

At-Large Workspace: ccNSO PDP3: Initial Proposals for Process to Retire ccTLDs

Public Comment Close	Statement Name	Status	Assigned Working Group	Assignee (s)	Call for Comments Open	Call for Comments Close	Vote Open	Vote Close	Date of Submission	Staff Contact and Email
10 July 2020	ccNSO PDP3: Initial Proposals for Process to Retire ccTLDs	ADOPTED 13Y, ON, 2A	CPWG	Hadia Elminiawi Otieno Barrack	14 June 2020	06 July 2020	07 July 2020	10 July 2020	09 July 2020	Bart Boswinkel, Vice President, Policy Development & ccNSO relations Bart.Boswinkel@icann.org

Hide the information below, please click [here](#) >>

Brief Overview

Purpose: The ccNSO Policy Development Process 3 (PDP3) working group, tasked with developing and proposing policy for the retirement of country code Top-Level Domains (ccTLDs), is seeking input and feed-back from the broader community on its proposed process to retire ccTLDs, when the country code is removed from list of country codes in the ISO 3166 standard.

Current Status: The Interim Paper is the first step in documenting the recommended policy for the retirement process of ccTLDs.

Next Steps: After closure of the Public Comment period, the working group will review the comments received and take into account in developing a final set of policy recommendations.

Section I: Description and Explanation

The working group tasked with developing and proposing policy for the retirement of country code Top-Level Domains (ccTLDs) is seeking input and feedback from the broader community on its proposed process to retire ccTLDs, when the country code is removed from list of country codes in the ISO 3166 standard. The purpose of the policy proposals is to provide clear and predictable guidance and to document a process that is orderly and reasonable up and to, but excluding, the removal of a ccTLD from the DNS Root Zone file.

The ISO 3166-1 list is dynamic and country codes are added and removed on a regular basis. When a new ISO 3166-1 Alpha-2 code element (Alpha-2 code) is added a ccTLD corresponding to that Alpha-2 code can be added to the Root by the IANA Naming Functions Operator (IFO). However, as was identified in 2011 by the ccNSO Delegation and Redelegation Working Group, there is no formal policy available for the removal of a ccTLD from the Root Zone after a country code is removed from the ISO 3166-1 list of country names.

The proposals are focused on the following items:

- Definition of event that causes the start of the retirement process of a ccTLD and the event that closes the process
- Description of the retirement process
- Duration of the process
- Retirement Plan
- Oversight of process and identification of decisions during process that should be subject to a review mechanism.

The working group would appreciate feedback on each and every item identified above, specifically:

- Do you consider the proposed approach, definition or description reasonable?
- Do you suggest an alternative definition or approach?

In addition, and as part of developing the process, the working group has completed a series of stress tests. The method, description of tests and results are included in the Interim Paper. The working group would appreciate your view whether the stress testing of the proposals is adequate and complete. The working group would also be interested in suggestions for additional stress tests.

After closure of the Public Comment period, the working group will review the comments received and taken into account in developing the policy recommendations of the Final Paper. This Final Paper will be included in the required ccPDP3 reports, after the second part of the PDP is concluded.

Section II: Background

In accordance with the recommendations of the ccNSO Delegation and Redelegation Working Group (DRDWG) from 2011 and to increase the predictability and legitimacy of decisions pertaining to the retirement of ccTLDs, the void or lack of policy relating to the retirement of ccTLDs needs to be filled by a policy developed by the ccNSO.

Developing such a policy for the retirement of ccTLDs working group is part 1 of the third ccNSO Policy Development Process effort. The second part will look at the development of policy proposals for a review mechanism of decisions pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs.

Following initial discussions by the ccNSO Council, input and feedback was sought from the ccTLD community at the Marrakesh (ICANN55) and Helsinki (ICANN56) meetings. At its meeting in Helsinki (ICANN56), the ccNSO Council launched the ccNSO Policy Development Process 3.

The ccNSO Council initiated ccPDP3 in March 2017 by adopting the Issue Report and the ccPDP3 Working Group to develop policy recommendations for the Retirement of ccTLDs was established by June 2017.

The ccPDP3 Retirement working group was tasked to develop policy proposals to address at a minimum the following topics and issues identified in the Issue Report:

- Consistency of terminology
- What triggers a retirement?
- Who triggers retirement process?
- Additional conditions for retirement of a ccTLD? What are conditions for actual retirement of a ccTLD? Is the occurrence of a triggering event sufficient or should additional requirements be in place?
- Compliance with conditions? Assuming retirement of a ccTLD is conditional, who will monitor, and who will be held accountable, if at all, if requirements are not met?

