Final Report of the Delegation, Re-delegation and Retirement Working Group of the ccNSO

ICANN-CCNSO-DRDWG

2011-05-02

Executive Summary

The Delegation, Re-delegation and Retirement Working Group ("DRDWG") was created by the Country Code Names Supporting Organisation ("ccNSO") Council to advise whether it should launch a Policy Development Process ("PDP") to recommend changes to the current policies for delegation, re-delegation and retirement of country code Top Level Domains ("ccTLDs").

The DRDWG has conducted an in depth analysis of the current policies and guidelines used by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority ("IANA") and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers ("ICANN"), and measured all published information pertaining to ICANN decisions and procedures relating to the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.

Based on its findings and after extensive public consultation the DRDWG recommends to the ccNSO Council:

1. Retirement of ccTLDs

   The DRDWG recommends the ccNSO Council undertakes a Policy Development Process to develop policies for the retirement of ccTLDs.

2. Delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs

   The DRDWG recommends that, as a first step, the ccNSO Council undertakes the development of a "Framework of Interpretation" for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. This framework should provide a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board on interpretations of the current policies, guidelines and procedures relating to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. The results of the use of such a Framework of Interpretation should be formally monitored and evaluated by the ccNSO Council after a pre-determined period. If the results of this evaluation indicate that the Framework of Interpretation failed to provide logical and predictable outcomes in ICANN decision making, the ccNSO Council should then launch PDPs on the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.

If the ccNSO Council adopts the above recommendations, the DRDWG suggests that the ccNSO Council makes use of the full reports[1] on retirement, delegation and re-delegation (with or without consent of the incumbent operator) of ccTLDs for:

1. **Developing the "Framework of Interpretation" for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs**, and

2. **Launching the PDP for the retirement of ccTLDs**.

The DRDWG suggests that the ccNSO Council consider the development of the recommended "Framework of Interpretation" as a higher priority than the PDP for retirement of ccTLDs.

The DRDWG also believes these recommendations provide a framework to resolve the issues identified and create an environment for making consistent and predictable decisions regarding the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs while enhancing accountability and transparency.

---

[1] Please see http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg.htm for meeting notes and a history of publications.

Contents

1 INTRODUCTION

This is the final report of the DRDWG to the Council of the ccNSO. The DRDWG was constituted following the decision of the ccNSO Council to adopt the charter on June 9, 2009 and the members of the DRDWG were appointed on the June 24th, 2009 ccNSO Council teleconference.

The purpose of the DRDWG was to advise the ccNSO Council whether it should launch a Policy Development Process to recommend changes to the current policies for delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.

The DRDWG considered current policies and guidelines relating to delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs, and reported on issues and matters of concern that arose during its detailed analysis phase. It also considered possible solutions to issues and matters of concern.

The IANA functions contract between the US Government and ICANN, including any contract implementation issues or procedures relating to it, were considered outside the scope of the DRDWG mandate.

The purpose and scope of the DRDWG are included in Annex A and the list of its members, observers and ICANN support staff is contained in Annex B

This report contains the key findings as well as the recommendations of the DRDWG to the ccNSO Council.

Section 2 of the report contains the findings and recommendations regarding the process of delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. The findings and recommendation regarding the retirement of ccTLDs are described in Section 3. An overview of the working method used and process is described in Section 4 of this report.

The complete results of the work undertaken by the DRDWG are contained in four reports published in November and December 2010 for public consultation (listed in Annex C), updated to take into account the public comments. These reports also include the consensus recommendations by the DRDWG on delegation, re-delegation (with and without consent) and retirement of ccTLDs.

The DRDWG considered documentation that was available up until December 2010 and does not take into consideration any documentation that was made public after this date. The documentation reviewed relating to the delegation of ccTLDs is listed in Annex D. Annex E and F list the documentation to re-delegations with and without consent of the incumbent operator respectively. Finally, the documentation relating to retirement of ccTLDs is included in Annex G.

2 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING DELEGATION AND RE-DELEGATION OF CCTLDS

2.1 General findings of the DRDWG

2.1.1 Sponsorship Agreements

The ICANN Board approved a resolution in September 2000 requiring a Sponsorship Agreement for all delegations and re-delegations[2].

The ICANN Board resolution regarding the .KZ re-delegation of June 2005 approved the re-delegation without a Sponsorship Agreement[3]. All subsequent delegations and re-delegations (with the exception of .EU), were completed without the ICANN Board requiring Sponsorship Agreements.

