1 # ccPDP-Ret WG

2 ## ICANN63 Face-To-Face Meeting

3 ## Notes

4 ## 2018-10-20 15:00 (Local Time)

5 ## 1 Welcome and Roll Call

6 • List of participants:

7 • List of remote participants:

8 • Apologies:

Lists to follow

9 Rough consensus sought during this meeting on what is needed to remove a string
10 from the root zone

11 ## 2 Administrative Announcements, if Any

12 Scheduled until 18:30. Suggestion to break at a logical end point. Frequency and
13 rotation schedule post ICANN63: every other week, 6h rotation.

14 ## 3 Action Items

15 None

16 4 Bylaw Definitional Issue

17 (Article 10.4 (a)) and proposed way forward second reading (Plenary).

18 see document CCPDP-RET. SummaryofApplicabilityDiscussion..2018-10-10, which
19 was already circulated before the last call

20 Chair will write to the ccNSO council with the WG's observations. At the next meeting,
21 this proposed wording will be presented to the group, or earlier on mailing list.

22 5 Applicability Second Reading (Plenary)

23 see document CCPDP-RET.SummaryofApplicabilityDiscussion..2018-10-10, which
24 was already circulated before the last call.

25 Reminder that we write policy directed at ICANN, not so much at individual ccTLDs.

26 Definitions in Fast Track Process and overall policy: the IDN ccTLD needs a link to a
27 meaningful representation of the name of the country listed on ISO-3166.

28 Argument by Nenad to be re-visited during next agenda item

29 Garth's position was solitary. Withdrawn

30 Peter K: Triggering events. Hopefully we have agreement that the changes on
31   the iso-code do not have immediate effect on the TLDs in the root.
32   Exceptionally reserved list. Difficult to create policy based on availability
33   of that list. We may need to discuss whether we want to include those
34   4 ccTLDs in the applicability of the policy or not.

35 Nick: we should document in the report that we leave this for the people that
36   follow us.

37 Eberhard: there are 4 lists. Active list, exceptionally reserved, permanently re-
38   served, 4th list. Needs to be clear what we are talking about. Scope of
39   the policy that needs to be applicable. This item will not return on the
40   agenda.

41 Jaap: list of allocated codes. Exceptionally reserved list: not part of the stan-
42   dard. Whether they are reserved or not, is irrelevant. Deletions from
43   the list shall be made upon request from UN headquarters or request
44   by a member of the ISO-3166 MA.

45 Nenad: concern on IDN ccTLDs.

46 Bart: we are talking now about the 2-letter country codes. There is no defini-
47   tion of ccTLDs in the ICANN Bylaws. ccTLDs are not in the ISO-list, but
48   country codes are in the ISO-list.

49 Nick: similar discussion to what we discussed at the start of this group. We
50   first deal with the main problem, the bulk of the ccTLDs. The allocated
51   ones. There are some others, such as .uk. or the IDN ccTLDs. We will
52   see about those later.

53 Bart: at one point in time, the ccTLD is to be removed from the root zone.
54   Duration in time is not clear yet. Just trying to get agreement, that
55   indeed at one point, it is going to be deleted from the root zone.

56 Rough consensus of the attendants.

6 Overview on Going Forward Including Process Plan and Oversight (Plenary)

59 see document CCPDP-RET.SummaryofApplicabilityDiscussion..2018-10-10, which
60 was already circulated before the last call and CCPDP-RET.OversightofRetirementProcess.v1.0.2018
61 10-16

62 idea to have text by Kobe we can go through in detail. Similar to how policy was
63 developed for the FOI.

64 Bart will divide people in groups. 20 min discussion in groups, come up with activities
65 a registry / ICANN / IANA may need to do in moving from point A to point B.

66 Consider e.g. potential retirement of .PR if it becomes a state rather than a territory.
67 If it would be absorbed into .us, they would need to deal with non-US registrations.
68 (nexus requirements for .us)

6.1 Break-out Sessions 1: how to move from A to B? Which steps in between?

71 **A:** trigger event

72 **B:** removal from the zone

73 6.1.1 Group 1: Stephen Deerhake

74 • How do you solve the locale issue if the gaining registry has one

75 • Staff allocations

76 • Process of transferring registrations to the gaining registry. If the gaining reg-
77   istry is empty, that is straightforward (Congo to Zaire). If the TLD is going away
78   with no successor: do you play out the renewals until all domains are expired.
79   Or do you do an active cancellation?

80 • Communication between registry and registrars. Community to be given input
81   into the process early.

82 • Potential trademark issues.

83 • IANA activities regarding database changes

84 6.1.2 Group 2: Allan McGillivray

85 • Need for communication between IANA functions operator and ccTLD manager

86 • How many domains in zone file?

87 • Communication with registrars, broader community. GVT no longer part of that

88 • Notion of the need for a plan between IANA functions operator and the ccTLD
89   manager. Need for flexibility in the plan

90 • Default plan in case ccTLD manager refused to cooperate in the development
91   of the plan

92 6.1.3 Group 3: Nick Wenban-Smith

93 • Code-element changes in 3166

94 • Key-event being removal of the code

95 • PTI notifying ccTLD manager

96 • Long-stop date when domain is removed from root

97 • In between steps to be agreed between PTI and the manager

98 • Long-stop date: shorter if ccTLD manager is non-responsive?

