# Policy for the Retirement of ccTLDs

```
2 DRAFT
```

3 CCNSO

4 2019-01-28

# 5 1 Background & Introduction

- 6 Request For Comment [2] ("RFC") 1591 [1] states:
- 7 4. Rights to Names
- 8 [...]
- 9 2) Country Codes

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

- 15 In 2014 the ccNSO through its Framework of Interpretation confirmed that RFC 1591 applies to ccTLDs.
- 17 The ISO 3166-1 list is dynamic and country codes are added and removed<sup>1</sup> on a regu-
- 18 lar basis. When a new country code is added a ccTLD can be added via the standard
- 19 delegation process by the IANA Naming Functions Operator<sup>2</sup> (IFO). However, as was
- 20 identified in 2011 by the ccNSO Delegation and Redelegation Working Group, there
- 21 is no formal policy available for the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone when a
- 22 country code is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list of country names.

# 23 2 Policy Objective

- 24 The objective of the policy is to provide clear and predictable guidance and to docu-
- 25 ment a process that is orderly and reasonable from the time:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>ISO 3166-1, Section 3.4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Currently operated by PTI

- A code element is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list by the ISO 3166/MA; or
- [a code element is removed from the list of exceptionally reserved codes by the ISO 3166/MA; or
- an IDN ccTLD string of characters no longer qualifies as an IDN ccTLD string (to be defined under ccPDP 4).]
- 31 up and to, but excluding, the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone $^3$ .

## 32 3 Applicability of the Policy

- 33 This policy is developed in accordance with Article 10, section 6 (a) and (b) of the
- 34 ICANN Bylaws and accordingly is directed at ICANN.
- 35 For the purpose of this policy an IDN ccTLD is considered to be a ccTLD and an IDN
- 36 ccTLD Manager is considered to be a ccTLD Manager, unless it is explicitly stated
- 37 otherwise.
- 38 This policy is applicable to ccTLD Managers which are members of the ccNSO, are
- 39 managed by a functional Manager and where the corresponding country code has

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>The removal of a (cc)TLD by the IFO is excluded from the policy, as this outside the remit of the policy scope of the ccNSO.

- 40 been removed from the ISO 3166-1 list or in the case of IDN ccTLDs [which no longer
- 41 qualifies as such].
- 42 For the purposes of this policy a Functional Manager is the entity listed as "ccTLD"
- 43 Manager" or any later variant used in the IANA Root Zone database, and who is ac-
- 44 tive with respect to the management of the ccTLD or with whom the IFO can officially
- 45 and effectively communicate.
- 46 If a country code has been removed from the ISO 3166-1 list and its corresponding
- 47 ccTLD does not have a Functional Manager the policy for the retirement of a ccTLD
- 48 is not applicable and the IFO cannot transfer responsibility to a new manager ac-
- 49 cording to its standard process. This set of circumstances would create a deadlock
- 50 situation which would prevent the IFO from ever removing the retiring ccTLD from
- 51 the Root Zone. To avoid such a deadlock, and only under these specific conditions,
- 52 this policy allows the IFO to proceed with a transfer of responsibility for the retiring
- 53 ccTLD to establish a functional manager and insure the ccTLD can be retired. Such
- 54 a transfer should follow the standard IFO process where possible.
- 55 In the event the retirement process is triggered by the removal of a code element
- 56 from the list of [exceptionally reserved codes] the removal process shall be decided
- 57 on a case by case basis, taking into account all relevant circumstances of the case.
- 58 As an example, if a code element from the [exceptionally reserved list] is assigned
- 59 and associated with a Country and this code is transferred to the ISO 3166-1 list
- 60 and remains assigned and associated with the same Country name to which it was

- 61 assigned and associated with in the list of exceptionally reserved codes elements
- 62 then the ccTLD should not be retired.

#### **63 4 Retirement Process**

#### 64 4.1 Expectations

- 65 There is a good faith obligation for both the IFO and the Manager of the retiring
- 66 ccTLD to ensure an orderly shutdown of the retiring ccTLD which takes into consid-
- 67 eration the interests of its registrants and the stability and security of the DNS.
- 68 Note: Given the importance and exceptional nature of the ccTLD retirement process
- 69 the IFO, prior to sending a Notice of Retirement, should contact the ccTLD Manager
- 70 and confirm who the IFO should be dealing with regarding the retirement process.
- 71 The person or role identified by the ccTLD Manager to deal with the retirement pro-
- 72 cess is referred to as the Manager in the remainder of this document.

