

Policy for the Retirement of ccTLDs

DRAFT v2. 04

ccNSO

2020-02-13

0. Executive Summary

1 Background & Introduction

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

4. Rights to Names

[...]

2) Country Codes

6

7

8

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

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

15 The ISO 3166-1 list is dynamic and country codes are added and removed on a regular basis.
16 When a new ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 code element (Alpha-2 code) is addenda ccTLD corresponding to
17 that Alpha-2 code can be added to the Root by the IANA Naming Functions Operator (IFO).
18 However, as was identified in 2011 by the ccNSO Delegation and Redefinition Working Group,
19 there is no formal policy available for the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone when a country
20 code is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list of country names.

21 It is important to note that ccTLDs are defined as those entries in the Root Zone database
22 identified as such, these include:

- 23 • 2 letter ccTLDs corresponding to an Alpha-2 code (the majority of ccTLDs)
- 24 • 2 letter Latin ccTLDs not corresponding to an Alpha-2 code
- 25 • IDN ccTLDs as approved by ICANN

26
27
28

29

30
31
32
33
34
35

36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

2 Policy Objective

The objective of the policy is to provide clear and predictable guidance and to document a process that is orderly and reasonable up and to, but excluding, the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone¹.

3 Applicability of the Policy

This policy is applies to all entries in the Root Zone database which are identified as ccTLDs, and are subject to a Retirement Triggering Event (Trigger).

Retirement Triggering Events are defined as follows:

- For 2 letter ccTLDs which correspond to an Alpha-2 code – The Trigger is the removal of the corresponding Alpha-2 code from the ISO 3166-1 standard by the ISO 3166-1 Maintenance Agency (“ISO 3166/MA”)
- For 2 letter Latin ccTLDs which do not correspond to an Alpha-2 code

¹The 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

53 – The Trigger is the ISO 3166-1/MA making a change (other than making that code an
54 Alpha-2 code) to any of these. For each such Triggering Event the IFO will consider if the
55 change requires retiring that ccTLD. If the ccTLD Manager disagrees with the IFO’s decision
56 to initiate the retirement process it can appeal the decision using the ccTLD appeals
57 mechanism.

- 58 • For IDN ccTLDs – The Triggering Event will be identified in the policy which applies to IDN
59 ccTLDs.

60 For the purposes of this policy a Functional Manager is the entity listed as “ccTLD Manager” in
61 the IANA Root Zone database or any later variant, who is active with
62 respect to the management of the ccTLD or with whom the IFO can officially and
63 effectively communicate.

64 If a ccTLD is to be retired but does not have a Functional Manager the IFO cannot
65 transfer responsibility to a new Manager according to its standard process. This set of
66 circumstances would create a deadlock situation which would prevent the IFO from ever retiring
67 the ccTLD. To avoid such a deadlock, and only under these specific conditions, this policy allows the
68 IFO to proceed with a transfer of responsibility for the ccTLD to establish a Functional Manager
69 and insure the ccTLD can be retired. Such a transfer should follow the standard IFO transfer
70 process where possible.

71
72
73

74

4 Retirement Process

75

76

4.1 Expectations

77
78
79

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

80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88

Note: Given the importance and exceptional nature of the ccTLD retirement process the IFO, prior to sending a Notice of Removal (see next section), should contact the ccTLD Manager and confirm who the IFO should be dealing with regarding the retirement process. The person or role identified by the ccTLD Manager to deal with the retirement process is referred to as the Retirement Contact and in the remainder of this document the use of the term ccTLD Manager should be understood to mean ccTLD Manager or Retirement Contact if one has been formally identified to the IFO by the ccTLD Manager.

89

4.2 Notice of Removal

90
91
92
93
94
95

Once the IFO confirms that a ccTLD should be retired and has a Functional Manager, it shall promptly notify the Manager of the ccTLD that the ccTLD shall be removed from the Root Zone 5 years (Default Retirement Date) from the date of this

96 notice (Notice of Removal) unless a Retirement Plan (see following sections for de-
97 tails) which is agreed to by the Manager and the IFO stipulates otherwise and is in accordance
98 with this Retirement Policy.

