

## **Planning for removal**

One of the core elements identified to date has been the “transition” plan to ensure a predictable, structured approach to the removal of the ccTLD from the DNS Rootzone database. In some cases the plan includes agreed upon actions between ICANN and the ccTLD manager.

For discussion by the WG is whether the requirement for such a plan should be included in the policy, and if so, how much detail should be included. One could also revert to include it as an expected, but not mandatory part of the recommended policy. One could argue that a mandatory requirement for such a plan is beyond the remit of the ccNSO policy, as it directly affects the ccTLD managers operations and registration policies (see Annex C of the ICANN Bylaws).

## **YU case**

content of the plan

The plan recognizes the need to freeze registrations in the .YU zone so as not to disadvantage either existing or prospective registrants, and also charts a clear and predictable process so that the Internet community is fully informed on how the transition is to occur. All this is to be done on a schedule that provides reasonable time for registrants to prepare and transition to the new domains.

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

During the first six months of .RS operations, only existing .YU domain holders were able to obtain domains corresponding to the reservations. As the domains have a hierarchical model (.CO.RS, .ORG.RS, etc.) rights were also awarded for domains directly under .RS on a first-come first-served basis.

By September 2008, after the six month period, unredeemed .RS reservations expired, and general availability started for .RS domains. The .YU registry was then curated, with inactive and unused .YU domains being identified. 2,769 .YU domains deemed as still active, and all remaining .YU domains were removed in March 2009. Between March and May 2009, 1,236 domain holders appealed to have their domains re-instated.

See: <https://www.iana.org/reports/2010/yu-report-01apr2010.html>

## **.AN case**

In January 2011, the University of the Netherlands Antilles presented its initial application to ICANN for delegation of the .CW top-level domain. Subsequently, over the course of the year the application was expanded and revised.

In March 2011, the University and SX Registry SA executed a “grand-father agreement”.

In September 2011, the University entered into a revised agreement with SX Registry SA B.V. in regards to the transitional arrangements concerning the .AN top-level domain,

o .AN: Delegation of the .CW domain representing Curacao and transitional arrangements for the .AN domain representing the Netherlands Antilles

<https://www.iana.org/reports/2011/cw-report-20111003.html>

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

<https://www.iana.org/reports/2011/cw-report-20111003.html>

Transition plan was in place This included inter alia:

- to move registrations from the .AN domain to new domains .CW and .SX,
- the University of the Netherlands Antilles continuing to act as manager of the .AN domain until transition is complete

See <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-11-en#1.3.rationale>

From the decision

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

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.

The proposed sponsoring organization for .CW intends to continue to operate the .AN domain while transitional arrangements are executed. These transitional arrangements include provisions for registrants in Curaçao to transfer registrations to .CW; and for registrants in Saint Maarten to transfer registrations to .SX. The application calls for a phased transition to be concluded over a period of three years, after which time the .AN domain will be fully retired.

(Delegation report .CW : <https://www.iana.org/reports/2011/cw-report-20111003.html>)

### **.ZR case**

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

See: <https://www.iana.org/reports/2011/cd-report-07jan2011.html>

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

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

### **Owner of Plan**

YU. was re-delegated (transferred in terms of FoI) to RNIDS. RINDS:

See: 11 September 2007 Board Decision (*the .YU domain be redelegated to the Serbian National Registry of Internet Domain Names in a temporary caretaker capacity.*)

### **NOTE NEW CONCEPT THAT NEEDS TO BE DEFINED: TEMPORARY CARETAKER**

*Concept also used in other contexts*

#### *Notes from discussion*

Temporary Caretaker needs to be included in Glossary.

Has been mentioned in different documents.

First used in case .VI.

Registry/caretaker: needs to be voluntary

Can not be mandatory. Why is a caretaker needed? Need to find a way that is voluntary.

Do you believe that some language that addresses it along lines described?

Eberhard: Should be ccTLD manager

Caretaker can be appointed. Technically can be difficult

In case .CW and .AN, transition was executed manually. If it is voluntary offer assistance.