Currently, the September 2000 decision regarding Sponsorship Agreements has not been modified, but is no longer applied.

The DRDWG believes the ccNSO Council should request that the ICANN Board revoke this requirement.

2.1.2 Minutes of ICANN Board meetings

There are several documented cases of failure to minute Board discussions regarding the re-delegation of ccTLDs contrary to the procedures as laid out in the ICANN Bylaws for this.

This includes, with increasing frequency:

- Simply recording the decision of the Board and not recording any of the Board discussions.
- Noting in the minutes: "The information contained in the discussion regarding the re-delegation was held in private."

This issue raises significant concerns relating to accountability and transparency of ICANN.

The Chair of the DRDWG wrote to the Chair of the Board and the President and CEO of ICANN on June 9th 2010 noting that since 3 February 2009 (.BY re-delegation decision) the Board agreed to have re-delegation decisions in private session and requesting an explanation for this significant change in the methodology of the Board in dealing with re-delegation decisions. The Chair of the Board replied on the same date confirming reception of the request and that he would ask staff to prepare a formal response regarding these issues.

The original letter from the Chair of the DRDWG and the response from the President and CEO of ICANN can be found at the DRDWG's Website [4].

---

[2]http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-25sep00.htm
[3]http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-28jul05.htm
[4]http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg.htm

2.1.3 Definition of consent

RFC1591 and ICP1 use the same language to define consent: "(IANA) must receive communications from both the old organization and the new organization that assure the IANA that the transfer is mutually agreed".

Interpretation of consent (communication that the transfer is agreed), by IANA's own admission, is highly variable depending on a number of factors including culture and the immediate physical security of the ccTLD manager.

This includes interpreting a failure to reply to an IANA email as consent in certain cases of re-delegations where the current manager has stated he does not support the request.

2.1.4 Interested Parties (or Local Internet Community) support for delegations and re-delegations

The requirement that "Interested Parties" support delegations and re-delegations is clearly documented in RFC1591 and ICP1, as a key element of any such request, although there has never been a clear definition for this terminology[5]. This requirement is still in effect and has been inconsistently applied in ICANN decisions over the years, with increasing inconsistency in recent years.

Although ICANN has used a number of different terms as a substitute for "Interested Parties" over time (without embarking on any formal consultation or seeking advice from the stakeholder community) the implied definition of these terms seemed to have remained relatively clear until the recent transition to the term "Public Interest" (IANA Report on the re-delegation of .CO in November 2009[6]).

An analysis of all approved delegation and re-delegation requests published by ICANN indicates a significant degree of inconsistency in applying the "Interested Parties" requirement. This includes the approval of a number of delegation and re-delegation requests which have no documentation indicating any support by Interested Parties.

The analysis of all delegation and re-delegation requests approved by ICANN has also identified a clear trend that the "Interested Parties" requirement evolved to "Interested Parties and Government Support" and then further evolved to "Government Support, and Community Support, if available". There have been no documented changes to the relevant policies and guidelines, and no formal consultation or advice sought from the affected stakeholder community.

The following quotes from the minutes of the April 22nd, 2010 meeting of the ICANN Board highlight this issue (http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-22apr10-en.htm) :

- "...Jonne Soininen expressed his support for Harald, Rita and Ram's comments and moving forward with the delegations. Jonne also requested that the Board agree that "what is community support" should be a matter for ccNSO policy development, so that the Board is not trying to define such policies on its own."

- "...Jean-Jacques noted his support for Jonne's suggestion for ccNSO advice on this topic."

- "The Chair confirmed that the timing of the ongoing work at the ccNSO would not provide answers on these issues for a couple of years to come."

The ccNSO has not been contacted by the Board regarding this issue.

---

[5]Neither RFC1591 nor ICP1 (or any other documented policy statement by IANA or ICANN) provide a procedure for the re-delegation of a ccTLD without the consent of the incumbent operator. RFC1591 and ICP1 discuss the revocation of a delegation by IANA, for cause, followed by a delegation to a new operator. There is no documentation which shows that this has ever occurred.

[6]http://www.iana.org/reports/2009/co-report-24nov2009.html

2.1.5 GAC Principles 2005

The Government Advisory Committee ("GAC") Principles do not constitute formal ICANN policy, but provide advice to the ICANN Board regarding the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. The GAC has stated that it expects the ICANN Board to follow this advice in its decisions, or to formally explain to the GAC why they have not followed advice.