99 The IFO shall include with the Notice of Removal a document describing the reasonable
100 requirements (Reasonable Requirements Document) it expects of a Retirement Plan and note that
101 the IFO will make itself available to the Manager to assist in the development of such a plan
102 should the Manager request it.
103
104

105 **4.3 Setting a date for Retirement**

106 The IFO cannot require that a retiring ccTLD also be removed from the Root Zone less than 5
107 years from the date the IFO has sent the Notice of Removal (Section 4.2 of this policy) to the
108 retiring ccTLD Manager unless an alternate Retirement Date is mutually agreed to by both the
109 ccTLD Manager and the IFO. If the Manager wishes to request an extension to the Default
110 Retirement Date it must request this from the IFO as part of a Retirement Plan.

111
112 The IFO must remove a retiring ccTLD from the Root Zone no later than 10 years after having
113 sent a Notice of Removal to the ccTLD Manager (Maximum Retirement Date).
114
115
116

117 **4.4 Retirement Plan**

118 After receiving a Notice of Removal the Manager must decide if it wishes to request an
119 extension to the Default Retirement Date.

120 If the Manager of the retiring ccTLD does not wish an extension to the Default
121 Retirement Date stated in the Notice of Removal it is expected, but not mandatory,

122 that the Manager produce a Retirement Plan for the ccTLD which would typically
123 include:

- 124 • A copy of the Notice of Removal
- 125 • Date the ccTLD is expected to stop taking registrations, renewals and transfers that
126 exceed the date of removal from the Root Zone. It is important to note that there is
127 a reasonable expectation that the date provided is the earliest practical date for
128 implementing this.
- 129 • Details of a communications plan to advise the registrants of retirement of the
130 ccTLD.

131 If the manager of the retiring ccTLD wishes to request an extension beyond the De- fault
132 Retirement Date stated in the Notice of Removal it must produce a Retirement Plan which
133 is acceptable to the IFO and is in accordance with the conditions listed below.
134

135 Granting an extension to the Default Retirement Date is at the discretion of the IFO and
136 shall not be unreasonably withheld. The Reasonable Requirements Document that the
137 IFO will have included with the Notice of Removal will describe the factors it will consider
138 when evaluating a request for an extension to the Default Retirement
139 Period.

140

141 A Retirement Plan which requests an extension shall include, in addition to the
142 previously listed items, the following:

- 143 • The length of the extension requested (a maximum 5 additional years) including
144 the proposed date of the removal of the ccTLD from the Root Zone.
- 145 • The reasons for requesting an extension. An impact analysis which supports the
146 reasons for making the extension request.

147 If the ccTLD Manager wishes to produce a Retirement Plan it must do so within 12
148 months of the IFO having sent the Notice of Removal to the Manager of the retiring
149 ccTLD. At its discretion the IFO can extend the 12 month limit to a maximum of 24
150 months in total upon receiving a request for such an extension from the Manager. If
151 the IFO grants such an extension it shall promptly notify the Manager of this.

152 If the ccTLD Manager submits a Retirement Plan to the IFO, the IFO shall provide a
153 definitive response to the Manager regarding the request for an extension within 90
154 days of such a request being received by the IFO.

155 The response by the IFO, if positive, shall state the length of the extension which has been
156 granted. If the response is negative, the IFO shall include the specific reasoning for the
157 refusal. The approval of an extension request shall not be unreasonably withheld.

158

159 If the request for an extension is rejected and the ccTLD Manager believes that the
160 rejection is unreasonable or is inconsistent with the Reasonable Requirements
161 Document it may appeal the decision by the IFO (see Section 5.2 on page 11 of this pol-
162 icy).

163

164 If the Manager of the retiring ccTLD and the IFO cannot agree on a Retirement Plan
165 within 12 months, or up to a maximum of 24 months if the IFO has granted such an
166 extension, of the IFO having sent the Notice of Removal to the Manager, then the IFO
167 shall promptly advise the Manager that the ccTLD shall be removed from the Root Zone
168 5 years from the date the IFO has sent the Notice of Removal to the Manager of the
169 retiring ccTLD.

170

171 **4.5 Exception Conditions**

172 If the Manager becomes non-functional after a Retirement Plan is accepted the IFO can
173 use the same procedure outlined in the Requirements section to transfer the ccTLD to
174 a new manager. In such cases the original timeline for retiring the ccTLD shall not
175 change.