#### 73 4.2 Notice of Retirement

- 74 Once the IFO has been informed, and confirmed, that a country code has been re-
- 75 moved from the ISO 3166-1 list and that the IFO has also confirmed that the ccTLD
- 76 has a functional manager, it shall promptly notify the Manager of the ccTLD that the
- 77 ccTLD shall be removed from the Root Zone 5 years (Default Retirement Period) from
- 78 the date of this notice (Notice of Retirement) unless a Retirement Plan (see follow-
- 79 ing sections for details) which is agreed<sup>4</sup> to by the Manager and the IFO stipulates
- 80 otherwise and is in accordance with this Retirement Policy.
- 81 The IFO shall include with the Notice of Retirement a document describing the rea-
- 82 sonable requirements (Reasonable Requirements Document) it expects of a Retire-
- 83 ment Plan and that the IFO will make itself available to the Manager to assist in the
- 84 development of such a plan should the Manager request it.

### 85 4.3 Time Span for Retirement

- 86 The IFO cannot require that a retiring ccTLD be removed from the Root Zone less
- 87 than 5 years from the time the IFO has sent a Notice of Retirement to the retiring

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Failure to reach agreement between the Manager and the IFO on a Retirement Plan as specified in the policy automatically implies that the ccTLD will be removed from the Root Zone 5 years from the date of the Notice of Retirement

- 88 ccTLD Manager unless this is mutually agreed by the ccTLD Manager and the IFO.
- 89 If the Manager wishes to request an extension to the Default Retirement Period it
- 90 must request this from the IFO as part of a Retirement Plan.
- 91 The IFO must remove a retiring ccTLD from the Root Zone no later than 10 years after
- 92 having sent a Notice of Retirement to the ccTLD Manager (Maximum Retirement
- 93 Period).

#### 94 4.4 Retirement Plan

- 95 After receiving a Notice of Retirement the Manager must decide if it wishes to re-
- 96 quest an extension to the Default Retirement Period.
- 97 If the Manager of the retiring ccTLD does not wish an extension to the Default Re-
- 98 tirement Period stated in the Notice of Retirement it is expected, but not mandatory,
- 99 that the Manager produce a Retirement Plan for the ccTLD which would typically in-
- **100** clude:
- Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop taking registrations that exceed the
- date of removal from the Root Zone.
- Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop accepting the renewal of existing
- registrations that exceed the date of removal from the Root Zone.

- Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop accepting the transfer of registrations that exceed the date of removal from the Root Zone.
- Date the ccTLD is expected to be removed from the Root Zone.
- Details of the communications plan to advise the registrants of retirement of the ccTLD.
- 110 If the manager of the retiring ccTLD wishes to request an extension beyond the De-
- 111 fault Retirement Period stated in the Notice of Retirement it must produce a Retire-
- 112 ment Plan which is acceptable to the IFO and is in accordance with the conditions
- 113 listed below.
- 114 Granting an extension to the Default Retirement Period is at the discretion of the
- 115 IFO. Such an extension shall not be unreasonably withheld. The Reasonable Require-
- 116 ments Document that the IFO will have included with the Notice of Retirement will
- 117 describe the factors it will consider when evaluating a request for an extension to
- 118 the Default Retirement Period.
- 119 A Retirement Plan which requests an extension shall include:
- The length of the extension requested (a maximum 5 additional years) including
- the proposed date of the removal of the ccTLD from the Root Zone.
- The reasons for requesting an extension
- An impact analysis which supports the reasons for making the extension request.

- Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop taking registrations that exceed the date of removal from the Root Zone.
- Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop accepting the renewal of existing
   registrations that exceed the date of removal from the Root Zone.
- Date the ccTLD Manager is expected to stop accepting the transfer of registrations that exceed the date of removal from the Root Zone.
- Details of the communications plan to advise the registrants of retirement of the ccTLD.
- 132 If the ccTLD Manager wishes to produce a Retirement Plan it must do so within 12
- 133 months of the IFO having sent the Notice of Retirement to the Manager of the retir-
- 134 ing ccTLD. At its discretion the IFO can extend the 12 month limit to a maximum of
- 135 24 months in total upon receiving a request for such an extension from the Manager.
- 136 If the IFO grants such an extension it shall promptly notify the Manager of this.
- 137 If the ccTLD Manager submits a Retirement Plan to the IFO, the IFO shall provide a
- 138 definitive response to the Manager regarding the request for an extension within
- 139 90 days of such a request being received by the IFO.
- 140 The response by the IFO, if positive, shall state the length of the extension which has
- 141 been granted. If the response is negative, the IFO shall include the specific reason-

