

Policy for the Retirement of ccTLDs

DRAFT

ccNSO

2019-01-28

1 Background

Request For Comment[2] ("RFC") 1591[1] states:

4. Rights to Names

[...]

2) Country Codes

10 *The IANA is not in the business of deciding what is and what is not a coun-*
11 *try. The selection of the ISO 3166 list as a basis for country code top-level*
12 *domain names was made with the knowledge that ISO has a procedure for*
13 *determining which entities should be and should not be on that list.*

14 In 2014 the ccNSO through its Framework of Interpretation confirmed that RFC 1591
15 applies to ccTLDs.

16 The ISO 3166-1 list is dynamic and country codes are added and removed¹ on a regu-
17 lar basis. When a new country code is added a ccTLD can be added via the standard
18 delegation process by the IANA Naming Functions Operator² (IFO). However, as was
19 identified in 2011 by the ccNSO Delegation and Redelegation Working Group , there
20 is no formal policy available for the removal of a ccTLD from the root when a country
21 code is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list of country names.

22 **2 Policy Objective**

23 The objective of the policy is to provide clear, and predictable guidance and to doc-
24 ument a process that is orderly and reasonable from the time a country code is re-

¹ISO 3166-1, Section 3.4

²Currently operated by PTI

25 moved from the ISO 3166-1 list of country names³ up and to, but excluding, the
26 removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone⁴.

27 **3 Applicability of the Policy**

28 This policy is applicable to all ccTLDs which are a member of the ccNSO and are
29 managed by a functional manager and whose country code is removed from the
30 ISO 3166-1 list.

31 For the purposes of this document a functional manager is the manager of the ccTLD
32 as listed in the IANA root database, who is active with respect to the management
33 of the ccTLD and with whom the IFO can officially and effectively communicate.

34 If a ccTLD's country code has been removed from the ISO 3166-1 list and it does
35 not have a functional manager the policy for the retirement of a ccTLD is not appli-
36 cable and the IFO cannot transfer responsibility to a new manager according to its
37 standard process. This set of circumstances would create a deadlock situation which
38 would prevent the IFO from ever removing the retiring ccTLD from the root. To avoid

³The procedures and process related to the removal of a country code are excluded, as this is determined by ISO.

⁴The removal of a (cc)TLD by the IFO is excluded from the policy, as this is outside the remit of the policy scope of the ccNSO.

39 such a deadlock, and only under these specific conditions, this policy allows the IFO
40 to proceed with a transfer of responsibility for the retiring ccTLD to establish a func-
41 tional manager for the ccTLD for the purpose of retiring the ccTLD. Such a transfer
42 should follow the standard the IFO process for such transfers where possible.

43 **4 Retirement Process**

44 **4.1 Expectations**

45 There is a good faith obligation for both the the IFO and the Manager of the retiring
46 ccTLD to ensure an orderly shutdown of the retiring ccTLD which takes into consid-
47 eration the interests of its registrants and the stability and security of the DNS.

48 Note: Given the importance and exceptional nature of the ccTLD retirement process
49 the IFO, prior to sending a Notice of Retirement, should contact the ccTLD Manager
50 and confirm who the IFO should be dealing with regarding the retirement process.
51 The person or role identified by the ccTLD manager to deal with the retirement pro-
52 cess is referred to as the Manager in the remainder of this document.

53 4.2 Notice of Retirement

54 Once the IFO has been informed, and confirmed, that a country code has been re-
55 moved from the ISO 3166-1 list and that the IFO has also confirmed that the ccTLD
56 has a functional manager, it shall promptly notify the Manager of the ccTLD that
57 the ccTLD shall be removed from the Root 5 years from the date of this notice (No-
58 tice of Retirement) unless a retirement plan (see following sections for details) which
59 is mutually agreed⁵ to by the Manager and the IFO stipulates otherwise and is in
60 accordance with this Retirement Policy.

