This document includes an automatically translated outline from Retirement Process Comparison version 3.2.

1 Retirement Process Steps

Steps identified in the retirement process based on scenario documentation. Each of the topics (including sub-steps), add the text that is currently in the scenario documents,
and also add the IANA reports and Board resolutions. This shows what is currently happening. It does not go into the question: does this need to go into a new policy? That question is the theme of the Panama Workshop.

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:
• significant rename of country

Examples: Scenario 1:
AI (French Afar and Issas) to DJ (Djibouti) (1977)
HV (Upper Volta) to BF (Burkina Faso) (1984)
BU (Burma) to Myanmar (MM) (1989)
BY (Byelorussian SSR to Belarus, no change in code elements) (1992)
ZR (Zaire) to CD (Congo, Democratic Republic of) (1997)
TP (East Timor) to TL (Timor-Leste) (2002)

The codes ZR, TP and BU are included in the Online Browsing Platform (OBP) in the list of transitionally reserved codes. Note that transitionally reserved is NOT a category of codes defined in the Standard. In addition, AI is now assigned to Anguilla, HV is listed as unassigned (see Online Browsing Platform Country Codes, ISO). Note that unassigned is NOT a defined term.

• end of country/territory

Examples Scenario 2 document
Examples are:
SU, (Sovjet Union) (1990)
NT, Neutral Zone (1993)
YU, Yugoslavia (2003)
CS, Serbia and Montenegro (2006)
AN, Netherlands Antilles (2010)
The code element SU was removed from the list of country names. After a few years it was included in the list of exceptionally reserved code elements. The code elements NT, YU and AN were removed from the list of country names and included in the list of transitionally reserved code elements, which is a list published through the Online Browsing Platform, but which is not defined under the standard itself.

- fragments/no successor
- Discontinues, but replaced

- other causes?
  - Fragmentation, combined with significant rename of core part?
    * Results in continued role original manager
      * Example: .YU -> CS -> RS
  - Brexit like scenario?
    Scenario: Significant part of geopolitical entity exits geopolitical entity
Example: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland leaving European Union.

Impact in terms of ISO 3166-1: No change in code element of original entity (EU remains to be listed).

This scenario should not be covered by the ccNSO Policy on retirement of ccTLDs.

Rationale:

1. Original Code Element is not affected. Hence triggering event as identified does not manifests itself.

If there is an impact it manifests itself at level of local policy is out of scope of ccNSO policy remit (see Annex C ICANN Bylaws)

1.2 Notifications

1.2.1 Who and how to inform?

• IANA Function Operator
• ccTLD manager

• Admin and Tech Contact

1.2.2 Who is required to inform whom and when?

To be addressed in follow-up discussion:

People that are going to need to be informed are the “significant interested parties”, including from the old registry. The government is likely to have disappeared, if the country no longer exist. ccTLD manager’s responsibility to keep it significant interested parties informed, e.g. registrants, residual local administration, etc.

The registry operator, ccTLD manager has the duty to inform all its stakeholders, all interested parties.

The policy should not go into details of how things will happen. A large number of registrants might be affected, that are not necessarily aware.
1.3 Need for Specific arrangements/documentation?

This topic refers to the description of roles and responsibilities in the upcoming process and acceptance of these roles and commitment to behave accordingly.

Assumption is that such an arrangement is needed if no policy is in place.

Question for future discussion should such an arrangement be required under the policy?

1.3.1 No arrangement?

No examples, however rudimentary there always appears to have been a kind of arrangement involving at a minimum, the ccTLD manager of the cc removed and IFO

- What triggers TLD manager plan?
- Role of stakeholders?
1.3.2 Arrangement

- Trigger for TLD manager plan?
  Not clear from documentation to date
- Defines roles and responsibilities
  - Case ZR

.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:

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

- Case YU

.YU case

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

YU: Delegation of RS Top Level Domain and redelegation of the YU domain

YU: IANA report on the delegation of the .ME Domain

In line with historical practice, and consistent with the principles of adherence to the ISO 3166-1 standard, these (.ME and .RS) were delegated on the condition that the “.YU” domain be retired.

See:

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.

Also: the proposed operator of the .RS domain and the proposed operator of the .ME domain have mutually agreed a transfer and decommissioning plan
for the .YU domain that would see a stable transition to the new domains.

See:

– Case NA

.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,

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

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

• Specific circumstances

– Case NA

.AN Case
The .AN operator expressed that while the majority of domain registrants have migrated to the new domains, there remains a minority of about 30 registrants that need more time to complete their transition. The operator is concerned that the current deadline is not achievable for the remaining registrants.

