

Core Elements

Panama City

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

~~2018-06-28~~ 2018-08-28

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

7 1 Core elements Retirement

8 1.1 Must be included

9 1.1.1 ~~Group 1~~ Agreed elements

- 10 • Trigger event description
- 11
- 12 • Notification/ procedure
- 13
- 14 • End-of life plan reference
- 15 – (how that plan will be developed, with incumbent manager and what if the
- 16 incumbent manager does not want to help, or if there is no incumbent man-
- 17 ager)
- 18 – Checklist
- 19 Plan for retirement needs to contain these/predefined elements

20 – Sunset
21 How strictly does this need to be defined in the policy? Only empty zonefiles
22 to be deleted? New registrations to be blocked?

23 – Procedures

24 * Procedures of the actual retirement of a ccTLD

25 **1.1.2 Group 1**

26 • End of life reference

27 – (how that plan will be developed, with incumbent manager and what if the
28 incumbent manager does not want to help, or if there is no incumbent manager)

29
30 – Board approval of plan

31

32 – Oversight of execution

33

- 34 – Who to provide oversight?
- 35 PTI ? Community? No answer to that. Controversial ideas in this group.
- 36 Historically, ccNSO has not do that
- 37 – ~~Checklist~~
- 38 ~~Plan for retirement needs to contain these/predefined elements~~
- 39 – Predefined role EC
- 40 Language re the empowered community on how the plan is to be executed

41 1.1.3 Group 2

- 42 • ~~Trigger event description~~
- 43 • ~~Notification procedure~~
- 44 • Timeframe
- 45 – Determination of a timeframe. This should be a process, rather than having
- 46 a fixed value.
- 47 • Default actions
- 48

- 49 • If delegations are included, ~~relation~~relations
- 50 Sometimes new delegations involved. Interaction between removal process
- 51 • ~~Sunset~~
- 52 ~~How strictly does this need to be defined in the policy? Only empty zonefiles to~~
- 53 ~~be deleted? New registrations to be blocked?~~
- 54 • Deletion from zone

55 1.1.4 Group 3

- 56 • ~~definitions, including triggering event~~
- 57 • ~~Scope of policy~~
- 58 • ~~Procedures~~
- 59 – ~~Procedures of the actual retirement of a ccTLD~~
- 60 • Review Mechanism
- 61

- 62 • Governance roles
- 63 How to ensure the policy is adhered to? How to ensure transparency and account-
64 ability?
- 65 • review of policy
- 66 – Policy might need to be reviewed after X amount of time
- 67 • Plan
- 68 – For the incumbent manager to come up with a plan. What is the actual
69 structure? The policy might contain as an appendix, the elements a good
70 plan should contain. The plan does not need formal approval to come into
71 effect. It is up to the ccTLD manager to come up with a plan. (this is different
72 to Group 1&2)
- 73 Must be included in the plan: a hard-coded long-stop-date on when the
74 retirement would become effective.
- 75 • Checklist
- 76 regarding the end of life plan.

77 1.2 Not to be included

78 1.2.1 Group 1

- 79 • Reasons for code change

80

- 81 • Past cases

82 1.2.2 Group 2

- 83 • Making policy on the fly

84

- 85 • Interfere with registry policy

86

- 87 • Risk: process may be stalled

88 1.2.3 Group 3

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

90 1.3 Maybe included

91 1.3.1 Group 1

92 1.3.2 Group 2

- 93** • Project Plan

94

- 95** • Process between new and old operator

96 1.3.3 Group 3

97 1.4 Questions & Discussions

98 1.4.1 Group 1

99 What is the Board involvement?

100 Kim: Board has not approved delegations/transfers since 2012 (no substantive deci-
101 sions)

102 - What about the PTI Board? However, 3 members are ICANN staff. What should they

103 handle? What should they not deal with?

104 What kind of decision is being talked about? Due diligence checks? Or rather substantive

105 decisions?

106 • What ~~is Board involvement?~~

107 ~~Kim: Board has not approved delegations/transfers since 2012 (no substantive~~
108 ~~decisions)~~

109 • ~~What~~ about the PTI Board?

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

112 • What is decision?

113 Due diligence checks? Or rather substantive decisions?

114 • ~~What if non-cooperative manager?~~

115 ~~what if the incumbent manager does not want to help, or if there is no incumbent~~
116 ~~manager)~~

117 1.4.2 Group 2

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

119 - Identify what the sunset process is

120 - Reach of this policy. Does this only apply to ccNSO Members?

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

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

126 • ~~How to ensure adherence to the plan?~~

127 • ~~Identify sunset process~~

128 • ~~Scope of policy.~~

129 ~~Does this only apply to ccNSO Members?~~

130 • Policy change in 2012 re role of Board

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

134 • Contractual arrangements

135 Contractual arrangements that we should be aware of? We should not go down a

136 track that is not allowed.

137 1.4.3 Group 3

138 Did you consider the case where the manager is non-existent, or not cooperating? No.

139 - Would scope of the policy apply retroactively? No

140 - Long-stop-date. Has to be dependent on the potentiality of ISO to reassign the code.

141 Currently 50 years. 50 years is an exception to the exception. Do not build on the 50

142 years.

143 - Agreement that there should be no stalling of the process

144 - What if the ccTLD is retired without any continuing business? The ccTLD Manager

145 might drop of. That is why the group called it an end-of-life plan.

146 - Role/responsibility of IANA, and how it relates to providing informal guidance.

147 - Does this apply to non-ccNSO members? Should be considered by IANA/PTI. Engage-

148 ment with non ccNSO-members? Wait for feedback from PTI.

149 - ICANN board approval vs ICANN audited decision making: sounds very different, but

150 ultimately it is the same.

151 - IANA team treats all ccTLDs equally, whether they are a ccNSO member or not

152 - ICANN policies - developed by

- 153 • ~~Non-existent or non-cooperative manager~~
- 154 • Does policy apply retroactively?
- 155
- 156 • Include long-stop date?
- 157 Long-stop-date. Has to be dependent on the potentiality of ISO to reassign the
- 158 code. Currently 50 years. 50 years is an exception to the exception. Do not build
- 159 on the 50 years.
- 160 • ~~Stalling: how to deal with it?~~
- 161 • ~~What if no continued business for incumbent?~~
- 162 ~~The ccTLD Manager might drop of. That is why the group called it an end-of-life~~
- 163 ~~plan.~~
- 164 • Role and Resp. IFO
- 165 how does it relate to providing informal guidance.
- 166 **1.4.4 Agreed questions and discussions all**
- 167 • Does policy apply to non-ccNSO?

168 Should be considered by IANA/PTI. Engagement with non ccNSO-members? Wait
169 for feedback from PTI.

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

171 [Does this only apply to ccNSO Members?](#)

172 [What is scope of policy](#)

173 • [What is Board involvement?](#)

174 [Kim: Board has not approved delegations/transfers since 2012 \(no substantive](#)
175 [decisions\)](#)

176 • [What if non-cooperative manager?](#)

177 [what if the incumbent manager does not want to help, or if there is no incumbent](#)
178 [manager\)](#)

179 – [Stalling: how to deal with it?](#)

180

181 – [How to ensure adherence to the plan?](#)

182

183 – [Non-existent or non cooperative manager](#)

184

- 185 – What if no continued business for incumbent?
- 186 The ccTLD Manager might drop of. That is why the group called it an end-of-life
- 187 plan.
- 188 • Board decision
- 189 ICANN board approval vs ICANN audited decision making: sounds very different,
- 190 but ultimately it is the same.