# Policy Discussion

## Panama City

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

2018-06-28

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

# 1 Core elements Retirement

## 1.1 Must be included

### 1.1.1 Group 1

- Trigger

- Notification

- End-of life plan reference
    - (how that plan will be developed, with incumbent manager and what if the incumbent manager does not want to help, or if there is no incumbent manager)
    - Board approval of plan

    - Oversight of execution

22   – Who to provide oversight?

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

25   – Checklist

26   Plan for retirement needs to contain these/predefined elements

27   – Predefined role EC

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

### 29  1.1.2  Group 2

30   • Trigger event description
31

32   • Notification procedure
33

34   • Timeframe

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

**37**   • Default actions

**38**

**39**   • If delegations are included, relation

**40**     Sometimes new delegations involved. Interaction between removal process

**41**   • Sunset

**42**     How strictly does this need to be defined in the policy? Only empty zonefiles to
**43**     be deleted? New registrations to be blocked?

**44**   • Deletion from zone


**45** **1.1.3  Group 3**

**46**   • definitions, including triggering event

**47**

**48**   • Scope of policy

**49**

**50**   • Procedures

**51**     – Procedures of the actual retirement of a ccTLD

52 • Review Mechanism

53

54 • Governance roles

55 How to ensure the policy is adhered to? How to ensure transparency and account-
56 ability?

57 • review of policy

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

59 • Plan

60     – For the incumbent manager to come up with a plan. What is the actual
61       structure? The policy might contain as an appendix, the elements a good
62       plan should contain. The plan does not need formal approval to come into
63       effect. It is up to the ccTLD manager to come up with a plan. (this is different
64       to Group 1&2)

65       Must be included in the plan: a hard-coded long-stop-date on when the
66       retirement would become effective.

67 • Checklist

68 regarding the end of life plan.

## 69 1.2  Not to be included

### 70 1.2.1  Group 1

71 • Reasons for code change

72

73 • Past cases

### 74 1.2.2  Group 2

75 • Making policy on the fly

76

77 • Interfere with registry policy

78

79 • Risk: process may be stalled

### 80 1.2.3  Group 3

81 • No pressure on ISO MA and their internal processes and procedures.

**82 1.3  Maybe included**

**83 1.3.1  Group 1**

**84 1.3.2  Group 2**

85  • Project Plan
86

87  • Process between new and old operator

**88 1.3.3  Group 3**

**89 1.4  Questions & Discussions**

**90 1.4.1  Group 1**

91 What is the Board involvement?
92 Kim: Board has not approved delegations/transfers since 2012 (no substantive deci-
93 sions)
94 - What about the PTI Board? However, 3 members are ICANN staff. What should they

95 handle? What should they not deal with?

96 What kind of decision is being talked about? Due diligence checks? Or rather substantive
97 decisions?

98 • What is Board involvement?

99 Kim: Board has not approved delegations/transfers since 2012 (no substantive
100 decisions)

101 • What about the PTI Board?

102 However, 3 members are ICANN staff. What should they handle? What should
103 they not deal with?

104 • What is decision?

105 Due diligence checks? Or rather substantive decisions?

106 • What if non-cooperative manager?

107 what if the incumbent manager does not want to help, or if there is no incumbent
108 manager)

## 109 1.4.2 Group 2

110 How to ensure adherence to the plan? This will be a thorny issue
111 - Identify what the sunset process is
112 - Reach of this policy. Does this only apply to ccNSO Members?
113 - Policy change in 2012, but reports are still being published.  The board's role was
114 limited in 2012.  Was this reconfirmed in the current set of contracts?  (footnote to
115 include assumption this group is working on)
116 Contractual arrangements that we should be aware of? We should not go down a track
117 that is not allowed.

118 • How to ensure adherence to the plan?
119

120 • Identify sunset process
121

122 • Scope of policy.

123 Does this only apply to ccNSO Members?

124 • Policy change in 2012 re role of Board

125     Policy change in 2012, but reports are still being published. The board's role was
126     limited in 2012. Was this reconfirmed in the current set of contracts? (footnote
127     to include assumption this group is working on)

128     • Contractual arrangements

129     Contractual arrangements that we should be aware of? We should not go down a
130     track that is not allowed.


### 131 1.4.3 Group 3

132 Did you consider the case where the manager is non-existent, or not cooperating? No.
133 - Would scope of the policy apply retroactively? No
134 - Long-stop-date. Has to be dependent on the potentiality of ISO to reassign the code.
135 Currently 50 years. 50 years is an exception to the exception. Do not build on the 50
136 years.
137 - Agreement that there should be no stalling of the process
138 - What if the ccTLD is retired without any continuing business? The ccTLD Manager
139 might drop of. That is why the group called it an end-of-life plan.
140 - Role/responsibility of IANA, and how it relates to providing informal guidance.
141 - Does this apply to non-ccNSO members? Should be considered by IANA/PTI. Engage-
142 ment with non ccNSO-members? Wait for feedback from PTI.

**143** - ICANN board approval vs ICANN audited decision making: sounds very different, but
**144** ultimately it is the same.
**145** - IANA team treats all ccTLDs equally, whether they are a ccNSO member or not
**146** - ICANN policies - developed by

**147** • Non-existent or non cooperative manager

**148**

**149** • Does policy apply retroactively?

**150**

**151** • Include long-stop date?

**152** Long-stop-date. Has to be dependent on the potentiality of ISO to reassign the
**153** code. Currently 50 years. 50 years is an exception to the exception. Do not build
**154** on the 50 years.

**155** • Stalling: how to deal with it?

**156**

**157** • What if no continued business for incumbent?

**158** The ccTLD Manager might drop of. That is why the group called it an end-of-life
**159** plan.

**160**   • Role and Resp. IFO

**161**   how does it relate to providing informal guidance.

**162**   • Does policy apply to non-ccNSO?

**163**   Should be considered by IANA/PTI. Engagement with non ccNSO-members? Wait
**164**   for feedback from PTI.

**165**   IANA team treats all ccTLDs equally, whether they are a ccNSO member or not

**166**   • Board decision

**167**   ICANN board approval vs ICANN audited decision making: sounds very different,
**168**   but ultimately it is the same.