

Results of the brainstorming scenario development

Group 1

- EPDP scenario. An IDN ccTLD seeks supports for variant set, along the way something happens with selected string, primary (i.e. selected string) is no longer eligible.
- Country name is replaced by other country name (in designated language)
- Country name as listed on standard is changed (ENG/FR)
- Applicant IND 1 and IDN2 and are not Confusingly Similar, IDN 3 is blocked. Assume IDN 3 is Confusingly Similar with delegated IDN, how will this play out?
- IDN 1 is delegated, manager IDN 1 applies for variant IDN 2. IDN2 is variant of IDN 1
- Change name in designated language
- Selected string is applied, usability of string across the globe (not limited to their territory) other countries type it slightly different end up with different string (variant).
- What if IDNccTLD Manager applies for Variant string that is not in official language of country. Wants to serve non-official language users. Limitation of usability by limitation of criteria?
- Confusing Similarity scenario. New manager applies for a CS of incumbent's non-delegated but allocatable variant. What options are open for incumbent, what is impact of CS
- Asymmetrical variants. Sometimes asymmetrical variants if you go from label A to label B label B is allocatable, vice versa is not possible. How will this play out?
- Chinese applicant IDN 1, and IDN2 with IDN3 blocked under Chinese RZ-LGR. However Japanese applicant applies for IDN 3 under Japanese variant table. Who will win IDN3?
- Asymmetrical variants () a-> B works (B-> A does not work) because of RZ-LGR. Scenario applicant applied for B first, before RZ-LGR became what will happen then? If applicants want both?

Group 2

- What if an IDN ccTLD no longer qualifies as an IDN ccTLD? Retirement needed?
- What if IDN ccTLD manager refuses to go through retirement process?
- What if the IDN ccTLD that is going to be retired is widely used by another community? e.g. tech community (not necessarily local community)
- if IDN ccTLD and all variants are retired. Someone else wants to register the retired label. What happens?
- The application of RZ-LGR makes the currently delegated ccTLDs become variant of each other. How will this play out?
- What if a requested IDN ccTLD is a variant of an existing delegated TLD?
- What if the de-selection request is limited to only the delegated variant IDN ccTLD?
- What if a de-selection request is for the delegated primary (selected) IDN ccTLD?

Group 3

- What if a ccTLD wishes to retire one of their IDNs (due to natural reasons, such as removal of support of the script on the governmental level), but the ccTLD IDN in question is the selected (primary) IDNccTLD?
- Label A has allocatable variants: A1, A2. But A1 -> A2 blocked variant A2 -> A1 blocked variant A, A1, A2 all exist in the DNS/Root Zone. What happens if A is deselected? Can A1 and A2 remain, even if they wouldn't be allowed to co-exist without the initial label A?
- What if two countries are merged, like Eastern and Western Germany,
 - o what if they used the same IDNs Scripts?
 - o What if they would use different scripts
 - o What if Eastern Germany had an IDN ccTLD that was retired?
- What if a country name is changed but the script and language remains the same and the relevant people would like to retain the same name as they had before the same?
- How to synchronize blocked IDN strings between ccNSO and GNSO sets of recommendation, because in the end it is going to be in IANA for the IDN variants. if a particular IDN string is applied for with variants then the applicant has the right to register later all the variants of the string, one of the notions is to keep roster in
- country split AA -> AA + XX and ISO3166-1 (AA) 2 letter code remains. Split is assigned different ISO3166-1 code. (XX)IDN ccTLDs related to AA will be kept, including languages and variant subject to local decision only, 'blocking' the names for the split off. What if XX applies for XXIDNccTLD? No way for XX to trigger deselection
- What if the English name of the country doesn't change, but the name of the country changes in the national language?
- What if the script of the local language changes and the country has decided to change the script it uses?
- What if a territory script and language do (not?) match, but a significantly interested parties withdraw from the existing script and would like to propose a new script, is Deselection process triggered?

Consolidated list of scenario's

A. Delegation/Transfer and Revocation

- i. Assume IDN 1 is delegated. Manager IDN 1 applies for variant IDN 2. IDN2 is variant of IDN 1. Will IDN2 be eligible for delegation and can it be delegated?
- ii. What if the applicant/ intended IDNccTLD Manager is not member of the ccNSO, does proposed policy apply? Does delegation/transfer/revocation policy apply?