From the time of the publication of the original version of the GAC Principles in 2000 the IANA Reports have consistently referred to these as "Relevant guidance is also provided in the GAC Principles."

Following the publication of the 2005 version of the GAC Principles the IANA Reports began referring to these as "This document serves as "best practices" to guide governments in assuming proper roles with respect to the Internet's naming system."

By the end of 2009 the IANA Reports had dropped all mention of the GAC Principles and simply referred to "and other informational memoranda". There is no mention of the GAC Principles in any publicly available documentation regarding delegation or re-delegation decisions since then. It is unclear if the GAC Principles are still being considered in delegation and re-delegation decisions relating to ccTLDs.

2.1.6 RFC1591 vs News Memo #1 and ICP1

IANA has published its current practices relating to ccTLD re-delegations via a number of methods over time.

In 1994, it published RFC 1591 as its statement of current practice and in 1997 it published new guidance as ccTLD News Memo #1. In 1999, ICP1 was published as its statement of current practice.

In 2001 RFC1591 and the principles it contained were accepted as appropriate policies by a majority of ccTLDs active in ccTLD management, and these ccTLDs continue their support for these principles today[7].

Neither News Memo #1 nor ICP1 (which integrates News Memo #1) were ever officially endorsed by any significant group of ccTLDs.

Contrary to the statements contained in its header, ICP1 does contain significant changes in policies. These changes were never approved by resolution of the ICANN Board. The DRDWG analysis of RFC1591 vs ICP1 concluded that this policy decision (implementing ICP1) failed to meet all of the requirements for policy development in effect at the time. Additionally ICP1 is the last published policy statement by IANA regarding ccTLDs and has not been updated since 1999, and is inconsistent with current rules and practices in several areas.

2.1.7 IANA Reports

Edited versions of IANA Reports are usually published on the IANA web site after the ICANN Board has approved a delegation, re-delegation or retirement[8].

These IANA Reports are often the only public source of information concerning specific delegation, re-delegation and retirement decisions, beyond the Board minutes recording the resolutions for these decisions. As such, the community looks to these reports to understand how specific requests meet the requirements for delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.

---

[7]see http://www.wwtld.org and http://web.archive.org/web/20000830115819/http://www.iatld.org/ web archives

[8]There is no record in the minutes of any ICANN Board meeting of the Board having rejected a delegation or re-delegation request presented by IANA

There are no published specifications as to what the public version of IANA reports (which are edited versions of what is provided to the ICANN Board) should contain regarding the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.

An analysis of all IANA reports pertaining to ccTLDs has noted:

- A high degree of variability in the information provided to support any specific recommendation.

- Any lack of information supporting a decision is not consistently noted or explained.

- The format and type of information contained in the public IANA reports has changed frequently, sometimes significantly, without any consultation with, or notice to, the stakeholder community.

These issues raise concerns relating to accountability and transparency of ICANN

2.2 Specific Findings regarding delegation of ccTLDs

2.2.1 Allowing ISO3166-1 Exceptionally Reserved List be delegated as ccTLDs

The ICANN Board approved a resolution in September 2000 (http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-25sep00.htm) allowing the delegation of elements of the ISO3166-1 Exceptionally Reserved List as ccTLDs under certain circumstances.

The DRDWG analysis of this Board Decision concluded that this policy decision failed to meet all of the requirements for policy development in effect at the time.

This decision has only been invoked once to approve the delegation of the .EU ccTLD in March 2005.

2.3 Specific Findings regarding re-delegation of ccTLDs with the consent of the incumbent operator

No additional findings.

2.4 Specific Findings regarding re-delegation of ccTLDs without the consent of the incumbent operator

2.4.1 No procedure for re-delegation of a ccTLD without the consent of the incumbent operator

Neither RFC1591 nor ICP1 provide a procedure for the re-delegation of a ccTLD without the consent of the incumbent operator[9].

Both of these documents discuss the revocation of a delegation by IANA, for cause, followed by a delegation to a new operator.

This is somewhat confusing given that in these types of situations the revocation has never caused a ccTLD to be removed from the root prior to being delegated to a new operator as is suggested in the two documents (thus trying to ensure continued resolution of the domains registered in the relevant ccTLD).

This further illustrates some of the issues surrounding the re-delegation of ccTLDs without the consent of the incumbent operator.

