## gTLD Revocation Readiness Report

This Report summarizes the status of the steps required to request the revocation of a generic top-level domain (gTLD) subject to the terms outlined in the Registry Agreement and the Registry Transition Process. This Report was produced by the ICANN Global Domains Division Operations Team and documents the relevant requirements for Revocation.

## **gTLD Revocation Readiness Summary**

<b>Top-Level Domain:</b>	.chloe
Registry Operator:	Richemont DNS Inc.
Registry Agreement:	https://www.icann.org/resources/agreement/chloe-2014-10-16-en
Type of Termination:	Voluntary Termination by Registry Operator, per section 4.4 (b) of Registry Agreement
Revocation Requested to Occur on:	6 October 2017 at the latest
<b>Revocation Readiness:</b>	Readiness Confirmed
<b>Submission Date:</b>	14 April 2017
Summary:	On 14 May 2017, Richemont DNS Inc., the Registry Operator for .chloe, notified ICANN that it wished to terminate the RA citing its own business needs. On 16 May 2017, ICANN made a preliminary determination that operation of the .chloe gTLD need not be transitioned to a successor Registry Operator.
	On 15 June 2017, after a 30-day period for comments by interested parties, ICANN made a Final Determination to terminate the .chloe Registry Agreement and revoke the TLD's delegation from the Root Zone.

## **Checklist for gTLD Revocation Readiness**

If any answers are "no," a description of the impact on readiness for revocation (if any) must be provider. The impact should include why ICANN has determined to proceed with the revocation.

Notice of Termination	
1: Did the Registry Operator provide all properly given, required notices to ICANN pursuant to the terms of the Registry Agreement and/or the Registry Transition Process?	Yes
2: Did ICANN provide the notices for public comment, community feedback or other processes required by the Registry Agreement and/or the Registry Transition Process?	Yes

	need to transition operation of the TLD	
1: Did ICANN con	sult with the Registry Operator?	Yes
2: Did ICANN pub	olish a preliminary determination?	Yes
URL for determi	nation:	
* ' '	w.icann.org/sites/default/files/tlds/chloe/chloe-legal-notice-y-determination-16may17-en.pdf	
3: Did the common preliminary de	unity have an opportunity to provide input on the etermination?	Yes
Email address fo	or community input:	
<u>ra-termina</u>	tion-comments@icann.org	
input on the pr received?	rere received, did ICANN provide a summary of community reliminary determination to the extent any input was nity input summary:	No
during whi	2017, after a 30-day period for comments by interested parties, ch no comments were received, ICANN has determined to move th the revocation considering that:	
represent	nt DNS Inc., in its function as the Registry Operator has ted to ICANN that it does not sell, distribute or transfer control or y registrations in the .chloe TLD to third parties. alifies as a .Brand TLD.	
-		

5: Was it determined that operations of the TLD does not need to be transitioned to a successor Registry Operator?  URL for determination: <a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/gtld-registry-agreement-termination-2015-10-09-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/gtld-registry-agreement-termination-2015-10-09-en</a>	Yes
6: Has ICANN assessed that revocation of the TLD's delegation in the DNS root zone will not create security, stability, and/or resiliency issues?	Yes
7: Was approval for the final determination appropriately authorized?	Yes
URL of the reference authorization:	
https://www.icann.org/sites/default/files/tlds/chloe/chloe-legal-notice-	
final-determination-22jun17-en.pdf	