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1 Stakeholders

8 FOI WG definition
9 Stakeholders in the context of the administration of ccTLDs to encompass Significantly Interested Parties, “interested parties” and “other parties” referenced in RFC1591.

11 1.1 Significantly Interested parties (FoI)

12 Definition from FoI (October 2014):
13 “Significantly Interested Parties” (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to include, but not be limited to: a) the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD and b) any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions, or others that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s) including the incumbent manager. To be considered a Significantly Interested Party, any party other than the manager or the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD must demonstrate that it is has a direct, material and legitimate interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s).

22 FOIWG defines Stakeholders in the context of the administration of ccTLDs to encompass Significantly Interested Parties, “interested parties” and “other parties” refer-
enced in RFC1591.

1.1. The FOIWG interprets the requirement for “interested parties” to have “some voice” (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to require applicants to provide documentation of support by Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for Delegations.

1.2. The FOIWG interprets the requirement for “concerned” or “affected” parties in Transfers to communicate with the IANA Operator (section 3.6 of RFC1591) to require applicants to provide documentation of support by Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for Transfers.

1.1.1 Role(s)?

1.1.2 Entities

- Government(s)
- FOI
  - The government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD
- What is government of territory in case of scenario 2 cases?
- SU, (Sovjet Union) (1990)
When and how to be involved

Which government(s)

In Scenario 2 cases different governments could be involved.
Or in other words: what is country or territory associated with the ccTLD?

In following cases:

SU, (Sovjet Union) (1990)
NT, Neutral Zone (1993)
YU, Yugoslavia (2003)
CS, Serbia and Montenegro (2006)
AN, Netherlands Antilles (2010)

Other SIP

FOIWG definition
any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions, or others that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s) including the incumbent manager.
With respect to transfers and revocation roles of Incumbent Manager are defined in FoI.

Transfer, or transfer of responsibilities

Needs to consent to transfer (1. process by which the IANA Operator transfers responsibility from an incumbent manager to a new manager with the consent of both parties.)

“Revocation” (section 3.5 of RFC1591) to refer to the process by which the IANA Operator rescinds responsibility for management of a ccTLD from an incumbent manager.

Part of SIgnificantly Interested Parties

- Registrars
  * Role: Open new TLD (registration to?)
  Supplier registrants

- Registrants
Role?

When and how to be involved

1.1.3 LIC

Local Internet Community

This term has been in use for a very long time, however was never defined. Through the work of the FOIWG it has been replaced by another set of terminology

1.2 ccTLD manager

1.2.1 Transition arrangement

1.2.2 Transition Plan

• Develop Plan
• Role: Implementing Executive/operational

• When and how to be involved?

1.2.3 Temporary Caretaker or Incumbent?

1.3 IANA/PTI

See respective IANA reports about role

1.3.1 Role: Guardian of process

• Coordinate with Incumbent or caretaker

• Propose actions

• Monitor progress
1.3.2 When and how to be involved?

1.3.3 Counterpart transition arrangement

1.4 ICANN Board

1.4.1 Oversight?

- How and when involved
- Decisions
  - certify start retirement process

Start of the .AN retirement process Board resolution 11 October 2011

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 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,
Resolved (2011.10.11.05), that the University of Netherlands Antilles work to complete the transition of the .AN domain to the .CW domain, the .SX domain, and any other relevant domain; so that it may be removed from the DNS root zone no later than 31 October 2014.

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.

See:

- Extension of retirement process
- Example: Extension removal date .AN
- see:
- Decision on removal from root zone
- Removal of .TP from root zone

1.5 Other Interested Parties

FOIWG interprets the requirement for “concerned” or “affected” parties in Transfers to communicate with the IANA Operator (section 3.6 of RFC1591) to require applicants
to provide documentation of support by Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for Transfers.

1.5.1 Registry Service Provider

• Role: Do what instructed

• When and how to be to be involved?

1.5.2 Users of domain name