ccPDP3 WG scenario testing

Scenario Testing

- Step 1: Develop Scenario's
- Step 2: Impact of the policy. How does scenario play out under the policy. What would be result of apllying the policy to the scenario?
- Step 3: Assessment of impact. Does the outcome of step 2 result in an unwanted outcome or unforesee negative side effect? If so, does the policy need to be adjusted?

Step 1: develop scenario's

Scenario: **a description of possible events, or a description of the story of a movie, play, or other performance**.

A worst-case scenario is the worst situation that can be imagined: In the worst-case scenario, the whole coast would be under waterStory of circumstances that could happen

Method:

- Zoom Break-out rooms: max 5 participants per group:
  - 2 minutes to think about scenario
  - 10 minutes to record
  - Use Jamboard: Staff to record scenario with sticky notes

- If time permits
- Combine notes: each group to present scenario's 5 minutes to present per group

Step 2 & 3 per scenario (next meetings)

- Start with scenario 1
- Individually consider scenarion and how it would play out under the policy (individually)
- Group to describe the outcome
- Assessment of the outcome

Group 1 (main room) Bernard: Scenario development

A description of possible events, or of the story to test the policy.

IFO has lost contact but registry is operating

registry has asked changes to name server - a technical demand to make a change - ccTLD manager doesnt respond or doesnt exist

several requests from different organization - and technically they are correct

routine changes to name server (valid request refused)

redelegation request

renew country code ISO (declined)

change of registry operator in middle of retirement

potential retirement, ccTLD manager asking for extension of time and being refused

if someone wants an IAR review but is only communicating in a non English language

if manager refuses agreement with IANA retirement

this is test

change of registry operator in middle of retirement, who is eligible, is transfer subject to review?

IFO has lost contact but registry is operating

if someone wants an IAR review but is only communicating in a non English language

Percevied vagueness ambuigity of terminology, differences in interpreatation by applant and IFO

Whatif lawyer or others starts re-interpreting

A Change of terminology in 3166 result in impact on eligibility of review and its impact on the review

Change of existing policies that revert to review mechanism

terminology /procedural change,

renew country code ISO (declined)

several requests from different organization - and technically they are correct

routine changes to name server (valid request refused)

redelegation request

registry has asked changes to name server - a techn...

Bach-end registry provider, ccTLD Manager, DNS service operator etc. what is issue between parties?

arties who are invovled in operation of ccTLD all covered?

If deadline , No action from IFO

also applies to the previous IFO actions. delegations, transfers. What if IFO does not respond within the deadline?

comment: that language might be for the implementation phase

if manager refuses agreement with IANA retirement, and retitment is pushed through, how would thsi play out?

potential retirement, ccTLD manager asking for extension of time and being refused

Multi parties affected by decision in similar case, only one applies for review. Is there a precedence of review result, does it apply backwards?

what if IFO does not reply within 90 days?

suggestion: add language, enforcement to respect the appropriate time

if no response: extension is automatically granted?

Group 2 (breakout room) Joke: # Scenario development

A description of possible events, or of the story to test the policy.

also applies to the previous IFO actions. delegations, transfers. What if IFO does not respond within the deadline?

comment: that language might be for the implementation phase

what if IFO does not reply within 90 days?

suggestion: add language, enforcement to respect the appropriate time

if no response: extension is automatically granted?

How do we define unreasonably withheld?

Multi parties affected only one applies for review

If deadline , No action from IFO

Percevied vagueness ambuigity of terminology, differences in interpreatation by applant and IFO

A Change of terminology in 3166 result in impact on eligibility of review and its impact on the review

Grou cenario elopi

Situation two competing application to Review and at teh same time internal IFO review

Whatif lawyer or others starts re-interpreting

terminology /procedural change,

A description of poss nts, o story to test the policy.

Change of existing policies

Multi parties affected only one applies for review

If deadline , No action from IFO

Percevied vagueness ambuigity of terminology, differences in interpreatation by applant and IFO

A Change of terminology in 3166 result in impact on eligibility of review and its impact on the review

Situation two competing application to Review and at teh same time internal IFO review

Whatif lawyer or others starts re-interpreting

terminology /procedural change,

Change of existing policies

Consolidation of Scenario’s