Framework for PDP

Introduction

Council tasked the secretariat to provide a more detailed and realistic overview, including the alternatives of one or two policy development processes to address the need for a review mechanism fro decisions pertaining to delegation, revocation, transfer and retirement of ccTLDs and a policy for the retirement of ccTLDs.

At the Marrakesh meeting Becky and Bart gave a presentation to the community present on these PDP(s). This included a show of cards on the structure of the PDPs. The results were:
- First focus on review mechanisms for decisions on delegation, revocation and transfer of ccTLDs. This was considered to be of highest priority, in particular in light of the IANA Stewardship transition
- Secondly focus on retirement, and to extend needed, revisit review mechanism outcome to adjust for the retirement of ccTLDs
- Do as many things in parallel as feasible.
- Preference to conduct 1 PDP (with the topics), although implications were not very clear.

Based on these results 3 scenario's were mapped out and are presented:
- One PDP two sequential WG
- One PDP two Parallel WG (effectively the same as one PDPD with one WG)
- Two PDPs run sequentially

The summary overviews are presented.

Assumptions to map the scenario's

1. Following the Marrakesh discussions, the Review Mechanism will be developed first.
2. Scope of PDP, charter of WG will be developed as part of the Issue Reporting, which is under direct auspices of Council. Proposed to set up a Council oversight committee to guide and assist the Issue Manager. Appointment of oversight committee is not included in scenario's. Experience has shown that a committee of 5-6 (one Councillor per region and 1 NonCom appointee, works well).
3. Council will launch the PDP on review Mechanism and/or review mechanism and retirement at the ccNSo Council meeting at its f-2-f meeting in Helsinki.
4. The initial decisions of Council will be:
   a. Appoint Issue Manager
   b. Appoint Oversight committee
   c. Request Issue report (implies an intial high-level description of the issues to be addressed).
   d. Set time-line for Issue report (realistically is 2 – 2,5 months)

5. Duration of actual policy development phase is 8 months, which is probably optimistic:
   a. 4 months develop initial policy
   b. 2 months public comment
   c. 2 months finalization.
6. In all modes the moment the review mechanism is available for use, is determined by the completion of implementation by ICANN staff, which under all modes is 6 months (usual duration for implementation of policy recommendations).
7. One of the concerns raised is the availability of the volunteers, in particular availability of people needed to develop the review mechanism. It is assumed that this would require a core group of people with a thorough understanding of current policy (RFC 1591) and the FOI. This group is very limited and will decrease with passage of time.

Note: The scenario, which is not included is one (1) PDP and one (1) WG. Effectively, it will work in a similar fashion as 1 PDP, with two WG working in parallel.

Basic Questions
In order to assist Council in its decision-making on structuring the process, the secretariat has prepared the following questions:

Does the review mechanism need to be available as soon as feasible or should it only be available when both the policy for retirement and review mechanism are completed?

The determining factor in both cases is the moment the ccNSO will vote (if review mechanism needs to be available as soon as feasible, then the two PDP scenario is probably warranted)

Is same kind of expertise needed to develop the review mechanism and policy for retirement of ccTLDs?

One of the concerns raised is the availability of the volunteers, in particular availability of people needed to develop the review mechanism. It is assumed that this would require a core group of people with a thorough understanding of current policy (RFC 1591) and the FOI. This group is very limited and will decrease with passage of time. It is assumed that for the development of a policy for the retirement of ccTLDs the following areas of expertise are needed: operational, policy, business, and thorough understanding of the ISO 3166 rules and procedures.

If these different sets of experise are indeed critical a sequential approach is warranted).

Pro's and Con's 3 modes

Scenario	Availability review Mechanism	Pro's	Con's
One PDP two sequential WG	Beginning Q 4 2019 (duration of implementation)	Less dependency Availability of volunteers, sequential. Management of work load	Total duration: based on assumption, closure PDP in Q 2 2019, Late decision making by Council and members (anticipated Q 4 2018) Relative availability Review Mechanism
One PDP two Parallel (or one WG) WG	Both Review Mechanism available Q 4 2018 (after closure of PDP)	Duration One call for volunteers. Duration of total process.	Availability Volunteers with right skill-set. Review mechanism, legal and policy background. Retirement operational, business and policy background. Management of process. Expectation that review mechanism will be addressed first.
Two PDPs run sequentially, partly overlapping	Review Mechanism available end Q 2 2018.	Less dependency on availability of volunteers with right skill-set and expertise sequential.	Total duration of process: Q 1 2019. Managing scope of second PDP (retirement and consolidation)