99 • Process factors, e.g. stop taking new registrations, transfers of domain name
100   holders, registrars transfers, renewals etc., stop accepting disputes

101   • The actual plan is best left to ccTLD manager in their domestic environment

102 **6.1.4 Discussion**

103 Stephen: Is there a need to stop accepting registrant and registrar transfers?

104 Nick: If you got a 5-year retirement process, the need to be able to renew if it
105   grandfathers into a new ccTLD is important.

106 Kim   D: no constraint on what registration period can be. Concept of renewal.
107   Practical solution can't be fully gated at the length of the registration
108   period. What would happen if .CD would change back to .ZR?

109 Kim D: I assume this would need to go through a new delegation process. As-
110   suming the local community is in support, this would be a straightfor-
111   ward process.

112 Stephen: speaking about the formula, let's go back to breakout groups. Thoughts
113   as to what the possible scenarios are (at least 2 or 3) and for each
114   scenario, how long do you think time should be between A and B? Why
115   is that a reasonable number?

116 Peter: the next user of the code is not at the table here. The larger TLD will
117   leave more waste (use of name outside the DNS). Renaming a big TLD.
118   Real stakeholder is not here.

119 **7 Timeline for Retirement**

120 (overview, breakouts, wrap-up): see document CCPDP-RET.SummaryofApplicabilityDiscussion..201
121 10-10, ccpdp-ret.timingofremoval.v1.2018-10-16.

122 **7.1 Break-out Sessions 2: How should the timeframe for the**
123   **retirement look like?**

124 **7.1.1 Group 3: Nick**

125   • 3-year lead-up process before a country does not exist

126   • 5-year period from moment the ccTLD is no longer in 3166. Lights get switched
127   off in 5 years, unless the ccTLD has a retirement plan with PTI (milestones,
128   consultation stakeholders)

129   • If needed Extended to 10 years. Max period

130 Bart: did you make distinction between significant name change, or ...

131 Nick: no, we did not. Hard to predict

132 7.2 Group 2: Allan

133   • 9 to 10 years: longer timeframe

134   • 5 years was muted.

135   • Minimum period needed. Max period needed as well

136   • No established process within PTI for termination of a ccTLD outside of the
137   process we are going to deal with

138   • Need to consider a process for voluntary process to surrender

139 Eberhard: out of scope for our group.

140 KimD: it happened in so far that retirements did not have a long-term process.
141   The operator of .UM expressly asked to wind down the domain.

142 Bart: did you make distinction between significant name change?

143 Allan: no

144 Bart: is 10y the drop-dead date

145 Allan: yes. 9 to 10

146 7.2.1 Group 1: Stephen

147   • 3 cases were looked into:

148   **1.** old TLD replacement with empty new TLD. 1a: new operator is same or
149   not

150   **2.** New TLD is not empty

151   **3.** Old TLD split up into new empty TLDs

152   • Start to finish in all 3 cases: 3 years are sufficient to solve branding issues

153   • Old registry operator has 3 years to get the job done.

154 Eberhard: Why 3 years?

155 **156** **157**	Stephen:	We did not want the process to be dragged out. We initially considered 5. Once a registry starts cutting off registry streams. By 5 years: registry will have run out of cash
158 **159**	Eberhard:	never considered to think about the registry that might run out of cash. If they need longer than 5 years, they can get up to 10 years.
160 **161** **162** **163**	Allan:	worried about ICANN's reputation when there is an involuntary removal. Whatever we do, we need to be seen more than generous in the policy. Let's not forget about the registrants. As long there is no other country looking for that code ....
164 **165** **166**	Liz Williams:	@Bart...in timelines...one question to ask would be to understand risks associated with 3 5 10 years (on the latter one would hope that in ten years one could reasonably be personally retired...)
167	Bart:	noted
168 **169** **170** **171** **172** **173**	Kim D:	failing business model scenario. We talk about a minority of cases. Likely scenario, if the current operator is not involved with the new operator. Future consideration, flagged as an issue: gap in the policy, there is no provision that allows us to do a transfer request for a TLD that is no longer eligible to exist. We do need to have a mechanism by which if the business fails, they need to have a formal transfer
174 **175** **176** **177**	Tom Barett:	we need to be overly generous to the registrants to ensure their stability of the namespace. 3 years is definitely too short. You should focus on what best serves the registrants. Try to maintain continuity for the registrants
178 **179**	Bart:	the country no longer exists. Registrants would naturally look for alternatives.
180 **181**	Tom:	if our focus is on the registrant, we should focus on the protection of the registrant.
182 **183**	Ajay:	if something is dying, you do not want to be associated with it. Registries should not be forced to continue.
184	Peter:	moving a bigger registry, there are interesting side effects
185 **186** **187**	Nenad:	we should not decide for others. From my experience in retiring .YU domain names, 3 years is not enough. E.g. try changing your email address in paypal
188 **189** **190** **191**	Bernard:	next level. If there is no-one to accept the transfer, the reality is about the registrant. We make guidelines as to how it should be. If something goes very wrong, we have to build in safety procedures. Not that you extend it forever. But your minimum should make sense.

192 Tom Barret: is there a ccTLD that accept registrations for more than 10 years?

193 Alejandra: yes, we do. As long as you want

194 Allan: there could be a broader issue that argues for a shorter period

8 Arrangements/Framework for Removal

196 (overview, breakouts, wrap-up):

197 see document CCPDP-RET.PlanningforremovaloftheccTLDV1.0.2018-10-16

9 AOB

199 No items raised

10 Next meetings

201 2018-11-15 17:00 UTC

11 Closure

203 Adjourned.