

Core Elements

Panama City

ccPDP-Retirement Working Group

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 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 man-
- 29 ager)
- 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 – Predefined role EC
- 38 Language re the empowered community on how the plan is to be executed

39 1.1.3 Group 2

- 40 • Timeframe
 - 41 – Determination of a timeframe. This should be a process, rather than having
 - 42 a fixed value.
- 43 • Default actions
- 44
- 45 • If delegations are included, relations
- 46 Sometimes new delegations involved. Interaction between removal process
- 47 • Deletion from zone

48 1.1.4 Group 3

49 • Review Mechanism

50

51 • Governance roles

52 How to ensure the policy is adhered to? How to ensure transparency and account-
53 ability?

54 • review of policy

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

56 • Plan

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

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

- 64 • Checklist
- 65 regarding the end of life plan.

66 **1.2 Not to be included**

67 **1.2.1 Group 1**

- 68 • Reasons for code change
- 69
- 70 • Past cases

71 **1.2.2 Group 2**

- 72 • Making policy on the fly
- 73
- 74 • Interfere with registry policy
- 75
- 76 • Risk: process may be stalled

77 1.2.3 Group 3

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

79 1.3 Maybe included

80 1.3.1 Group 1

81 1.3.2 Group 2

- 82 • Project Plan

83

- 84 • Process between new and old operator

85 1.3.3 Group 3

86 1.4 Questions & Discussions

87 1.4.1 Group 1

88 What is the Board involvement?

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

91 - What about the PTI Board? However, 3 members are ICANN staff. What should they
92 handle? What should they not deal with?

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

95 • What about the PTI Board?

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

98 • What is decision?

99 Due diligence checks? Or rather substantive decisions?

100 1.4.2 Group 2

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

102 - Identify what the sunset process is

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

104 - Policy change in 2012, but reports are still being published. The board's role was

105 limited in 2012. Was this reconfirmed in the current set of contracts? (footnote to
106 include assumption this group is working on)

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

109 • Policy change in 2012 re role of Board

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

113 • Contractual arrangements

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

116 1.4.3 Group 3

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

118 - Would scope of the policy apply retroactively? No

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

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

121 years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

129 ultimately it is the same.

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

131 - ICANN policies - developed by

132 • Does policy apply retroactively?

133

134 • Include long-stop date?

135 Long-stop-date. Has to be dependent on the potentiality of ISO to reassign the
136 code. Currently 50 years. 50 years is an exception to the exception. Do not build
137 on the 50 years.

138 • Role and Resp. IFO

139 how does it relate to providing informal guidance.

140 **1.4.4 Agreed questions and discussions all**

141 • Does policy apply to non-ccNSO?

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

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

145 Does this only apply to ccNSO Members?

146 What is scope of policy

147 • What is Board involvement?

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

- 150 • What if non-cooperative manager?
151 what if the incumbent manager does not want to help, or if there is no incumbent
152 manager)
- 153 – Stalling: how to deal with it?
154
 - 155 – How to ensure adherence to the plan?
156
 - 157 – Non-existent or non cooperative manager
158
 - 159 – What if no continued business for incumbent?
160 The ccTLD Manager might drop of. That is why the group called it an end-of-
161 life plan.
- 162 • Board decision
163 ICANN board approval vs ICANN audited decision making: sounds very different,
164 but ultimately it is the same.