B. Deselection Criteria/ retirement related scenario's

- i. Country name is replaced by other country name (in designated language). What if the English/French name of the country doesn't change, but the name of the country changes in the national language?
- ii. What if the Country name as listed on standard is changed (ENG/FR)
- iii. What if an IDN ccTLD no longer qualifies as an IDN ccTLD? Is retirement needed?
- iv. What if IDN ccTLD manager refuses to go through retirement process?
- v. What if IDNccTLD Manager is no (longer) member of the ccNSO, do de-selection and retirement policy apply?
- vi. What if the IDN ccTLD that is going to be retired is widely used by another community (e.g. tech community (not necessarily local community))?
- vii. What if a selected IDN ccTLD string and all its variants are retired and someone else wants to register the retired label. What happens?
- viii. What if a ccTLD Manager wishes to retire one of their IDNs (due to natural reasons, such as removal of support of the script on the governmental level), but the ccTLD IDN to be retired is the selected (primary) IDNccTLD?
- ix. What if two countries are merged, like Eastern and Western Germany,
 - a. what if they used the same IDNs Scripts?
 - b. What if they would use different scripts
 - c. What if Eastern Germany had an IDN ccTLD that was retired?
- x. What if the script of the local language changes and the country has decided to change the script it uses?
- xi. What if a territory script and language do (not?) match, but a significantly interested parties withdraw from the existing script and would like to propose a new script, is Deselection process triggered?

- xii. What if a country name is changed and the script and language remains the same, however the relevant people would like to retain the same name as they had before the same?
- xiii. Country split from AA to AA and XX and the ISO3166-1 2 letter code AA remains for one country. Split results in assigning different ISO3166-1 code XX to other part. Before split (XX)IDN ccTLDs was related to AA and will be kept, including languages and variant subject to local decision only. This will 'block' the names for the split off. What if XX applies for XX IDNccTLD? No way for XX to trigger deselection
- xiv. What if the script of the local language changes and the country has decided to change the script it uses?
- xv. What if a territory script and language do (not?) match, but a significantly interested parties withdraw from the existing script and would like to propose a new script, is Deselection process triggered?

C. Variant and variant management

- i. EPDP scenario. An IDN ccTLD seeks supports for variant set, along the way something happens with selected string, primary (i.e selected string) is no longer eligible.
- ii. What if IDN 1 is (already) delegated and Manager IDN 1 applies for variant IDN 2? IDN2 is variant of IDN 1
- iii. What if IDNccTLD Manager applies for a Variant string that is not in official language of country. The IDN ccTLD managers wants to serve non-official language users. Limitation of usability by limitation of criteria?
- iv. Asymmetrical variants. Sometimes variants are asymmetrical: if you go from label A to label B, label B is allocatable, however vice versa is not possible. How will this play out under the policy?
- v. Chinese applicant IDN 1, and IDN2 with IDN3 blocked under Chinese RZ-LGR. However Japanese applicant applies for IDN 3 under Japanese variant table. Who will win IDN3?
- vi. Asymmetrical variants () a-> B works (B-> A does not work) because of RZ-LGR. Scenario applicant applied for B first, before RZ-LGR became what will happen then?
 - a. If applicants want both?
- vii. The application of RZ-LGR makes the currently delegated ccTLDs become variant of each other. How will this play out?

- viii. Label A has allocatable variants: A1, A2. But A1 -> A2 blocked variant A2 -> A1 blocked variant A, A1, A2 all exist in the DNS/Root Zone. What happens if A is deselected? Can A1 and A2 remain, even if they wouldn't be allowed to co-exist without the initial label A?
- ix. How to synchronize blocked IDN strings between ccNSO and GNSO sets of recommendation, because in the end it is going to be in IANA for the IDN variants. if a particular IDN string is applied for with variants then the applicant has the right to register later all the variants of the string, one of the notions is to keep roster in (IANA repository?)

D. Confusing Similarity scenarios

- i. Confusing Similarity scenario. New manager applies for a CS of incumbent's non-delegated but allocatable variant. What options are open for incumbent, what is impact of CS
- ii. Applicant IND 1 and IDN2 and are not Confusingly Similar, IDN 3 is blocked. Assume IDN 3 is Confusingly Similar with delegated IDN, how will this play out?

Annex A Stress as part of the development of the retirement policy

Definition of Stress Testing

Stress Testing is defined as:

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

After completion of the draft process the Stress Testing was conducted through answering the following questions:

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

Identified Situations Where Adjustment/Additional Work May be Needed

The highlighted scenario's have also been identified by one the break-out groups IDN policy WG

The Working group identified the following 16 situations:

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

Examples are:

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

ii. Domain Names under management at removal Date

At the agreed end-date (Date of Removal from the Root Zone Database) Second Level domain names are still under management of the ccTLD Manager, despite reasonable efforts from the ccTLD Manager to end registrations.

