

1 Duration of removal process

2 speaking about the formula, let's go back to breakout groups

3 Thoughts as to what the possible scenarios are (at least 2 or 3) and for each scenario, how long do you
4 think time should be between A and B? Why is that a reasonable number?

5

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

7 **Common**

8 **Need voluntary process**

9 **Need for minimum and maximum period**

10 Minimum period needed. Max period needed as well

11 **No distinction name change/ removal**

12 distinction between significant name change and removal of code element?

13 **For discussion**

14 **Distinguish Cases**

15 **Old replaced with empty new TLD**

- 16 • new operator is same or not

17 **New ccTLD is not empty**

18 **Old split up into new empty TLDs**

19 **Policy only process for removal**

- 20 • No established process within PTI for termination of a ccTLD outside of the process we are going to
21 deal with

22

23 Section 15. 5 Annex B ICANN Bylaws: In the event the Board determines not to accept a ccNSO
24 Supplemental Recommendation, then the Board shall not be entitled to set policy on the issue
25 addressed by the recommendation and the status quo shall be preserved until such time as the ccNSO
26 shall, under the ccPDP, make a recommendation on the issue that is deemed acceptable by the Board.

27 **Duration**

28 The 3 groups argued for range of timeframes for duration. Staff Note: 1. depends on approach

29 Group 1, 3 years, was ultimately considered unrealistic by some of group members.

30 Acceptable range appears to be between 5-10 years, taking into account in country local knowledge
31 awareness of significant name change or dissolution of country/ territory.

32 **All cases 3 years sufficient**

33 Start to finish in all 3 cases: 3 years are sufficient to solve branding issues Old registry operator has 3
34 years to get the job done.

35 Q: Why 3 years?

36 R: We did not want the process to be dragged out. We initially considered 5. Once a registry starts
37 cutting off registry streams. By 5 years: registry will have run out of cash. Q: never considered to think
38 about the registry that might run out of cash. If they need longer than 5 years, they can get up to 10
39 years.

40 **9-10 years**

41 • 9 to 10 years hard removal date: longer timeframe

42 • 5 years was mooted.

43 • Minimum period needed. Max period needed as well

44 **Flexible approach**

45 ***3 year Pre-removal cc process***

46 • 3-year lead-up process before a country does not exist

47 What about significant change of name?

48 ***5 year basic period***

49 • 5-year period from moment the ccTLD is no longer in 3166. Lights get switched off in 5 years,
50 unless the ccTLD has a retirement plan with PTI (milestones, consultation stakeholders)

51 ***10 years, if extension***

52 • If needed Extended to 10 years. Max period

53 **Topic / Issues**

54 **Reputation damage ICANN/PTI**

55 worried about ICANN's reputation when there is an involuntary removal. Whatever we do, we need to
56 be seen more than generous in the policy. Let's not forget about the registrants. As long there is no
57 other country looking for that code

58 **Associated risks**

59 one question to ask would be to understand risks associated with 3 5 10 years (on the latter one would
60 hope that in ten years one could reasonably be personally retired

61 **Failing business scenario**

62 Experience to date limited.

63 a minority of cases. Likely scenario, if the current operator is not involved with the new operator. Future
64 consideration, flagged as an issue: gap in the policy, there is no provision that allows us to do a transfer
65 request for a TLD that is no longer eligible to exist. We do need to have a mechanism by which if the
66 business fails, they need to have a formal transfer.

67 Retain staff

68 **Ensure stability of namespace**

69 we need to be overly generous to the registrants to ensure their stability of the namespace. 3 years is
70 definitely too short. You should focus on what best serves the registrants. Try to maintain continuity for
71 the registrants.

72 The country no longer exists. Registrants would naturally look for alternatives. Registries should not be
73 forced to continue.

74 Moving a bigger registry, there are interesting side effects

75 If there is no-one to accept the transfer, the reality is about the registrant. We make guidelines as to
76 how it should be. If something goes very wrong, we have to build in safety procedures. Not that you
77 extend it forever. But your minimum should make sense.

78 Is there a ccTLD that accept registrations for more than 10 years?

79

80 Duration of cases to date (To be completed)

81 **Timing**

82 Timing looks at duration of retirement process & schedule of milestones (determining the
83 length in time of the different steps in the process)

84 **Duration of process**

85 *Anticipated duration*

86 . YU case. 26 September 2006. This revision removed the “CS” code, and added an “ME”
87 code for Montenegro, and an “RS” code for Serbia. Once the standard was revised it
88 became possible for ICANN to consider applications for delegation of these two new
89 codes in the DNS root zone. In December 2006, the Government of Montenegro
90 submitted a delegation application for the .ME domain. This was followed by the
91 applications for the delegations of the .RS domain, and the redelegation of the .YU
92 domain. Board discussion about the appropriate timeline for decommissioning — and
93 the Board ultimately believed it was more appropriate to have a relatively short
94 timeline. The final resolution that was adopted by the ICANN Board on 11 September
95 2007 is that the .YU domain **should be retired within two years.**

96

97 .AN Case. From the rationale. *The matter of the timeline for the transition from the .AN*
98 *domain to its successor domains is being addressed in conjunction with the evaluation of*
99 *the delegation of the .CW and .SX domains, in order to give clarity to the communities*
100 *involved the timeline upon which the transition will occur. This will allow the*
101 *communities to prepare and plan appropriately for the transition. See:*
102 *[https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-11-](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-11-en#1.3.rationale)*
103 *[en#1.3.rationale](https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2011-10-11-en#1.3.rationale). Decision to execute process initiated by the Board decision to delegate*
104 *.CW 25 August 2011. Expected to be completed by 31 October 2014.*

105 **Board decision Resolved** (2011.10.11.06), that the .AN domain be removed from the
106 DNS root zone on 31 October 2014, if not requested earlier by the manager of the
107 domain.

108 **.TP case.** In **2002**, the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste was established. The ISO
109 3166-1 standard removed the TP. On 23 March 2005, the .TL top-level domain was
110 delegated. IANA staff and .TP contacts continued discussions on the removal of the .TP
111 top-level domain. In August 2013, the IANA Department received a letter. In July 2014,
112 IANA staff was notified that the new point of contact for this request. The removal date
113 is currently scheduled for 28 February 2015. See: Board resolution (
114 <https://www.icann.org/resources/board-material/resolutions-2015-02-12-en#1.c>) and
115 related IANA report . <https://www.iana.org/reports/2015/tp-report-20150126.html>

116
117
118
119
120
121

122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131

132

133

134

135

136

Effective duration

.ZR-> .CD case. The .CD domain was initially delegated in **1997** to Interpoint SARL, a Switzerland-based registry provider that has also provided service for a number of other African countries such as Burundi and Rwanda. Interpoint was the operator of the .ZR domain for Zaire. When the country was renamed to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it was issued with a replacement ISO 3166-1 code of "CD" on **14 July 1997**.

Interpoint approached ICANN to **replace .ZR with .CD, and was delegated the .CD domain shortly thereafter.** In **February 2001**, the Government executed an agreement with Key Systems GmbH, a German provider of domain registry systems, to establish a company "Key-Systems Congolais" to be responsible for the administration of the .CD and .ZR domains. After this agreement, Key Systems wrote to ICANN seeking to obtain redelegation of these domains. ICANN responded that as the .ZR domain is to be retired, it could not be redelegated in this fashion. In June 2002, Key Systems and Interpoint SARL entered into a contract to take "measures necessary" to transfer the registry data for the .CD and .ZR domains to Key Systems, and to support redelegation of the domain to Key Systems.

.YU case

.AN Case