176 If the Manager breaches the Retirement Plan the IFO should work with the Manager to
177 reinstate the Retirement Plan. If this is not possible the IFO can advise the Manager that
178 it will maintain the Default Retirement Date from the Notice of Removal..
179

180

181 **5. Oversight & Review Mechanism**

182 **5.1 Oversight**

183 This policy is directed at ICANN and the IFO as the entity that performs the IANA Naming
184 Functions with respect to ccTLDs.

185 This policy is not intended and shall not be interpreted to amend the way in which ICANN
186 interacts with the IFO and the delineation of their roles and responsibilities.

187 This policy will not change or amend the role of the ICANN Board of Directors has with
188 respect to individual cases of ccTLD delegation, transfer and revocation, which is
189 understood to be limited to a review to ensure that the IFO (staff) has followed its
190 procedures properly. It is important to note that the IFO's decisions to:

- 191 • Notify the ccTLD manager of the retirement
- 192 • Remove a ccTLD from the Root Zone

193 Are of out scope for this policy (see Section 2 on page 3)

194
195

196 **5.2 Review Mechanism**

197 In this policy on retirement decisions have been identified which shall be subject to a review
198 mechanism.

6. Stress testing

6.1 Stress testing

202 Stress testing is defined as:

- 203 • Test the process as developed by applying the process to “corner case” situation and
- 204 understand whether such a case results in a unwanted outcome or side effects.
- 205 • If the outcome of that situation results in an unwanted outcome or side effects adjust
- 206 Policy/Process if needed.

207 After completion of the draft process the stress testing was conducted through answering the

208 following questions:

- 209 • What is outcome of this situation when process is invoked?
- 210 • Is the outcome of that situation/the result unwanted or are side effects
- 211 unwanted/unacceptable?
- 212 • Does Policy/Process need to be adjusted/refined?

6.2 Identified situations

214 *i. Significant names change of country (resulting in change of ccTLD).*

215 Examples are:

- 216 • ZR (Zaire) to CD (Congo, Democratic Republic of) (1997)
- 217 • TP (East Timor) to TL (Timor-Leste) (2002)

218 *ii. Domain Names under management at removal date.*

219 At agreed end-date (date of removal from the root-zone) Second Level domain names are still under management of the

220 ccTLD Manager, despite reasonable efforts from the ccTLD Manager to end registrations

221 *iii. Breach of Retirement Agreement*

222 *Draft Policy v2.03*

226 Various situations:

- 227 • The ccTLD Managers continues to promote ccTLD and accepts registrations during retirement
228 process. Does it make a difference if at removal date no SLDs under management or the
229 number of registrations under management has not declined or has even increased compared
230 to number at date of Retirement Notification?
- 231 • The ccTLD Manager stops all activities i.e. goes off-line
- 232 • The ccTLD Managers takes no action resulting in serious deterioration of the zone

233
234 ***iv. The ccTLD Manager goes bankrupt after Notification of Retirement***

235
236 ***v. Request for Transfer after the Retirement Notice is send***

- 237 • Retirement result of significant name change
- 238 • Retirement result of dissolution country, significant interested parties cannot
239 be identified

240
241 ***vi. ccTLD Manager ends membership of the ccNSO and claims policies (Retirement &
242 RFC1591/Fol) are therefore not applicable.***

243 Note: the ccNSO Council recently established that membership of ccNSO by definition ends
244 when entity listed as ccTLD Manager is no longer listed as such in the IANA Root Database,
245 implying that for the duration of the retirement process membership of the ccNSO does not
246 end, unless it is actively terminated by the Manager.

247
248 ***vii. Country Code was removed from list of Assigned codes because country dissolved and
249 Code was re-assigned shortly afterwards (within 10 years) to another country added to
250 the list***

251
252 ***viii. Uncertainty about authoritativeness of lines of communication between ccTLD Manager***

253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279

and IFO

The identity of authoritative entities are not clear during process.

ix. Breach of Agreement due to conflicts of laws

- Due to court injunction
- Due to applicable national law / Court order

ix.a Additional cases of breach of Agreement

- Breach of agreement during extension period

x. Island state disappears, but interests intend to keep ccTLD “alive”

xi. Unforeseen technical consequences/significant consequences for other affecting other TLDs/DNS in general

xii. Country disappears/ however there is a clear successor state

xiii. Decision by ISO 3166 MA to remove country code is completely out of line, in breach of ISO 3166 or ISO rules

xiv. Assets of the ccTLD go to other party during removal process

xv. Does the retirement policy apply to pending retirement case?

