

Duration of the Retirement Process

Barcelona

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

~~2018-11-14~~ 2018-11-27

*This document includes an outline **automatically** translated from ccPDP-ret.barcelona.removalduration.2018-10-20.*

7 **1 Duration of removal process**

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

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

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

13 **1.1 ~~Group 1~~Common**

14 **1.1.1 ~~Cases~~Need voluntary process**

15 **1.1.2 Need for minimum and maximum period**

16 Minimum period needed. Max period needed as well

17 **1.1.3 No distinction name change/ removal**

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

19 **1.2 For discussion**

20 **1.2.1 Distinguish Cases**

- 21 • Old replaced with empty new TLD
22 new operator is same or not
23 • New ccTLD is not empty
24
25 • Old split up into new empty TLDs

26 **1.2.2 ~~All cases 3 years sufficient~~Policy only process for removal**

27 No established process within PTI for termination of a ccTLD outside of the process we
28 are going to deal with

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

34 **1.2.3 Duration**

35 The 3 groups argued for range of timeframes for duration.

36 Staff Note: 1. depends on approach

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

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

40

41 • All cases 3 years sufficient

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

44 Why 3 years?

45 We did not want the process to be dragged out. We initially considered 5. Once a
46 registry starts cutting off registry streams. By 5 years: registry will have run out
47 of cash

48 Eberhard: never considered to think about the registry that might run out of cash.
49 If they need longer than 5 years, they can get up to 10 years.

50 • 9-10 years

51 **1.3 Group 2**

52 **1.2.1 9-10 years**

53 9 to 10 years hard removal date: longer timeframe 5 years was mooted. Minimum
54 period needed. Max period needed as well

55 **1.2.1 Need for minimum and maximum period**

- 56 • Flexible

57 ~~Minimum period needed. Max period needed as well~~

- 58 – 3 year Pre-removal cc process

59 **1.2.1 Policy only process for removal**

60 ~~No established process within PTI for termination of a ccTLD outside of the~~
61 ~~process we are going to deal with~~

62 **1.2.1 ~~Need voluntary process~~**

63 **1.2.1 ~~No distinction~~**

64 ~~distinction between significant name change and removal of code element?~~

65

66 **1.3 ~~Group 3~~**

67 **1.2.1 ~~3 year Pre-removal cc process~~**

68 3-year lead-up process before a country does not exist

69 What about significant change of name?

70 – 5 year basic period

71 **1.2.1 5-year basic period**

72 5-year period from moment the ccTLD is no longer in 3166. Lights get
73 switched off in 5 years, unless the ccTLD has a retirement plan with PTI
74 (milestones, consultation stakeholders)

75 **1.2.1 10 years, if extension**

76 – 10 years, if extension

77 If needed Extended to 10 years. Max period

78 **1.2.1 No distinction**

79 ~~between significant name change and removal~~

80 **1.3 Topic / Issues**

81 **1.3.1 Reputation damage ICANN/PTI**

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

85 **1.3.2 Associated risks**

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

88 **1.3.3 Failing business scenario**

89 Experience to date limited.

90 a minority of cases. Likely scenario, if the current operator is not involved with the
91 new operator. Future consideration, flagged as an issue: gap in the policy, there is no

92 provision that allows us to do a transfer request for a TLD that is no longer eligible to
93 exist. We do need to have a mechanism by which if the business fails, they need to
94 have a formal transfer

95 [Retain staff](#)

96 **1.3.4 Ensure stability of namespace**

97 we need to be overly generous to the registrants to ensure their stability of the names-
98 pace. 3 years is definitely too short. You should focus on what best serves the regis-
99 trants. Try to maintain continuity for the registrants

100 the country no longer exists. Registrants would naturally look for alternatives.

101 Registries should not be forced to continue.

102 moving a bigger registry, there are interesting side effects

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

107 is there a ccTLD that accept registrations for more than 10 years?