---

[9]It is unclear what rules apply to legacy ccTLDs (where the current delegee was selected prior to ICANN being created) which do not have any formalized relationship with ICANN and are not members of the CCNSO.

2.4.2 Definition of an active administrative contact and procedures relating to the retirement of a ccTLD administrative contact

There are a number of IANA Reports regarding the re-delegation of ccTLDs that state that there is no valid administrative contact.

In such cases IANA has recommended the re-delegation of the ccTLD to the ICANN Board, which has approved these, without the approval of the administrative contact or seeking to replace it.

There are no published rules which define how IANA can determine if an administrative contact is no longer valid and the documentation indicates IANA takes significant latitude in making such a determination.

Additionally there are no published rules as to what IANA should do once it has determined that the administrative contact is no longer valid especially with respect to a re-delegation request[10].

The issue is closely associated with the notion of consent for re-delegations.

2.5 Recommendation regarding delegations and re-delegations of ccTLDs

The DRDWG recommends that, as a first step, the ccNSO Council undertake the development of a "Framework of Interpretation" for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. This framework should provide a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board on interpretations of the current policies, guidelines and procedures relating to delegations of ccTLDs.

The results of the use of such a Framework of Interpretation should be formally monitored and evaluated by the ccNSO Council after a pre-determined period. If the results of this evaluation indicate that the "Framework of Interpretation" failed to provide logical and predictable outcomes in ICANN decision making, the ccNSO Council should then launch a PDP on the delegation and/or re-delegation of ccTLDs.

---

[10]Any process which results in the effective re-delegation of a ccTLD should be considered as a re-delegation

3 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION REGARDING RETIREMENT OF CCTLDS

3.1 Findings

- The removal of a ccTLD from the root (retirement of ccTLD) is considered one of the most critical recommendations ICANN can make.

- ICANN is a policy based organization

- There is no policy regarding the retirement of ccTLDs.

- There is significant divergence between the approach to the retirement of .TP, .UM and .YU.

3.2 Recommendation

The DRDWG recommends to the CCNSO that it undertake a PDP on the retirement of ccTLDs.

4 METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

The DRDWG first met on September 10th, 2009 and has met regularly since then[11].

The DRDWG initially adopted a work plan that contemplated completion of its mandate by July 2011. As a result of the progress made since the Nairobi and Brussels ICANN meetings, the DRDWG is able to deliver its final report at an earlier stage. As indicated in the second progress report, the activities of the DRDWG have been broken down into 3 major phases of activity:

Phase 1:   Identify relevant policies, guidelines, procedures and practices regarding delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs;

Phase 2:   Analyze the documented processes against the relevant policies and guidelines identified in Phase 1 and define a methodology to identify and classify areas where the documented actions appear to be inconsistent with, or not addressed in, the policies and guidelines;

Phase 3:   Identify issues, if any, regarding each of the three phases and develop recommendations to resolve the issues identified. Submit a final report to the ccNSO Council, including the recommendations.

As reported in its first progress report:

- The DRDWG has not identified an authoritative policy document that reflects all relevant policy inputs; and,

- There is no publicly available documentation of the current practices or procedures.

To understand the current policies and practices, as reported in the second progress report, the DRDWG performed an initial analysis of the following documents ("Policy Statements"):

- RFC 1591

- ICP-1

- GAC Principles 2000 and 2005

These policies and guidelines provided a baseline against which to evaluate the actual practices of IANA, and the decisions of the ICANN Board, as reflected in the following documentation ("Documentation"):

- All available IANA reports on ccTLD delegations, re-delegations and retirements

- All ICANN Board decisions affecting ccTLD delegations, re-delegations and retirements.

If the DRDWG noted a difference between the Policy Statements and the processes and outcomes reflected in the Documentation, and this suggested a change in policy had occurred, the DRDWG considered whether or not such a change was implemented in a manner consistent with the procedural requirements covered by the ICANN Bylaws. On this basis, individual cases were identified that the DRDWG considered potentially relevant to its work. A summary of these cases were included in the second progress report and fully documented in the DRDWG analysis report of 14 June 2010.

In September 2010 the DRDWG reconvened and undertook the following activities:

- Review of the results of its public consultation;

- Published a report on the public consultation; and

- Developed a future work plan for the DRDWG, based on the separate elements of retirement, delegation, re-delegation with consent of the incumbent operator and re-delegation without consent of the incumbent operator.

---

[11]Please see http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg.htm for meeting notes and a history of publications.