~~61 In conjunction with the Notice of Retirement the IFO will inform the manager that
62 it is expected, but not mandatory, to produce a mutually agreeable retirement plan
63 for the ccTLD. the IFO should include with the notice a document describing the
64 Reasonable Requirements it expects of a retirement plan and that the IFO will make
65 itself available to the Manager to assist in the development of such a plan should
66 the Manager request it.~~

- 67 • ~~The Notice should also clearly state that:~~
 - 68 – ~~If the Manager does not produce a mutually acceptable retirement plan within
69 the prescribed time frame (described in the following sections) that the ccTLD
70 will be removed from the root 5 years from the date the Notice of Retirement
71 was sent by the IFO to the manager of the retiring ccTLD~~

⁵Failure to reach mutual agreement on a Retirement Plan as specified in the policy automatically implies that the ccTLD will be removed from the Root 5 years from the date of the Notice of Retirement

- 72 - ~~If the Manager intends on producing a retirement plan it should formally~~
73 ~~communicate this to the IFO within 60 calendar days of the IFO having sent~~
74 ~~the Notice of Retirement to the Manager of the retiring ccTLD.~~

75 4.3 Time **S**pan for **R**etirement

- 76 • the **IFOPTI** cannot require that a retiring ccTLD be removed from the root less
77 than 5 years from the time the IFO has sent a Notice of Retirement to the retiring
78 ccTLD Manager unless mutually agreed by the ccTLD Manager and the IFO.
- 79 • **The IFOPTI** must remove a retiring ccTLD from the Root no later than 10 years
80 after having sent a Notice of Retirement to the ccTLD manager.
- 81 - ~~If according to the IFO the retirement of the ccTLD within the 10 year limit~~
82 ~~would pose a threat to the security and stability of the DNS the IFO can request~~
83 ~~an extension to the 10 year limit from the ICANN Board.~~
- 84 • **Extending the removal of the ccTLD beyond 5 years:**
- 85 - **An extension to the 5 year retirement period is possible but is at the discretion**
86 **of the IFO and shall not be unreasonably withheld. The Reasonable Require-**
87 **ments document that the IFO will have included with the Notice of Retirement**
88 **will describe the factors it will consider when evaluating a request for an ex-**
89 **ension to the initial 5 year period.**

- 90 – If the Manager wishes to ~~request an extension to~~ the initial 5 year retirement
91 period it should ~~formally request this from the IFO~~ do so in ~~its~~ Retirement
92 Plan. ~~The request for the extension should clearly state:-~~
- 93 * ~~T~~he length of the extension requested (a maximum 5 additional years)
 - 94 * ~~,~~ ~~T~~he reasons for requesting an extension
 - 95 * ~~and A~~n impact analysis which supports the reasons for making the re-
96 quest.
- 97 – ~~The Reasonable Requirements document that the IFO will have included~~
98 ~~with the Notice of Retirement will describe the factors it will consider when~~
99 ~~evaluating a request for an extension to the initial 5 year period. If an extension~~
100 ~~request to the initial 5 year period is made by the Manager of the retiring~~
101 ~~ccTLD T~~he IFO shall ~~ould~~ provide a definitive response to the Manager within
102 60 days of ~~such a~~the request being received by the IFO. The response by
103 the IFO ,if positive, shall ~~ould~~ state ~~the extension~~ the length of the extension
104 ~~which~~at has been granted. If the response is negative, the IFO shall ~~ould~~ in-
105 clude ~~the specific~~a detailed reasoning for the refusal ~~based on the Reasonable~~
106 ~~Requirements document~~⁶.
- 107 • A Retirement Plan that is [~~mutually agreed~~]to between the Manager of the retir-
108 ing ccTLD and the IFO can specify any date for the removal of the ccTLD from the

⁶If the request for an extension is rejected and the ccTLD Manager feels that the rejection is inconsistent with the rules it can appeal the decision via ICANN's IRP process

109 Root if no later than 10 years from the IFO having sent the Notice of Retirement
110 to the Manager. For further clarity this includes periods of less than 5 years from
111 the time the IFO has sent the Notice of Retirement to the Manager of the retiring
112 ccTLD.

