

## Questions pertaining to the total Duration of ccTLD retirement Process

During its session in Barcelona, the WG reached consensus on two important milestones of the Retirement Process:

- Start of the process. The Process is triggered by ending the assignment of a country code to a country name under ISO 3166-1. This trigger event is outside the remit of the policy as the ISO 3166 Maintenance Agency is responsible and executes the ending of the assignment.
- End of the process. The process ends with the removal from the country code Top Level Domain from the Root Zone Database and hence from the DNS. The initiation and procedures for removal are not part of the retirement process.

Given these two milestones, which demarcate the start and end of the retirement process, one of the main open topics is how long should the retirement process take, what is its duration?

The historical cases to date have shown no clear cut answers to this question. In the balance of this note you'll find questions to focus the discussion and assist the WG members to reach a shared opinion view on how long the process should take.

### Glossary

STPR - Specific Transition Plan for Retirement

1. Should there be a policy by the ccNSO that specifies an Absolute Maximum period for retirement process (from end of cc assignment to country name to removal from the root zone file) after it's active manager is notified that its 2 letter code has been un-assigned? - The consensus of the Working Group was that there should be such an Absolute Maximum.
  - 1.1. Should the Absolute Maximum be contingent on the size of the retiring registry?
    - 1.1.1. This was discussed at the meeting of the WG at ICANN 63 and it was the consensus of the group that it would be difficult to ensure an effective and applicable measurement of registry size for this purpose.
    - 1.1.2. It worth noting that under a **STPR** between the manager and PTI that the retirement period can be as short as the parties agree to. This could be useful in the context where the retiring registry has few if any registrations and the manager is cooperative (.UM retirement?).
  - 1.2. In an effort to encourage ccTLD Managers of retiring ccTLDs to negotiate an orderly retirement process with PTI should the Absolute Maximum depend on the retiring registry jointly agreeing to a **STPR** with PTI to ensure an orderly decommissioning of the registry?
    - 1.2.1. There seemed to be general support for this proposal at the ICANN 63 meeting of the WG. This would imply that if the retiring registry cannot or will not negotiate a **STPR** with PTI that PTI could impose a shorter time than the Absolute Maximum (Default Minimum?).

1.2.2. Any consideration of an STPR scenario must include handling a breach of the **STPR**.

1.3. Should the Absolute Maximum be contingent on the type of retirement?

Retirements which provide the option for registrants in the retiring registry to transfer to a new ccTLD should be of particular interest in helping to maintain the stability of the Internet and supporting registrants. Examples of transfer scenarios include 1 for 1 (.ZR to .CD) or 1 to many (.YU => .RS, .ME). If a Partial or Total Transfer is possible should additional time be allowed for the transition if required? There are essentially three scenarios of interest here:

- Total Transfer – All existing registrations in the retiring registry will be offered the opportunity to transfer their registrations to a new ccTLD.
- Partial Transfer – Some of the existing registrations in the retiring registry will be offered the opportunity to transfer their registrations to a new ccTLD.(see below for possible scenarios).
- No Transfer – The retiring ccTLD is not being replaced by any other ccTLD and as such there is no possibility of any process to transfer registrations in bulk to a new ccTLD.

1.3.1. This was discussed in Barcelona under the heading of Name Change but there was no clear consensus.

1.3.2. It would be consistent with ICANN values to allow for additional time if a Total or Partial Transfer of registrations is possible.

1.3.3. Even if the retirement of the ccTLD is associated with a name change there may be a number of issues which limit the possibility of a Total Transfer. A possible corner case with respect to Total Transfer is where in a name change scenario the retiring registry accepted specific IDN registrations while the new registry will not. Another variation of a corner case could be if the retiring registry accepted international registrants while the new registry will not.

1.4. What should the Absolute Maximum be?

1.4.1. In the group exercises held at ICANN 63 there seemed to be a consensus that the absolute maximum should be 10 years which could be contingent on a number of factors. There were also discussions of 3 or 5 year periods as being sufficient to wind up a registry's operations. Periods shorter than 3 years were generally not considered realistic. This generates a window of 3 to 10 years.

1.4.2. Considering the various options:

1.4.2.1. Only one Absolute Maximum (no encouragement to negotiate an STPR and no consideration of Total Transfer if any). This is not considered a viable option as it would go against the option to encourage manager to negotiate an STPR and would provide PTI with no leverage to ensure an orderly retirement of the ccTLD which would seem to go against the core ICANN philosophy of ensuring the security, stability and resiliency of the Internet.

1.4.2.2. Default Minimum and Absolute Maximum

1.4.2.2.1. It would seem logical to opt for a Default Minimum of either 2 or 3 years based on the discussions at ICANN 63 and would set the

date for the removal of the retiring ccTLD from the Root unless there is an **STPR** agreed to by both PTI and the Manager of the retiring registry.

1.4.2.2.2. The Absolute Maximum would be established at 10 years but could only be granted in the context of an STPR agreed to by both PTI and the Manager of the retiring registry.

1.4.2.2.3. A set of guidelines for negotiating an STPR should be established to ensure fair and consistent application to retiring registries.

2. What should be the approval process between ICANN and PTI to remove a ccTLD from the Root and should the policy address this?

2.1. THIS CAN ONLY BE CONSIDERED ONCE THE VARIOUS ASPECTS OF THE ABSOLUTE MAXIMUM HAVE BEEN ANSWERED AS SOME OPTIONS IN THAT SECTION CAN HAVE A DIRECT IMPACT ON THE APPROVAL PROCES.