280

281

282

6.3 Result of Stress test per identified situation

Item #	Situation	Result	Relevant section policy and / or other document if any	Adjustment if any
I	Significant names change of country	No need to adjust the policy. Significant name change as defined though ISO 3166 standard is one of the causes to remove country code.	Section 2	None
ii	Donain Names under management at removal date.	Whether significant number under management or only a limited set, is not relevant. There is a need to avoid gaming the system. Rationale for Retirement process is to accommodate new ccTLDs per RFC 1591	Section 4.3 and RFC 1591	None
iii	Breach of Retirement Agreement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ccTLD Manager promotes SLD post retirement notice - ccTLD stops all activities - ccTLD manager does not take any action 	Process continues if agreed, Compliance is not applicable. IFO may invoke revocation	Section 4.3 proposed policy, Section 4 Fol	None
iv	The ccTLD Manager goes bankrupt after Notification of Retirement	May become a Security and stability issue: IFO assess on case-by case basis. substantively it is responsibility of operator. Revocation may be warranted if threshold for revocation is met.	Section 4 Fol	None
v	Request for Transfer after the Retirement Notice is send	There is a gap in current policy (RFC 1591 and section 3 Fol). No specific mechanisms for expedient and "administrative" transfer specifically targeted at orderly retirement process.	RFC 1591, Section 3 Fol	Need to include specific mechanism targeting retirement

Item #	Situation	Result	Relevant section policy and / or other document if any	Adjustment if any
Vi	ccTLD Manager ends membership of the ccNSO	Policy is by definition only targeted at ICANN see Annex C of the ICANN Bylaws).It is up to ICANN to decide whether membership of the ccNSO is relevant in individual cases.	Section 3, Annex C ICANN Bylaws on scope ccNSO Policy Development Process	None
vii	Country Code was re-assigned shortly after removal (within 10 years) to another country added to the list	Currently considered impossible.	ISO 3166	None
viii	Uncertainty about authoritativeness of lines of communication between ccTLD Manager and IFO. Is ccTLD manager or its administrative contact authoritative and authorized to take the decision	The IFO deals with a Functional Manager, and if required may transfer to a new entity which is Functional. In addition, section 3.1 of the FoI provides a sound basis to expect that the IFO seeks contact with the ccTLD Manager and relevant decision-making entity of the ccTLD Manager.	Section 3, Functional manager (porpsod policy) Section 3.1 FoI	
ix	Breach of Agreement/Plan, resulting from conflict of laws: - Court Injunction - to applicable Law/ Court order	The retirement plan must be subject to legally binding court order in the jurisdiction.		None
ix a.	Breach of agreement during extension period	This situation could be handled, depending on reason, through proposed and existing policy. In case of “bad faith” or significant misbehaviour, revocation may be way to address issue.	Section 4.5 of proposed policy, Section 4 FoI	None
x	Island state disappears, but interests (was: commercial Interests” intend to keep ccTLD “alive”	If the code element is removed, the ccTLD is eligible for retirement. Reason for removal is not of relevance.	RFC 1591: IANA is not in business of deciding what is and what is not a country	None