113 - I.

114 4.4 Retirement Plan

- 115 • In conjunction with the Notice of Retirement the IFO will inform the manager
116 that it is expected, but not mandatory, to produce a mutually agreeable retire-
117 ment plan for the ccTLD. The IFO should include with the Notice of Retirement
118 a document describing the Reasonable Requirements it expects of a retirement
119 plan and that the IFO will make itself available to the Manager to assist in the de-
120 velopment of such a plan should the Manager request it. ~~If the Manager intends~~
121 ~~on producing a retirement plan it should formally communicate this to the IFO~~
122 ~~within 30 calendar days of the IFO having sent the Notice of Retirement to the~~
123 ~~Manager of the Retiring ccTLD.~~
- 124 • A retirement plan could typically include commitments to the following:
 - 125 - Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop taking registrations that exceed
126 the date of removal from the root zone.

- 127 - Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop accepting the renewal of existing
128 registrations that exceed the date of removal from the root zone.
- 129 - Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop accepting the transfer of registra-
130 tions that exceed the date of removal from the root zone.
- 131 - Date the ccTLD is expected to be removed from the Root Zone.
- 132 - Details of the communications plan to advise the registrants of retirement of
133 the ccTLD. ~~Date the ccTLD will stop accepting new registrations whose expiration~~
134 ~~date extends past the date of removal from the root zone.~~
- 135 - ~~Date the ccTLD will stop accepting the renewal of existing registrations whose~~
136 ~~expiration date extends past the date of removal from the root zone.~~
- 137 - ~~Date the ccTLD will stop accepting the transfer of registrations whose expiration~~
138 ~~date extends past the date of removal from the root zone.~~
- 139 - ~~Date the ccTLD will be removed from the Root Zone.~~
- 140 - ~~Details of the communications plan to advise the registrants of retirement of~~
141 ~~the ccTLD.~~
- 142 • If the ccTLD Manager wishes to produce a mutually agreeable Retirement Plan
143 it must be produced within 12 months of the IFO having sent the Notice of Re-
144 tirement to the Manager of the Retiring ccTLD. The IFO at its discretion can
145 extend the 12 month limit to a maximum 24 months total. If the IFO grants such
146 an extension it shall promptly notify the Manager of this.

- 147 • If the Manager of the retiring ccTLD and the IFO cannot ~~achieve a mutually~~ agreeable
148 on retirement plan within 12 months, or up to a maximum of 24 months if the
149 IFO has granted an extension, of the IFO having sent the Notice of Retirement to
150 the Manager of the Retiring ccTLD then the IFO shall ~~ould~~ advise the Manager of
151 the retiring ccTLD that the ccTLD will be removed from the Rroot 5 years from the
152 IFO having sent the Notice of Retirement to the Manager of the retiring ccTLD.

153 4.5 Exception ~~€~~Conditions

- 154 • If the ~~M~~Manager becomes non-functional after a Rretirement Plan ~~agreement~~ is
155 accepted ~~–The~~ the IFO can use the same procedure outlined in the Requirements
156 section to transfer the ccTLD to a new manager.
- 157 • If the Manager breaches the Retirement Plan ~~Agreement~~ ~~–The~~ the IFO should
158 work with the Manager with the objective of re-instating the Retirement Plan ~~agreement~~.
159 If this is not possible ~~the~~ the IFO can advise it will return to the initial 5 year re-
160 tirement period.
- 161 • IDN ccTLD's
- 162 • ISO3166-1 Exceptionally Reserved entries
- 163 • Applicability to non-ccNSO members

Draft, 2019-04-23

165 **References**

- 166 [1] NETWORK WORKING GROUP: *RFC 1591*. [https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1591)
167 [rfc1591](https://www.rfc-editor.org/info/rfc1591), Last Accessed: 2019-02-08
- 168 [2] WIKIPEDIA: *Request for Comments*. [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Request_for_Comments)
169 [Request_for_Comments](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Request_for_Comments), Last Accessed: 2019-02-08

Draft, 2019-04-23