Granting the requested extension date helps maintain the security and stability of the .AN domain name while ICANN works with the operator to remove the domain name from the DNS Root Zone.

1.4 TLD manager Plan

Included is description of TLD manager plan to date and to the extend publicly available.

1.4.1 Examples to date

- Scenario 1 cases

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

.ZR Case

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.

See:

.TP Case

See:

Following the successful delegation of the .TL domain, all new registrations within the .TP domain were disallowed, and the existing registry was maintained in a caretaker state to provide existing registrants time to transition to the new .TL domain.

Scenario 2 cases

YU case:

content of the plan
The plan recognises 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:.AN case:

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,

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 organisation for .CW intends to continue to operate the .AN domain while transitional arrangements are executed. These transitional arrangements include provisions for registrants in CuraÃ§ao to transfer registrations to .CW; and for registrants in Sint Maarten to transfer registrations to .SX.
The applicant 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 : )

1.4.2 What to include in policy?

Limited by scope of ccNSO policies
Role of ccTLD manager is defined in delegation and retirement process. It looks at the initial registration policy (transition from the retiring ccTLD to new ccTLD)
Needs to be flushed. In terms of principles, suggestions other?

• Owner?

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 context

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 ccTLD manager
Caretaker can be appointed. Technically can be difficult
In case .CW and .AN, it was done manually. If it is voluntary offer in favor

• Approval needed?
  – By Whom?

• Stakeholders
  – LIC
1.5 Execution manager Plan

1.5.1 Reporting

1.5.2 Execute

1.5.3 Notification progress Transition Plan

.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:
.ZR case.

https://www.iana.org/reports/2001/zr-report-20jun01.html
1.6 Removal TLD from RZ database

1.6.1 ICANN Board decision

Board confirms and takes decision on 30 September 2009, to allow IANA to remove YU from rootzone database on 1 April 2010

See:

- .AN Case
- .TP case

1.6.2 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
301 the remaining registrants to conclude their transition away from the .AN domain.
302 See:

303 1.6.3 Execution of removal

304 1.6.4 Cases to date

305 Cases and events to date as recorded in documents publicly available

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

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

See:

- Recorded Board decision .YU removal and delegation of .ME and .RS
  
  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

2 Process Management

2.1 Overall process management

2.1.1 Assessment of transition plan

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:
2.1.2 Monitoring of process

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: )

2.2 Timing

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

2.2.1 Duration of process

• Anticipated duration
. YU case:
26 September 2006. This revision removed the “CS” code, and added an “ME” code for Montenegro, and an “RS” code for Serbia. Once the standard was revised it became possible for ICANN to consider applications for delegation of these two new codes in the DNS root zone.

In December 2006, the Government of Montenegro submitted a delegation application for the .ME domain.

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

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

. AN Case
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.

See:
Decision to execute process initiated by the Board decision to delegate .CW 25 August 2011.

Expected to be completed by 31 October 2014.

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

.ZR Case

.TP case

In 2002, the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste was established. The ISO 3166-1 standard removed the TP

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

IANA staff and .TP contacts continued discussions on the removal of the .TP top-level domain. In August 2013, the IANA Department received a letter

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

The removal date is currently scheduled for 28 February 2015.

See: Board resolution (https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-en#1.c) and related IANA report
Effective duration

.ZR-> .CD case

The .CD domain was initially delegated in 1997 to Interpoint SARL, a Switzerland-based registry provider that has also provided service for a number of other African countries such as Burundi and Rwanda. Interpoint was the operator of the .ZR domain for Zaire.

When the country was renamed to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it was issued with a replacement ISO 3166-1 code of “CD” on 14 July 1997.

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

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

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

ICANN responded that as the .ZR domain is to be retired, it could not be redelegated in this fashion.
n 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.

- Removal from ISO 3166
  - Effective date of removal

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

- Anticipated date of removal
2.2.2 Anticipated Timing of decisions/actions

3 Oversight

3.1 Remedies?

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

3.3 Direct oversight

3.3.1 Board Decisions

Board decisions conforming
Initiation of process
Conclusion of process; .TP case
.YU. case
.AN case
3.3.2 Oversee of planning of process

Board decision 11 September 2007, re .YU

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

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.
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. 

3.3.3 Removal of ccTLD from root zone 

Board confirms and takes decision on 30 September 2009, to allow IANA to remove YU from rootzone database on 1 April 2010
3.4 Decision review

3.4.1 PDP 3 part 2

3.4.2 Include principles in this part?