nature suggests they will take as much time as they are given for transitioning. He suggested that the resolution should include a point that ICANN Staff should keep the Board informed of the progress of the transition.

In summation, the Chair suggested that the Board approves all three requests, and that ICANN Staff is expected to keep the Board informed on the retirement of .YU domain. Paul Twomey added that they communicate according to appropriate metrics.

Steve Goldstein moved and Vanda Scartezini seconded the following resolution:

Delegation of .ME

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

Montenegro ,

Whereas, ICANN has received a request for delegation of .ME to the Government of Montenegro,

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 (07.75), that the proposed delegation of the .ME domain to the Government of Montenegro is approved.

Delegation of .RS

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.

Redelegation of .YU

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.

A voice vote was taken of all Board Members present and all three motions were approved by a vote of all members present 13-0, with one abstention from Peter Dengate Thrush.

Peter Dengate Thrush explained that his reservation was associated with his belief that such policy decisions concerning delegation should rest with the ccNSO as specifically provided under the bylaws. He noted that he has raised this issue on a number of occasions suggesting that this matter should be referred to the ccNSO but to no avail.

The Chair noted that these practices have been in existence prior to the formation of the ccNSO, and that if policy is required in this area that the ccNSO work on a policy proposal, that might be properly considered.

See: <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/minutes-2007-09-11-en>

Update .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>

Removal Decision .YU

Board confirms 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>

Role of IANA

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>

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>)

ZR case.

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

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>