The covers scenario B. vi. Above

iii. Breach of Retirement Agreement

Various situations:

- The ccTLD Manager continues to promote the ccTLD and accepts registrations during the Retirement Process. Does it make a difference if at Removal Date there are no SLDs under management or the number of registrations under management has not declined or has even increased compared to the number at the date of the Retirement Notification?
- The ccTLD Manager stops all activities i.e. goes off-line.
- The ccTLD Manager takes no action resulting in serious deterioration of the zone.

This covers scenario B. iv. above

iv. The ccTLD Manager goes bankrupt after Notification of Retirement

v. Request for Transfer after the Retirement Notice is sent

- Retirement is the result of significant name change.
- Retirement is the result of the dissolution of the country and significantly interested parties cannot be identified.

vi. ccTLD Manager ends membership of the ccNSO and claims policies (Retirement & RFC1591/FoI) are therefore not applicable

Note: The ccNSO Council recently established that membership in the ccNSO, by definition, ends when entity listed as the ccTLD Manager is no longer listed as such in the Root Zone Database, implying that for the duration of the Retirement Process membership of the ccNSO does not end, unless it is actively terminated by the Manager.

This covers scenario A. ii. and B. v. above

- vii. **Country Code was removed from the list of Assigned codes because the country dissolved and the Code was re-assigned shortly afterwards (within ten (10) years) to another country added to the list**
- viii. **Uncertainty about authoritativeness of lines of communication between the ccTLD Manager and IFO**
The identity of the authoritative entities is not clear during the Retirement Process.
- ix. **Breach of Agreement due to conflicts of laws**
Due to court injunction
Due to applicable national law / Court order
- x. **Breach of Agreement during extension period**
- xi. Island state disappears, but interests intend to keep ccTLD "alive"**
This covers scenario B. xii. above
- xii. Unforeseen technical consequences/significant consequences affecting other TLDs/DNS in general**
This covers scenario B iv above
- xiii. **Country disappears, however there is a clear successor state**
- xiv. **Decision by ISO 3166 MA to remove country code is completely out of line, in breach of ISO 3166 or ISO rules**
- xv. **Assets of the ccTLD go to another party during removal process**
- xvi. **Does the Retirement Policy apply to a pending Retirement case?**

Result of Stress tests per identified situations

Item #	Situation	Result	Relevant section Annex A: Final Paper 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	Domain Names under management at removal date. S	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 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 sent	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
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.	Annex C Section 3, of the ICANN Bylaws on the scope of the 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

Item #	Situation	Result	Relevant section Annex A: Final Paper and / or other document if any	Adjustment if any
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 Fol provides a sensible 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 (proposed Policy) Section 3.1 Fol	None
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
x	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 misbehavior, Revocation may be way to address issue.	Section 4.5 of proposed Policy, Section 4 Fol	None
xi	Island state disappears, but interests (was: “commercial interests” intended 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
xii	Unforeseen technical consequences/significant consequences affecting other TLDs and the 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.	None
xiii	Country disappears/ however there is a clear successor state	Countries do not disappear overnight. It takes some time before ISO-code is removed. In addition, the decision to remove country code is not part of the Policy	ISO 3166 Standard	None
xiv	Decision by ISO 3166 MA to remove country code is completely out of line, in	The decision to remove a country code is not part of the Policy and ICANN should not be	RFC 1591: The IANA (ICANN) is not in the	None

Item #	Situation	Result	Relevant section Annex A: Final Paper and / or other document if any	Adjustment if any
	breach of ISO 3166 or ISO rules	involved in the process of the removal of a country code, independent of merits of the decision. Reasonably predictable decisions over the past years. This is not an issue for the Policy, but an issue for the ISO3166 MA and the ISO itself. No need to adjust the Policy.	business to decide what is and what is not a country. ISO has a process for adding (and removing) country codes.	
xv	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	None
xvi	Does the Retirement Policy apply to pending Retirement case? Clarification: where under the current operational practices, 1 of the ccTLDs is considered ineligible	The WG believes the applicability of the Policy to existing situations or those emerging before the proposed Policy becomes effective is out of scope of its mandate. For situations prior to this Policy coming into force, responsibility lies with the IFO to create a suitable procedure. The WG suggests that such a procedure could be based on and anticipates on the proposed Policy.	Section 1.2 and section 3 of this document	See Annex A footnote 17 Section 1.2