

Scenarios for stress testing the proposed CCPDP-RM mechanism:

- Retirement
 - change of registry operator in middle of retirement, who is eligible, is transfer subject to review? **(CAN THERE BE AN IAR IF THE TRANSFER IS REJECTED?)**
 - if manager refuses agreement with IANA retirement, and retirement is pushed through, how would this play out? **(UNCLEAR IS THIS ABOUT THE IAR)**
 - potential retirement, ccTLD manager asking for extension of time and being refused
- IFO does not respond
 - also applies to the previous IFO actions **(UNCLEAR)**. delegations, transfers. What if IFO does not respond within the deadline **(IN AN IAR?)?**
 - If deadline **(WHICH ONE?)**, No action from IFO
 - what if IFO does not reply within 90 days **(TO WHAT?)?**
 - suggestion: add language, enforcement to respect the appropriate time
 - if no response: extension is automatically granted? **(Retirement extension request? Was an IAR filed on the case?)**
- Language
 - comment: that language might be for the implementation phase **(UNCLEAR)**
 - if someone wants an IAR review but is only communicating in a non English language
- Terminology issues?
 - Perceived vagueness ambiguity of terminology, differences in interpretation by applicant and IFO
 - What if lawyer or others starts re-interpreting **(UNCLEAR, in what part of WHICH process?)**
 - A Change of terminology in 3166 result in impact on eligibility of review and its impact on the review **(UNCLEAR)**
 - terminology /procedural change,**(UNCLEAR/VAGUE)**
- Name server issues
 - routine changes to name server (valid request refused)
 - registry has asked changes to name server - a technical demand to make a change - ccTLD manager doesn't respond or doesn't exist
- Other issues
 - Situation two competing applications to Review and at the same time internal IFO review
 - Change of existing policies that revert to review mechanism **(UNCLEAR)**
 - IFO has lost contact but registry is operating **(how can the registry make a request to the IFO if there is no contact?)**
 - renew country code ISO (declined) **,(UNCLEAR)**
 - redelegation request **,(UNCLEAR, REDELEGATION IS NO LONGER IN USE SINCE THE FOI)**
 - Back-end registry provider, ccTLD Manager, DNS service operator etc. what is issue between parties? **,(UNCLEAR)**

- are the parties who are involved in operation of ccTLD all covered? ,(UNCLEAR)
- several requests (IAR?) from different organization - and technically they are correct (UNCLEAR)
- Multi parties affected by decision in similar case, only one applies for review. Is there a precedence of review result, does it apply backwards?
- How do we define unreasonably withheld?