Notes

Telephone Conference

ccPDP-Ret WG

2018-08-30 17:00 UTC

1 Welcome and Roll Call

6 Chair: Stephen Deerhake

7 Attendance: List of participants taken from the ADOBE Connect room.

8 Apologies: Peter Koch

9 Late attendance: Patricio Poblete

10 Audio only: Nigel Roberts, Sean, Brett Carey

2 Administrative Announcements, if any

12 • Introduction to run of the session. Warning possible issues with ADOBE.

3 Action items

14 • Update Mind map completed

15 – Shared before the call

4 Second Reading Consolidated Overview Core Elements

- Give opportunity all to look at the points captured from Panama. No comments. Considered closed.
  - shared before the call 2018-07-19

5 Overview of Elements to be Included in policy

5.1 Present overview

Overview (outline format explained) Identify topics, questions etc. by all groups or subset of the groups. Next steps is to fill items shared by all groups, and discuss whether or not to include in recommended policy. Example discussion initiated on "involuntary retirement". Note the item was captured in other forms by the groups in Panama (for example: Include hard end date? What to do with non-compliant ccTLD). No questions or comments from group re overview

5.2 Start discussion on what needs to be included

Initial Email:	Allan: 29 August 2018.
Response:	Peter Koch: 29 August
Response:	Eberhard: 30 August.
Allan:	Is the ultimate consequence of the policy the removal of a ccTLD from the root without the acquiescence or approval of the ccTLD manager? In short, is the group prepared to have the delegation of a ccTLD revoked without the manager's consent? This is raised, because a policy with the ultimate final step of non-consented revocation may be quite different than one in which this outcome is not available. In Allan's view a policy that allows for non-consented retirements requires a far more elaborate process,
Patricio:	Applicability yes only ccNSO members, Guidance to the Board
Nigel:	Fixed position at this point, post October depends on what comes to table. Policy only applies to ccNSO members by virtue of membership. Subset wider issue: fundamental question. Responsibility of ccNSO and ICANN Board to resolve. Not single use policy.

46 **47** **48** **49** **50**	Eberhard:	Disagree with Allan. Not deciding whether to remove, but how. Under RFC 1591 only if on ISO 3166 eligible for delegation. Consequently if removed from ISO 3166, then should be removed from DNS at one point. WG should focus on "how" of the removal. In addition policy developed through ccNSO PDP is an ICANN policy.
51 **52** **53** **54** **55** **56** **57** **58**	Nenad:	Involuntary retirement' is not a separate issue from what we're deciding on. From the start I said that is has to be clear: who shuts down ccTLD? If we declare in policy that DNS for domain is shutdown (records deleted) by ccTLD manager, then there can't be 'involuntary deletion'. If we decide in policy that domain records are deleted by ICANN, then there is no need for consent of ccTLD manager in ANY case. So it is important do decide: WHO and HOW retires domain (and by that I think physically)
59 **60**	Allan:	Policy only to ccNSO members. If not on the ISO 3166 then ultimately not in the DNS root zone
61 **62**	Eberhard:	if not on ISO 3166 , then not in the Root zone, This group is about the "how"
63 **64**	Nigel:	Legal perspective, whatever is in the policy, it can be only forced to ccNSO membership. ICANN is going to have problems.
65 **66**	Brent Carey:	Agree with Allan's position. If we do a good job, it is bonus. Core focus should be on ccNSO members
67 **68** **69**	Eberhard:	charter where we start from? Issue: need about consensus about in-voluntary removal, unclear what it means. Assumption: is that it is removed, and then how..
70 **71** **72** **73**	Patricio:	Principle if not on the list then not in the root. However the transition takes time. How needs to be clarified. Be aware for unreasonable outcomes from policy. Strange if cc remains in the root if removal not consented
74 **75** **76**	Nenad:	Has to be clear who and how decommission. End result has always to be made unavailable to users. No question of non-voluntary retirement.
77 **78** **79**	Eberhard:	terminology, avoid and do not introduce non-defined terms. Flow is clear, predictability is paramount. If ccTLD is making mess of it, potential for significant misbehavior
80 **81** **82**	Allan:	making progress. Understands talking about. No one is suggestion should not be discussed. Important to allow use case, still a lot of domain names in use at time of decommissioning.

83	Naela:	Concerns. Applicability of policies. Only to ccNSO members? From
84		practical perspective not considered. For example when making rou-
85		tine changes not looking whether ccTLD is members or non-member
86		of the ccNSO. Impact unclear. Question problematic. Non-consented
87		retirement is real and core issue (in practical terms)
88	Eberhard:	distinction applies to ccTLD and is binding on ccNSO members, not
89		necessary on non-members. ICANN needs to have a policy that is
90		predictable. Only binding for ccNSO members
91	Background:	Relevant Article ICANN Bylaws on whether policy only applies to
92		ccNSO members. Not only relevant in context work on Retirement,
93		also for second part of the PDP on Review Mechanism.
94		Article 10.4:

95 *(j) Subject to Section 10.4(k), ICANN policies shall apply*
96 *to ccNSO members by virtue of their membership to the ex-*
97 *tent, and only to the extent, that the policies (i) only address*
98 *issues that are within scope of the ccNSO according to Sec-*
99 *tion 10.6(a) and Annex C; (ii) have been developed through*
100 *the ccPDP as described in Section 10.6, and (iii) have been*
101 *recommended as such by the ccNSO to the Board, and (iv)*
102 *are adopted by the Board as policies, provided that such*
103 *policies do not conflict with the law applicable to the ccTLD*
104 *manager which shall, at all times, remain paramount. In*
105 *addition, such policies shall apply to ICANN in its activities*
106 *concerning ccTLDs.*

107 6 Next steps

108 • Continue discussion.

109 7 AOB

110 • Share experience ADOBE room todays call, in particular issues, with secretariat.

111 8 Next Meetings

112   • Next calls:

113   – 13 September 2018 (time to be announced)

114   – 27 September 2018

115   – 11 October 2018

116   • f-2-f meeting:

117   – Saturday 20 October 2018, 15.15-18.30

118   (blocks 4 and 5)

119 9 Closure

120 Thank you. bye all.