The activities of the working group are undertaken within the framework of the ccNSO Policy Development Process, the limitations with respect to the scope of a ccPDP, specifically Article 10 and Annexes B and C of the ICANN Bylaws.

Section III: Relevant Resources

Interim Paper: <https://ccnso.icann.org/en/workinggroups/pdp3-retirement-wg-interim-paper-29apr20-en.pdf>

Section IV: Additional Information

The working group has conducted two webinars to inform the broader community. The recordings and presentation are available at: <https://community.icann.org/x/oYPsBw>.

Charter of the ccPDP3 Retirement Working Group: <https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/charter-wg-retirement-ccTlds-10apr17-en.pdf>

Issue Report ccPDP 3 on retirement of ccTLD and review mechanism: <https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/issue-report-pdp-rrm-10apr17-en.pdf>

DRDWG report on Retirement of ccTLDs: https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/filefield_22613/drd-wg-retirement-report-07mar11-en.pdf

Section V: Reports

FINAL VERSION SUBMITTED (IF RATIFIED)

The final version to be submitted, if the draft is ratified, will be placed here by upon completion of the vote.



AL-ALAC-ST-072...0-01-01-EN.pdf

FINAL DRAFT VERSION TO BE VOTED UPON BY THE ALAC

The final draft version to be voted upon by the ALAC will be placed here before the vote is to begin.



AL-ALAC-ST-072...0-01-00-EN.pdf

The ALAC welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Process to Retire ccTLDs.

From an end user perspective, two points need to be considered:

1. As a user of the Internet, the removal of a TLD will mean less likelihood for confusion as usually a ccTLD would be removed to make way for a new one. This enhances Trust in the domain name identifiers.
2. As a domain name registrant, the retirement of the ccTLD could pose a problem when correspondents are accustomed to use the "old" address using the obsolete ccTLD. Some companies have built a brand around the "old" ccTLD.

In relation to the definition and applicability of process, the retirement triggering event perfectly describes the situation. However, the ALAC notes that in the event that a retired ccTLD does not have a ccTLD Manager referred to in this policy as a Functional Manager and the IANA Naming Functions Operator (IFO) operator is required to transfer the responsibility of the ccTLD to a Functional Manager, transparency and following due process is necessary to avoid any unexpected disruption to the process. In relation to the retirement process, the policy determines that both the IFO and the Functional Manager will work together in good faith to ensure the interests of the registrants are taken into consideration. Where end users are accustomed to using the old retired domains, the interests of the end users need to be taken into account as a part of the interests of the registrants.

In relation to the review mechanism, it is unclear what review mechanisms would be used and what exactly the mechanism will review.

As a whole, the ALAC supports the ccNSO PDP3. The retirement plan is fit for purpose. It is comprehensive and takes into account special cases like .UK .AC and .EU.

DRAFT SUBMITTED FOR DISCUSSION

The first draft submitted will be placed here before the call for comments begins. The Draft should be preceded by the name of the person submitting the draft and the date/time. If, during the discussion, the draft is revised, the older version(S) should be left in place and the new version along with a header line identifying the drafter and date/time should be placed above the older version(s), separated by a Horizontal Rule (available + Insert More Content control).

From an end user perspective, two points need to be considered:

1. as a user of the Internet, the removal of a TLD will mean less likelihood for confusion as usually a ccTLD is removed to make way for a new one. This enhances trust in the domain name identifiers.
2. as a domain name registrant, the retirement of the ccTLD could pose a problem when correspondents are used to use the "old" address using the obsolete ccTLD. Some companies have built a brand around the "old" ccTLD.

In relation to the definition and applicability of process, the retirement triggering event perfectly describes the situation. However, we note that in the event that a retired ccTLD doesn't have a ccTLD Manager referred to in this policy as a Functional Manager and the IANA Naming Functions Operator (IFO) operator is required to transfer the responsibility of the ccTLD to a Functional Manager, transparency and following due process is necessary to avoid any unexpected disruption to the process. In relation to the retirement process, the policy determines that both the IFO and the Functional Manager will work together in good faith to ensure the interests of the registrants are taken into consideration. Where end users are used to using the old retired domains, the interests of the end users are required to be regarded as a part of the interests of the registrants.

In relation to the review mechanism, it is unclear what review mechanisms would be used and what exactly the mechanism will review.

Finally, the ALAC supports the ccNSO PDP3. The retirement plan looks good. It is comprehensive and takes into account special cases like .UK .AC and .EU.