

ICANN – CCNSO - FOIWG

Report (draft V1) for 7 July 2011 – 14:00 UTC

1. Present / apologies

Attendees:

Ugo Akiri, .ng

Jaap Akkerhuis, ISO

Jeremy Beale, GAC

Martin Boyle, .uk

Becky Burr, NomCom

Mark Carvell, GAC

Olga Cavalli, GNSO liaison

Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)

William Dee, GAC

Steven Deerhake, .as

Chris Disspain, .au

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, At-Large liaison

Eberhard Lisse, .na

Victor Martinez, GAC

Paulos Nyirenda, .mw

Ruth Puente, GAC

Patricio Poblete, .cl

Kathryn Reynolds, .ca

Nigel Roberts, .gg

Bill Semich, .nu

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Kristina Nordström

Bernard Turcotte

Apologies:

Dejan Djukic, .rs

2. Meeting report for 23 June 2011
  - 2.1. KDavidson – Olga Cavalli should be noted as the liaison for the GNSO and the ? should be removed.
  - 2.2. NR Section 4.3.2 ‘prospective manager’ can be removed.
  - 2.3. BS - .AQ should be added to the examples alongside .UM.
  - 2.4. KDavidson – V2 of the meeting report will be circulated for approval at the next meeting.
3. Terminology Paper

- 3.1. MB – given consent is used interchangeably with agree it should be included in the definition – generally accepted.
- 3.2. BS – The term Revocation is not included in the list and pre-judges the meaning of Re-delegation – as such it should be added – generally accepted.
- 3.3. NR the title of section 4.2 is technically incorrect given some of these terms do not have the same meaning:
  - 3.3.1. “Other terms used in the reference documentation to convey the same meaning”
  - 3.3.2. Proposed “Other terms used by IANA in the reference documentation”
- 3.4. BS – Proposed definition seems to confer power to approve to Manager, AC and TC and can lead to confusion – generally accepted.
- 3.5. BS – Proposed definition does not include Delegation. RFC1591 refers to approval for delegations and this should be included – generally agreed.
- 3.6. BS – Using .UM as an examples of ccTLDs that have no permanent residents is not very useful given it is currently not delegated. .UH is delegated and would be a better example- Generally agreed.
- 3.7. NR – Definition of AC and TC is problematic for several reasons:
  - 3.7.1. RFC1591 nor the GAC Principles 2005 define what are an AC or TC.
  - 3.7.2. There is no formal definition of who should name the AC or TC.
  - 3.7.3. The proposed definition includes responsibilities (approving changes) which are not defined anywhere and it seems inappropriate to include any such definitions at this point in the work of the FOIWG given this will be addressed under a future topic.
4. Report on the ad-hoc working group on property

- 4.1. Presentation by NR.
  - 4.2. BB will provide a formal document summarizing the results.
5. Any other business
- 5.1. No participants had any other business
6. Future Meetings (all meetings are 2 hours unless previously specified otherwise)
- 6.1. 14 July at 21:00UTC (continue Terminology, begin Consent)
  - 6.2. 21 July at 05:00UTC (continue Consent)
  - 6.3. 4 Aug at 13:00UTC (Terminology for consultation, finalise Consent)
  - 6.4. 11 Aug at 21:00UTC (Spare meeting in case we need it)
  - 6.5. 1 Sep at 21:00UTC (Initial review of consultation on Terminology, start Valid Admin Contact)
  - 6.6. 8 Sep at 05:00UTC (Final review of consultation on Terminology, continue Valid Admin Contact)
  - 6.7. 22 Sep at 13:00UTC (Finalise Valid Admin Contact)
  - 6.8. 6 Oct at 21:00UTC (Finalise everything for Senegal)
  - 6.9. 12 Oct at 05:00UTC (Spare just in case)
7. Conclusion of the meetings

7.1. The meeting was concluded at about 16:00 UTC.