The retirement, delegation and re-delegations reports all follow the same methodology, based on the previous work and the public consultation document issued before the Brussels meeting:

- All relevant documentation relating to policies, guidelines and procedures for each given element (such as retirement) are identified and listed.

- All documentation of relevant cases for a given element (such as delegation), which were noted to be of interest to the DRDWG are identified and listed.

- Each element of documentation that is relevant is analyzed for conformity and applicability

- A list of issues is generated from the analyses.

- A recommendation is generated based on the analyses and issues.

The complete reports on retirements, delegations and re-delegations (with and without the consent of the incumbent operator) have been published for public comment. Based on the feed-back received there was no need to adjust any of the reports, including the recommendations contained therein.

A PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE DRDWG

Purpose

The purpose of the DRDWG is to advise the ccNSO Council whether it should launch a Policy Development Process to recommend changes to the current policy for delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.

Scope

The DRDWG will consider the current policies and guidelines relating to delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs, and report on any issues or matters of concern that it believes exist. It will also consider possible solutions to any issues or matters of concern.

The IANA functions contract between the US Government and ICANN, including any contract implementation issues or procedures relating to it, are considered outside the scope of this working group.

The DRDWG will recommend whether or not to launch a ccNSO Policy Development Process (PDP). If it does recommend a PDP, it shall be considered as a request for an issues report to the ccNSO Council as documented in Annex B, Section 1 of the ccNSO PDP.

If issues outside this scope become apparent to the DRDWG, the Chair will inform the ccNSO Council of the issue so that it can be taken into account and dealt with as the ccNSO Council believes appropriate.

B MEMBERS OF THE DRDWG

Members

- Eberhard Lisse, .NA Africa
- Vika Mpisane, .ZA Africa
- Paulos Nyirenda, .MW Africa
- Alioune Badara Traore, .ML Africa
- Keith Davidson, .NZ (DRDWG Chair) Asia-Pacific
- Chris Disspain, .AU (ccNSO Chair) Asia-Pacific
- Young-Eum Lee, .KR (ccNSO Vice-Chair) Asia-Pacific
- Dave Main, .WS Asia-Pacific
- Bill Semich, .NU Asia-Pacific
- Martin Boyle, .UK Europe
- Staffan Jonson, .SE Europe
- Annebeth Lange, .NO Europe
- Slobodan Markovic, .RS Europe
- Desiree Miloshevic, .GI Europe
- Nigel Roberts, .GG Europe
- Denzil West, .MS Europe
- Patricio Poblete, .CL Latin America Caribbean
- Oscar Robles, .MX Latin America Caribbean
- Byron Holland, .CA (ccNSO Vice-Chair) North America
- Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .VI North America

GAC Observers:

- Jayantha Fernando, Sri Lanka
- Suzanne Sene, USA

Other:

- Erick Iriarte Ahon, LACTLD (Observer)
- Jaap Akkerhuis, expert invited by the Chair
- Becky Burr, NomCom appointee to the ccNSO Council (WG Vice Chair)
- Kim Davies, IANA

ICANN Staff Support & Contractors:

- Bart Boswinkel
- Anne-Rachel Inne
- Massimiliano Minisci
- Kristina Nordström
- Bernard Turcotte
- Gabriella Schittek

C INTERIM DRDWG REPORTS

The DRDWG published 4 Progress Reports:

- http://ccNSO.icann.org/workinggroups/report-drd-25feb10-en.pdf

- http://ccNSO.icann.org/workinggroups/drd-progress-report-14jun10-en.pdf

- http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg-third-progress-report-30nov10-en.pdf

- http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/fourth-drdwg-progress-report-01dec10-en.pdf

The DRDWG also published 5 reports for public consultation[12]:

- Public Consultation On Potential Issues and their Classification
  (http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drd-analysis-report-14jun10-en.pdf)

- Report on the retirement of ccTLDs
  (http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg-retirement-report-30nov10-en.pdf)

- Report on the delegation of ccTLDs
  (http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg-delegation-report-30nov10-en.pdf)

- Report on the re-delegation of ccTLDs with the consent of the incumbent operator
  (http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg-re-delegations-with-consent-30nov10-en.pdf)

- Report on the re-delegation of ccTLDs where the incumbent operator does not consent
  (http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg-re-delegation-without-consent-21dec10-en.pdf)

---

[12]Please see http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drdwg.htm for meeting notes and a history of publications.

D DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO DELEGATIONS OF CCTLDS

Documentation - policy, rules and procedures

The DRDWG identified and analyzed a number of documents dealing with policies, guidelines, rules and procedures which apply to the delegation of ccTLDs:

- RFC1591
- News Memo #1
- ICP1
- GAC Principles 2000 and 2005
- IANA publication - "Understanding the delegation and re-delegation procedure"
- Sponsorship agreement decision by the ICANN Board - September 25th 2000
- ISO3166-1 Exceptionally Reserved List decision by the ICANN Board September 25th 2000
- No longer allowing individuals as delegees for ccTLDs - September 2001
- April 2010 approval of Internationalized Domain Name ("IDN") ccTLDs by the ICANN Board (as it relates to local Internet community support)

Documentation - ICANN Board decisions regarding delegations

All cases of delegations of ccTLDs were analyzed, however this does not include the delegation of IDN ccTLDs as this is currently the subject of a PDP in the ccNSO. However, the DRDWG is aware that under the rules of the ccNSO IDN Fast Track process, and as tentatively proposed under the IDN ccPDP, IDN ccTLDs should be delegated and re-delegated according to the same practices as the traditional ASCII ccTLD's.

The following cases were included in the final report of the DRDWG on the delegation of ccTLDs:

- .TL delegation January 2005
- .EU delegation March 2005
- .AX delegation June 2006
- .KP delegation September 2007
- .ME delegation September 2007
- .RS delegation September 2007

E DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO RE-DELEGATIONS OF CCTLDS WITH THE CONSENT OF THE INCUMBENT OPERATOR

Documentation - policy, rules and procedures

The DRDWG identified and analyzed a number of documents dealing with policies, rules and procedures which apply to the re-delegation of ccTLDs with the consent of the incumbent operator:

- RFC1591
- News Memo #1
- ICP1
- GAC Principles 2000 and 2005
- IANA document "Understanding the delegation and re-delegation procedure"
- Sponsorship agreement decision by the ICANN Board - September 25th 2000
- No longer allowing individuals as delegees for ccTLDs - September 2001
- April 2010 approval of IDN ccTLDs by the ICANN Board (as it relates to local Internet community support)

Documentation - ICANN Board decisions regarding delegations

All cases of re-delegations of ccTLDs with the consent of the incumbent operator were analyzed.

The following cases were included in the final report of the DRDWG on the delegation of ccTLDs:

- .KZ re-delegation June 2005
- .GD re-delegation July 2006
- .BB re-delegation November 2007
- .AE re-delegation January 2008
- .BY re-delegation February 2009
- .NG re-delegation April 2009
- .CO re-delegation November 2009

F DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO RE-DELEGATION OF CCTLDS WITHOUT THE CONSENT OF THE INCUMBENT OPERATOR

Documentation - policy, rules and procedures

The DRDWG identified and analyzed a number of documents dealing with policies, rules and procedures which apply to the re-delegation of ccTLDs without the consent of the incumbent operator:

- RFC1591
- News Memo #1
- ICP1
- GAC Principles 2000 and 2005
- IANA document "Understanding the delegation and re-delegation procedure"
- Sponsorship agreement decision by the ICANN Board - September 25th 2000
- No longer allowing individuals as delegees for ccTLDs - September 2001
- April 2010 approval of IDN ccTLDs by the ICANN Board (as it relates to local Internet community support)

Documentation - ICANN Board decisions regarding delegations

All cases of re-delegations of ccTLDs without the consent of the incumbent operator were analyzed.

The following cases were included in the final report of the DRDWG on the delegation of ccTLDs:

- .AU re-delegation - September 2001
- .KE re-delegation - November 2002
- .UZ re-delegation - December 2002
- .KY-re-delegation - June 2003
- .MD re-delegation - August 2003
- .LY re-delegation - July 2004
- .IQ re-delegation - July 2005
- .CX re-delegation - January 2006
- .SO re-delegation - February 2009

G DOCUMENTATION RELATING TO THE RETIREMENT OF CCTLDS

Documentation - policy, rules and procedures

There are no policy statements for the retirement of ccTLDs.

Documentation - ICANN Board decisions regarding retirement of ccTLDs

The DRDWG considered the following Board decisions relating to the retirement of ccTLDs:

- .TL delegation - January 2005 (and corresponding requirement to retire .TP)
- .UM "un-delegation" - January 2007
- .YU retirement - September 2007