ICANN – CCNSO – FOIWG

Meeting Notes (draft V1) for 12 April 2012, 13:00 UTC

1. Present / apologies

ccNSO:

Ugo Akiri, .ng

Martin Boyle, .uk

Becky Burr, NomCom (Vice Chair)

Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)

Stephen Deerhake, .as

Eberhard Lisse, .na

Paulos Nyirenda, .mw

Nigel Roberts, .gg

Bill Semich, .nu

Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO

Kim Davies IANA

Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN

Chris Disspain, .au

Patricio Poblete, .cl

Suzanne Radell, GAC

2. Agenda - Approved

3. Meeting notes for 15 March 2012 – Accepted.

4. Revocation and RFC1591

4.1. Long discussion up until point 6.2.4. Points of agreement are included in the new version of the Revocation document in version 1.1 in red line. Details can be found in the transcript.

5. Work Plan

5.1. Accepted.

6. Presentation of letter regarding "Consent Report" to GAC

6.1. BS from transcript: Yeah, in the press of time, I believe, and I think relevant staff and the chairman were busy traveling to meetings in Asia. This letter was drafted and sent without, at least without my knowledge and I suspect without being posted to the work group list. And there was a small but important sentence in the annex to the letter which set off a few whistles and bells in my alarm system. And I have proposed changing a couple of words of that in order to make it consistent with how we've been describing RFC 1591 versus the GAC principles in the context of this working group, with the principles serving as guidelines and not as policies. And I think we've been consistent with that so far and I feel uncomfortable suddenly changing that approach. And I would strongly urge that we modify the annex and merely send it as a substitute annex to the GAC with the explanation that in deference of the need to get the letter to them quickly, it hadn't been reviewed by the members of the working group. And assuming that the working group concurs with my proposed changes, or something like it, we would include that (inaudible).

6.2. Apologies from Chair for sending letter without consulting.

6.3. Chair - Yes, certainly at a minimum I would recommend that we read into our

records what the wording should have been so that any further dissection of the data later on leaves no question either what we actually really meant.

6.4. From BS email posted to the FOIWG list: The response states in Annex A: "The FOIWG fully concurs with the GAC that the terminology on the IANA function manager website should be aligned and consistent with the proposed guidelines, and more importantly with RFC 1591 and the GAC principles."

For me, at least, it is untenable to equate RFC1591, which is a community-accepted policy document WRT ccTLDs, with the GAC Principles, which is a self-described advisory of voluntary guidelines drafted by the GAC, with no other community input, and which we have never viewed as anything other than an advisory document, albeit an important one.

I would propose this alternative language:

"The FOIWG fully concurs with the GAC that the terminology on the IANA function manager website should be aligned and consistent with the proposed guidelines, and more importantly with RFC 1591, as well as reflecting the voluntary guidelines put forward in the GAC principles."

6.5. This topic will be discussed at the next meeting of the wg.

7. Meeting Schedule to Prague meeting. - Approved

7.1. May 3   UTC 21:00
7.2. May 17   UTC 5:00
7.3. May 24   UTC 13:00
7.4. June 7   UTC 21:00

8. Conclusion of the meetings

8.1. About 15:00 UTC.