- 142 ing for the refusal<sup>5</sup>. The approval of an extension request shall not be unreasonably withheld.
- 144 The WG anticipates that if the request for an extension is rejected and the ccTLD
- 145 Manager feels that the rejection has been unreasonably withheld or is inconsistent
- 146 with the rules it will be able to use the review mechanism [that will be developed in
- 147 part of the ccNSO PDP 3].
- 148 If the Manager of the retiring ccTLD and the IFO cannot agree on a Retirement Plan
- 149 within 12 months, or up to a maximum of 24 months if the IFO has granted an exten-
- 150 sion, of the IFO having sent the Notice of Retirement to the Manager, then the IFO
- 151 shall promptly advise the Manager that the ccTLD shall be removed from the Root
- 152 Zone 5 years from the IFO having sent the Notice of Retirement to the Manager of
- 153 the retiring ccTLD.

#### 154 4.5 Exception Conditions

155 If the Manager becomes non-functional after a Retirement Plan is accepted the IFO can use the same procedure outlined in the Requirements section to transfer the

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>The WG anticipates that if the request for an extension is rejected and the ccTLD Manager feels that the rejection is inconsistent with the rules it will be able to use the review mechanism that will be developed in part 2 of the ccNSO PDP 3. To avoid any misunderstanding, ICANN's IRP process is not applicable to decisions pertaining to ccTLDs.

- 157 ccTLD to a new manager. In such a case the original Notice of Retirement is still considered valid.
- 159 If the Manager breaches the Retirement Plan the IFO should work with the Manager
- 160 with the objective of reinstating the Retirement Plan. If this is not possible the IFO
- 161 can advise it will return to the initial 5 year retirement period.

## **5 Oversight & Review Mechanism**

### 163 5.1 Oversight

- 164 This policy is directed at ICANN and the IFO as the entity that performs the IANA
- 165 Naming Functions with respect to ccTLDs. This includes but is not limited to the del-
- 166 egation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs. This policy is not intended
- 167 and should not be interpreted to amend the way in which ICANN interacts with the
- 168 IFO and the delineation of their roles and responsibilities. With respect to the dele-
- 169 gation, transfer and revocation of ccTLDs this delineation is documented for the cur-
- 170 rent IFO Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) in the IANA Naming Function Contract.
- 171 [However, it is expected that the IANA Naming Function Contract will be amended to
- 172 refer to this policy with respect to the retirement of ccTLDs.] In addition, this policy
- 173 is not expected to change or amend the role of the ICANN Board of Directors has
- 174 with respect to individual cases of ccTLD delegation, transfer and revocation, which

- 175 is understood to be limited to a review to ensure that the IFO (staff) has followed
- 176 the proper procedures. For purposes of this policy it is strongly advised that the
- 177 ICANN Board of Directors limit itself to a similar review with respect to the decisions
- 178 of the IFO regarding the retirement of ccTLDs.
- 179 It is important to note that the IFO's decisions to:
- Notify the ccTLD manager of the retirement
- Remove a ccTLD from the Root Zone
- 182 Are out of scope for this policy (see Section 2 on page 2)

#### 183 5.2 Review Mechanism

- 184 The Review mechanism for decisions pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revoca-
- 185 tion and retirement of ccLTDs [shall be developed in part 2 of the ccNSO PDP 3]. In
- 186 this policy on retirement decisions have been identified which shall be subject to
- 187 such a review mechanism.

#### 188 References

189 [1] POSTEL, Jon: Domain Name System Structure and Delegation / RFC Editor.
190 Version: March 1994. http://www.rfc-editor.org/rfc/rfc1591.txt. RFC
191 Editor, March 1994 (1591). - RFC. - ISSN 2070-1721. - http://www.rfc-editor.
192 org/rfc/rfc1591.txt
193 [2] WIKIPEDIA: Request for Comments. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/
194 Request\_for\_Comments, Last Accessed: 2019-02-08