ccPDP 3
Working Group
Review Mechanism

Introduction Webinar
January 2020
Issue Report PDP

• Issues to be addressed through ccPDP3
• Working method (Task Force or other)
  • Working Groups
• General Counsel opinion
  • In scope of ccNSO PDP (Annex C)
  • Lasting value
• Required request advice or opinion GAC
  • Just received
• Overall schedule of deliverables and timeline
• Charters WG retirement and review mechanism
• Current Status
  • Provide input to work of this WG
Charter Review Mechanism WG

• Charter included in Issue Report (March 2017)
  • Drafted by community
• Section Scope and high-level description of issues to be addressed
• Deliverables
• Membership
• Working method
• Tentative Timeline
Topics and Issues to be addressed by ccPDP 3

**Scope of the review mechanism**
- Which decisions and/or actions could be subject to a review mechanism?
- Who’s decisions and/or actions could be subject to a review mechanism?
- What will be result / scope of the review decision? What powers will be bestowed upon review panel?

**Standing at review mechanism**
- Who may invoke the Review Mechanism?
- Should a Review Mechanism be open and applicable to all ccTLDs?

**What are the grounds?**
- Should the review be limited to questions on due process with respect to delegation, transfer, revocation or retirement of a ccTLD or should it be broader?

**Rules and structure of review mechanism**
- What are the rules and procedures to be used?
- What is structure of panel and what are requirements and selection mechanism for panellist?
Contextual material

- **RFC 1591.** RFC 1591, section 3.4, the Internet DNS Names Review Board (IDNB). This IDNB was never established by IANA, or any other entity.

- **Framework of Interpretation.** With respect to the IDNB: The FOI WG believes it is consistent with RFC 1591 (section 3.4) to recognize the manager has the right to appeal a notice of revocation by the IANA Operator to an independent body.

- **CWG-Stewardship and CCWG-Accountability.** The CWG-Stewardship and CCWG—Accountability excluded issues relating to ccTLD delegation and re-delegation from review mechanisms. Under the understanding that mechanism(s) is to be developed by the ccTLD community post-transition.

- **ICANN Bylaws 1 October 2016.** According to latest version of the ICANN Bylaws (Section 4.2) Reconsideration:
  (d) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.2, the scope of reconsideration shall exclude the following:
  - (i) Disputes relating to country code top-level domain ("ccTLD") delegations and re-delegations;

- **ccTLD-ICANN Accountability Frameworks and Exchange of Letters.** Some AFs and EoIs include reference to ICC Arbitrage to settle issues
Deliverables

• WG deliverables
  • Interim Paper (including at least one public comment)
  • Final Paper
  • Progress reports to community during process
  • Regular Updates to ccNSO Council

• Public comment on Interim paper (at least 40 days)
  • If required additional round of public comment

• Final Paper to be included in Interim Report Issue Manager
  • Will also include Final Paper on Retirement
  • Public comment (at least 40 days)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date (tentatively)</th>
<th>Closure</th>
<th>Minimum Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create RM Working Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed by February 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Interim Paper</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>October 2020</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Comment on Interim Paper</td>
<td>November 2020</td>
<td>December 2020</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Paper</td>
<td>January 2021</td>
<td>March 2021</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closure of the WG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Membership

• Members
  • Related to ccTLD managers
  • ccNSO Council appointed

• Participants
  • Appointed/ participate through other SO/AC’s

• Observers

• Experts
  • PTI/IANA
  • ISO 3166
  • ICANN staff
WG Working Method

• Call every two weeks
  • 1 hour – 1.5 hour
  • Rotational basis

• Issue Manager/staff provide strawman documents

• Provide comments on-line
  • (one week after call)

• Redline versions to be circulated 2 business days for the next meeting

• Adopt only after two readings

• Consensus decision making (“die in the ditch” criterion)
  • By full group
  • Only if vote needed: members only

• Engage broader community at f-2-f meetings
Tools

• PDP RM Website
  • List of membership
  • Background material
  • Static information

• PDP RM Wiki space
  • To be used to keep WG and broader community abreast what is going on
  • Repository working documents
  • Repository of conference calls output

• Conference calls & F-2-F meetings
  • Zoom room
  • Transcripts (if requested/needed)
  • High level notes, action items and decisions
What to expect upcoming weeks?

• Call for volunteers
  • Members to be appointed by ccNSO Council
  • Observers and experts

• Kick-off discussion
  • Review of issues identified in Issue Report and Charter
  • Agree on working method and decision making
  • Work plan & High-Level Schedule

• WG to nominate chair & vice chair
  • To be appointed by the ccNSO Council