.ca redelegation model
Model of .CA Redelegation

1: .ca delegation
   May 1987

2: letter (Gov. recognizes
   CIRA as .ca administrator)
   March 1999

3: trilateral agreement
   May 2000

4: letter (Gov notifies ICANN
   that Gov recognizes CIRA
   as .ca administrator)
   Oct. 2000

5: letter (CIRA requests formal redelegation)
   Nov. 2000

Formal agreement not yet?

Hiro Hotta
Outline of letter 2

Letter from Michael Bindar, Industry Canada, to Robert Hall, CIRA
11 March, 1999

- Government recognizes CIRA as the administrator of the .ca domain space
- Government expresses the following requirements
  - Open and transparent activities
  - Fair and sound business practices
  - Balance of representation, accountability and diversity on the Board of Directors
  - Quick and easy application and competitive price
  - Reduction of conflicts between domain name holders and other fights holders such as trademark holders
  - Easy entry for new players including registrars
Outline of agreement 3

Umbrella Agreement Among UBC, CIRA, and the Government of Canada
9 May 2000

• Government designates CIRA as .ca manager transferred from UBC under the requirement of Letter 2
• UBC and CIRA cooperate to achieve an orderly transition
• Government may terminate the designation if it decides CIRA is unable to continue to properly manage .ca
• If government terminates the designation, government may designate another party for designation and transfer the designation with CIRA’s help
Outline of letter 4

Letter from Michael Bindar, Industry Canada, to Michael Roberts, ICANN
10 October 2000

- Government expresses the community’s intention to transfer the .ca administration responsibility from UBC to more commercial organization CIRA
- Government notifies ICANN that Government, UBC and CIRA entered Umbrella agreement 3
- Canada’s approach is compatible with GAC principle
- Government designates CIRA as a formal .ca delegate
- Direct discussion between ICANN and CIRA about the date of the change in the “A root server” is asked for, while Government would anticipate the change would occur on November 1, 2000
Outline of letter 5

Letter from Maureen Cubberley, CIRA, to Michael Roberts, ICANN
30 November 2000

• UBC and CIRA have completed the steps required for transition and CIRA is prepared to assume its duties as delegee of the .ca domain on December 1, 2000
• CIRA supports the framework of the GAC principles – communication-based relationship among ccTLD delegee, government, and ICANN
• CIRA is prepared to enter into a formal, legally binding agreement with ICANN that:
  – Intention of escrow or mirror site policy establishment
  – Formulation of ADR policy
  – CIRA agrees to reassignment of the delegation if so decided formally
Key points in .jp redelegation model
Model of .JP Redelegation (key points)

1: .jp delegation
   1987 (1988?)

2: letter (plan of transferring .jp admin to JPRS)
   Feb.2001

(A) Whether Gov issues formal certificate to JPRS?
   * send a letter spontaneously
   * reply to ICANN’s query
   * disregard ICANN’s query?

(B) Whether trilateral agreement be signed?

(C) Whether Gov
   * send a letter spontaneously
   * reply to ICANN’s query
   * disregard ICANN’s query?
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Motivation for redelegation

Letter from Michael Bindar, Industry Canada, to Robert Hall, CIRA
11 March, 1999

• As a non-profit and public organization, JPNIC has been .jp administrator since 1988
• Domain name market becomes more competitive
• Service provider had better be a private company
  – in order to provide better services to customers, and
  – maintain competitiveness and openness
• Redelegation required for the private company to be recognized as .jp registry
issue(A)
Whether Government issues formal certificate to JPRS?

• If government issues formal certificate, it is very helpful to persuade ICANN that JPRS is formally a delegate in the nation.

  but

• It is sometimes difficult for government to issue certificate in a new area

  therefore

• Option 1: JPNIC and JPRS communicate with government to get verbal recognition of the status of JPRS as a delegate

• Option 2: ?????
issue (B)

Whether trilateral agreement be signed?

- If trilateral agreement is signed, it is absolutely OK. **but**
- It is sometimes difficult for government to have a contract with a private company
- A private company is sometimes unwilling to have a contract with government **therefore**
- **Option 1**: JPNIC and JPRS have a bilateral contract. And Government endorses the contract by giving signature on it with optional comments.
- **Option 2**: JPNIC and JPRS have a bilateral contract. And Government just reports to ICANN that “Government recognizes the contract.”
- **Option 3**: JPNIC and JPRS have a bilateral contract. And Government does nothing in response to ICANN’s query. This may mean implicit recognition.
issue(C)

Whether Government
* send a letter spontaneously or
* reply to ICANN’s query or
* disregard ICANN’s query?

- Upper solution is better while all of them might work
- To transfer the delegee status in appropriate timing, JPRS and JPNIC should persuade government to send a letter to ICANN spontaneously