

Staff Report of Public Comment Proceeding

Initial Report on the Third ccNSO Policy Development Process (ccPDP3): Retirement of ccTLDs

Publication Date: 22 April 2021

Prepared By: Bart Boswinkel

Public Comment Proceeding

Open Date: 3 March 2021

Close Date: 14 April 2021

Staff Report Due Date: 21 April 2021

Important Information Links

[Announcement](#)

[Public Comment Proceeding](#)

[View Comments Submitted](#)

Staff Contact: Bart Boswinkel

Email: Bart.Boswinkel@icann.org

Section I: General Overview and Next Steps

The purpose of the public comment was to seek community response and input on the following two (2) questions:

1. To expedite the ccNSO decision-making on the proposed recommended policy for the Retirement of country code Top-Level Domains (ccTLDs), it is proposed to separate Part 1 (on the Retirement of ccTLDs) from Part 2 (on Review Mechanism). Are there any concerns separating the two policy development efforts: Retirement of ccTLDs (Part 1) and Review Mechanism (Part 2)?
2. Related, are there any major concerns with respect to the proposed recommendation for the retirement policy, which have not been raised before or are inadequately addressed in the final paper?

As there are no major concerns, neither regarding the separation of Part 1 and Part 2 nor regarding the recommended Retirement Policy itself, the Policy recommendations contained in the Interim Report will be taken to the ccNSO Council and ccNSO Membership for their consideration, which will conclude the policy development process on the Retirement of ccTLDs.

Section II: Contributors

At the time this report was prepared, a total of two (2) community submissions had been posted to the forum. The contributors, both individuals and organizations/groups, are listed below in chronological order by posting date with initials noted. To the extent that quotations are used in the foregoing narrative (Section III), such citations will reference the contributor's initials.

Organizations and Groups:

Name	Submitted by	Initials
gTLD Registries Stakeholder Group	Elizabeth Bacon	RySG
Business Constituency	Steve DelBianco	BC

Individuals:

Name	Affiliation (if provided)	Initials
NA		

Section III: Summary of Comments

General Disclaimer: *This section intends to summarize broadly and comprehensively the comments submitted to this public comment proceeding but does not address every specific position stated by each contributor. The preparer recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments, or the full context of others, refer directly to the specific contributions at the link referenced above (View Comments Submitted).*

Both commentors (RysG and BC) support the separation of the two parts of ccPDP3: Part 1 (on the Retirement of ccTLDs) from Part 2 (on Review Mechanism).

The RySG expressed no major concerns with respect to the proposed policy recommendations.

With respect to the proposed policy recommendations, BC reiterated its desire for a process that is not in conflict with the ICANN contractual agreement applicable to Registries.

The BC repeated their comment on previous interim paper of the ccPDP3 Retirement Working Group (WG) that:

- Relevant data from the retiring ccTLD should be preserved by ICANN/ccNSO
- Mandate a periodic review of ISO 3166-1 standard.

Section IV: Analysis of Comments

General Disclaimer: *This section intends to provide an analysis and evaluation of the comments submitted along with explanations regarding the basis for any recommendations provided within the analysis.*

Based on the comments received, the ccNSO Council will be advised to separate ccPDP3 Part 1 (Retirement) and Part 2 (Review Mechanism) and proceed with decision making with respect to Part 1. There are no terms to advise the WG to review the policy.

With respect to the comments of BC on the policy recommendations the following is noted:

1. With respect to the desire of the BC that the policy should not be in conflict with ICANN contractual agreement applicable to Registries, it is not clear what is meant. ICANN and (IDN)ccTLD Managers have not entered into such a contractual agreement.
2. The two specific comments that were raised before by the BC (data preservation and mandate a period review of the ISO3166 standard) were addressed by the ccPDP3 Retirement WG (see Initial Report, Annex C section 5 and section 7). At the time, the WG, after careful consideration, concluded that the proposed policy did not need to be amended.