Item #	Situation	Result	Relevant section policy and / or other document if any	Adjustment if any
xi	Unforeseen technical consequences/significant consequences for other affecting other TLDs/DNS in general. Nameservers for Domain names not under ccTLD, are still under ccTLD to be removed.	Communication to customers is part of the retirement plan. In addition the removal of ccTLD is predictable and foreseeable process. There should be no surprises. Customers should know where their essential services are hosted.	Section 4.4 of proposed process (line 131 and 132 above)	None
xii	Country disappears/ however there is a clear successor state	Countries do not disappear overnight. Takes some time before ISO-code is removed. In addition decision to remove country code is not part of the policy	ISO 3166 Standard	None
xiii	Decision by ISO 3166 MA to remove country code is completely out of line, in breach of ISO 3166 or ISO rules	Decision to remove country code is not part of the policy and ICANN should not be involved in process of removal of country code, independent of merits of decision. Reasonably predictable decisions over the past years. This is not an issue for the policy, but an issue for the ISO3166 MA and ISO itself. No need to adjust the policy.	RFC 1591: The IANA (ICANN) is not in the business to decide what is and what is not a country. ISO has a process for adding (and removing) country codes.	None
xiv	Assets of the ccTLD go to other party during removal process.	Receiving end will be aware of the issues: Retirement of the ccTLD. No surprises for them. Even if ccTLD manager would go bankrupt. People in the country will know about the removal and retirement process.	Section 4.4 of proposed process (line 131 and 132 above)	None
xv	Does the retirement policy apply to pending retirement case?	WG is of the opinion that the policy should not be applied retroactively; the proposed policy does not apply to cases that have already emerged or will emerge up to the	Line 26 and line 46-52	[the members of WG on 6 February call propose to include a clarification around

Item #	Situation	Result	Relevant section policy and / or other document if any	Adjustment if any
	<p>Clarification: where under the current operational practices, 1 of the ccTLDs is considered ineligible</p>	<p>time the proposed policy becomes effective. This does not preclude that IFO and the ccTLD Manager may agree to use the proposed mechanisms for retirement of a ccTLD.</p>		<p>the exceptionally reserved codes in either footnote or the text: The ccTLDs .uk and .AC which refer to exceptionally reserved codes UK and AC are grandfathered as ccTLD and .EU, which corresponds with the exceptionally reserved code EU, was delegated under the relevant ICANN Board resolution from September 2000 (“ <i>It is therefore RESOLVED [00.74] that the IANA staff is advised that alpha-2 codes not on the ISO 3166-1 list are delegable as ccTLDs only in cases where the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency, on its</i></p>

Item #	Situation	Result	Relevant section policy and / or other document if any	Adjustment if any
				<i>exceptional reservation list, has issued a reservation of the code that covers any application of ISO 3166-1 that needs a coded representation in the name of the country, territory, or area involved."</i>

283
284
285
286
287

288 7 . Background & Process to date

289

290 7.1 Background

291 At its meeting on 10 December 2015 the ccNSO Council discussed the launch of the formal ccNSO
 292 Policy Development Process to address the lack of policy with respect to the retirement of ccTLDs
 293 as well as a review mechanisms for decisions pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation and
 294 retirement of ccTLDs.

295

296 To increase the predictability and legitimacy of decision pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs and
297 in accordance with the recommendations of the ccNSO Delegation and Redelegation working group
298 (DRDWG) in 2011², the void or lack of policy relating to the retirement of ccTLDs needs to be filled by
299 a policy developed by the ccNSO. However, at the time the DRDWG also recommended that such a
300 ccNSO PDP should be launched following the development of a Framework of Interpretation of RFC
301 1591.

302
303 Following initial discussions by the ccNSO Council, input and feed-back was sought from the ccTLD
304 community at the Marrakesh (ICANN55) and Helsinki (ICANN56) meetings. At its meeting in Helsinki
305 (ICANN56) the ccNSO Council launched the ccNSO Policy Development Process 3.

306
307 On 9 March 2017, the Issue Manager submitted the Final Issue Report to Council.
308 Following the discussions by the ccNSO Council, feed-back and input from the community and the
309 drafting team, the Issue Manager recommended:

- 310 1. The ccNSO Council initiates one (1) ccNSO Policy Development Process to develop policy
311 proposals for both a Review Mechanism and on the Retirement of ccTLDs.
- 312 2. The initial focus needs to be on developing a Review Mechanism, which is considered the
313 highest priority, particularly in light of the IANA Stewardship transition. Only then the focus
314 should be on Retirement, and, if needed, revisit the Review Mechanism to include decisions
315 relating to the Retirement of ccTLDs.
- 316 3. To appoint two working groups each with its own charter, working method and schedule.

317
318 However, at the meeting in Copenhagen (ICANN58, March 2017, the ccTLD community present
319 suggested to change the order in which the topics need to be addressed. Analyses showed that
320 alternating the order would save at least 3 months and simplify the process. Effectively this meant

² See DRD WG Final Report, page 19, <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drd-wg-final-report-07mar11-en.pdf> and Council Decision 16 March 2011, <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/minutes-council-16mar11-en.pdf>

321 that by reversing the order, so first develop Retirement policy proposals and then those for the
322 Review Mechanism, the potential Review Mechanism would be available sooner to the community.

