Core Elements

Panama City

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

2018-06-28

*This document includes an **automatically** translated outline from* `panama.f2f.core.2018-06-28.nm5.`

7 1 Retirement Policy

8 1.1 Group 1

9 1.1.1 Not to be included

10 • Reasons for code change
11

12 • Past cases

13 1.1.2 Must be included

14 • Trigger
15

16 • Notification
17

18 • End-of life plan reference

19   – (how that plan will be developed, with incumbent manager and what if the
20   incumbent manager does not want to help, or if there is no incumbent man-
21   ager)

22   – Board approval of plan

23

24   – Oversight of execution

25

26   – Who to provide oversight?

27   PTI ? Community? No answer to that. Controversial ideas in this group.
28   Historically, ccNSO has not do that

29   – Checklist

30   Plan for retirement needs to contain these/predefined elements

31   – Predefined role EC

32   Language re the empowered community on how the plan is to be executed

33 1.1.3 Maybe

34 1.1.4 Q & discussion

35 • What is the Board involvement?
36   Kim: Board has not approved delegations/transfers since 2012 (no substantive
37   decisions)
38

39 • What about the PTI Board? However, 3 members are ICANN staff. What should
40   they handle? What should they not deal with?
41   What kind of decision is being talked about? Due diligence checks? Or rather
42   substantive decisions?

43 1.2 Group 2

44 1.2.1 Not to be Included

45 • Making policy on the fly
46

47 • Interfere with registry policy

48

49 • Risk: process may be stalled

50 1.2.2 Must be included

51 • Trigger event description

52

53 • Notification procedure

54

55 • Timeframe

56   – Determination of a timeframe. This should be a process, rather than having
57   a fixed value.

58 • Default actions

59

60 • If delegations are included, relation

61 Sometimes new delegations involved. Interaction between removal process

62   • Sunset

63   How strictly does this need to be defined in the policy? Only empty zonefiles to
64   be deleted? New registrations to be blocked?

65   • Deletion from zone

66 1.2.3 Maybe

67   • Project Plan

68

69   • Process between new and old operator

70 1.2.4 Q & discussion topics

71   • How to ensure adherence to the plan? This will be a thorny issue

72

73   • Identify what the sunset process is

74

75 • Reach of this policy. Does this only apply to ccNSO Members?

76

77 • Policy change in 2012, but reports are still being published. The board's role was
78 limited in 2012. Was this reconfirmed in the current set of contracts? (footnote
79 to include assumption this group is working on)
80 Contractual arrangements that we should be aware of? We should not go down a
81 track that is not allowed.

82 1.3 Group 3

83 1.3.1 Q&Discussion

84 Did you consider the case where the manager is non-existent, or not cooperating? No.
85 - Would scope of the policy apply retroactively? No
86 - Long-stop-date. Has to be dependent on the potentiality of ISO to reassign the code.
87 Currently 50 years. 50 years is an exception to the exception. Do not build on the 50
88 years.
89 - Agreement that there should be no stalling of the process
90 - To be added to the list of "MUST NOT be included": no pressure should be put on ISO
91 MA and on their internal processes and procedures.
92 - Check-list to be included in the policy regarding the end of life plan.

93 - What if the ccTLD is retired without any continuing business? The ccTLD Manager
94 might drop of. That is why the group called it an end-of-life plan.
95 - Role/responsibility of IANA, and how it relates to providing informal guidance.
96 - Does this apply to non-ccNSO members? Should be considered by IANA/PTI. Engage-
97 ment with non ccNSO-members? Wait for feedback from PTI.
98 - ICANN board approval vs ICANN audited decision making: sounds very different, but
99 ultimately it is the same.
100 - IANA team treats all ccTLDs equally, whether they are a ccNSO member or not
101 - ICANN policies - developed by the ccNSO - only apply to ccNSO members and for the
102 duration of their membership
103 Substantial misconduct. Revocation of a delegation as defined by FOI: would this apply
104 in the case of a retirement?

105 **1.3.2 Must be included**

106 • Scope of policy
107

108 • definitions, including triggering event
109

110 • Procedures

111   – Procedures of the actual retirement of a ccTLD

112   • Review Mechanism

113

114   • Governance roles

115   How to ensure the policy is adhered to? How to ensure transparency and account-
116   ability?

117   • review of policy

118   – Policy might need to be reviewed after X amount of time

119   • Objective criteria

120   – ∗ Objective criteria. Plain language

121   • Plan

122   – For the incumbent manager to come up with a plan. What is the actual
123   structure? The policy might contain as an appendix, the elements a good
124   plan should contain. The plan does not need formal approval to come into
125   effect. It is up to the ccTLD manager to come up with a plan. (this is different
126   to Group 1&2)
127   Must be included in the plan: a hard-coded long-stop-date on when the
128   retirement would become effective.

129   1.3.3 Not to be included

130   1.3.4 Maybe