323

324 The ccNSO Council initiated the 3rd ccNSO Policy Development Process (ccPDP3) in March 2017 by
325 adopting the Issue Report. Accordingly the ccPDP3 Working Group to develop policy
326 recommendations for the Retirement of ccTLDs was established by June 2017. The Charter of this
327 WG was included in the Issue Report and is available at:

328 <https://ccnso.icann.org/en/workinggroups/pdp-retirement.htm>.

329 The ccPDP3 Retirement WG was tasked to develop policy proposals to address at a minimum the
330 following topics and issues identified in the Issue Report:

- 331 • Consistency of terminology
- 332 • What triggers a retirement?
- 333 • Who triggers retirement process?
- 334 • Additional conditions for retirement of a ccTLD? What are conditions for actual retirement of a
335 ccTLD? Is the occurrence of a triggering event sufficient or should additional requirements be
336 in place?
- 337 • Compliance with conditions? Assuming retirement of a ccTLD is conditional, who will monitor,
338 and who will be held accountable, if at all, if requirements are not met?

339

340 As the activities of the WG are undertaken within the framework of the ccNSO Policy Development
341 Process, the limitations with respect to the scope of a ccPDP, specifically by Article 10 and Annexes
342 B and C to the ICANN Bylaws limit the scope of the WG's work and proposals.

343

344 Further, the ccPDP3 Retirement WG was tasked to report to ccNSO Council on topics or issues
345 which they identified and considered out of scope for the WG. Accordingly, the Chair of the WG
346 informed the ccNSO Council and Issue Manager that the ccPDP3 Retirement WG identified two
347 issues, which need to be addressed, but were considered out of scope of ccPDP3:

- 348 - The ccNSO membership definition (section 10.4 (a) of the ICANN Bylaws). The membership
349 definition was changed as part of the IANA Stewardship Transition process.
350 - The events that would trigger the retirement of IDN ccTLDs. The Retirement WG advised
351 Council that the events leading the de-selection of IDNccTLDs should be identified under a
352 ccPDP that also defines the selection of IDNccTLD strings.
353

354

355 **7.2 Process to date**

356 After the call for volunteers and appointment by the ccNSO Council of the members (see Annex A of listed members,
357 observers and experts and staff support) the ccPDP3 Retirement Working Group held its first conference call and
358 commenced its work in June 2017. Since then the WG has met [x] times, of which [y] times in person during ICANN
359 meetings starting at the Johannesburg meeting in June 2017 (ICANN59) and [z] times through conference calls.

360

361 In the course of its work the original timeline and schedule as included in the Issue Report, was updated twice (March
362 & December 2019).

363

364 The first work item the WG completed was on the Rules of Engagement i.e the internal procedures for interaction and
365 decision-making, which guided the activities of the WG members (see:

366 [https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=64081623&preview=/64081623/89981518/roe.draft.20](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=64081623&preview=/64081623/89981518/roe.draft.2017-08-17%20closed.pdf)
367 [17-08-17%20closed.pdf](https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=64081623&preview=/64081623/89981518/roe.draft.2017-08-17%20closed.pdf))

368 As of ICANN60 (in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates) and at every following meeting the ccPDP3 Retirement WG
369 informed the ccTLD community and members of the Governmental Advisory Committee present at the respective
370 ICANN meetings about its progress.

371

372 At the Kobe meeting (ICANN64), the ccTLD Managers present expressed their initial support for the proposed method
373 and process, including its proposed duration. At the Montreal meeting (ICANN66) the ccTLDs present expressed their
374 support for the proposals with respect to the decisions that should be subject to oversight and the Review Mechanism

375

376 At the Montreal meeting, the chair and vice-chair of ccPDP3 Retirement WG also conducted an extensive on-boarding
377 session for members of the Governmental Advisory Committee.

378

379

380

381

382

383 **References**

384

385

386 **Glossary**

387

388 **Index (if needed)**

389 **Annex A Overview of results stress testing**

390 **Annex B (membership of RET WG)**