

**Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG)**

**Final Report**

**Framework of Interpretation of current policies and guidelines pertaining  
to the delegation and redelegation of country-code Top Level Domain  
Names**

**October, 2014**

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>page 3</b>
<b>1 - Introduction</b>	<b>page 5</b>
<b>2 - FOIWG interpretation of RFC1591</b>	<b>page 7</b>
<b>3 - Recommendations regarding Implementation</b>	<b>page 12</b>
<b>4 - Background and Process</b>	<b>page 13</b>
<b>5 – Members of the FOI working Group</b>	<b>page 15</b>
<b>Annexes</b>	<b>page 16</b>

## Executive Summary

The Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG) presents its recommendations on the topics of Consent, Significantly Interested Parties and Revocation (unconsented redelegation) in this final report.

The FOIWG's goal was to provide IANA staff and the ICANN Board clear guidance in interpreting RFC1591, in order to clarify existing policies and to facilitate consistent and predictable application of these policies applicable to delegations and redelegations of ccTLDs.

The FOIWG has been working diligently for the past three years to complete its mandate, with members representing the ccNSO, GAC, ALAC and others. In this time the FOIWG has produced draft position papers, held public consultations, regularly presented status reports to both the ccNSO and GAC, and finalized individual reports on all the afore mentioned subjects.

In considering the following recommendations it is important to note the following points:

- The FOIWG's Charter prohibited the introduction of new policies or changes to existing policies. To the extent new or changed policies may be appropriate or desirable, such policies can only be developed through a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).
- The IANA functions contract between the US Government and ICANN, including any contract implementation issues or procedures relating to it, were outside the scope of the FOIWG.
- Recognising that ultimate authority on public policy for any country is its government and legislature, nothing in the FOIWG's report is intended to, or should be taken to, constrain or limit applicable law in respect of matters relating to country-code top-level domain names in the country or territory represented by the particular two-letter code or IDN string, or in the state of incorporation/place of business of the IANA operator.
- Nothing in the Framework of Interpretation limits or constrains the applicability of the 2005 GAC "Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

As such the following recommendations are presented to the ccNSO council for approval:

Regarding Consent, Significantly Interested Parties (SIP) and Unconsented Redelegations (Revocation):

*The IANA Operator should adopt and implement the interpretations of RFC1591 provided by the Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG) as presented in this document.*

Regarding IANA adoption and implementation of the FOIWG interpretations:

- *The ccNSO Council should consider chartering a working group to collaborate with IANA*

*to develop content and other tools to educate and inform stakeholders about IANA's processes and procedures consistent with the FOIWG interpretations.*

- *The IANA Operator should continue to publish a public a report on each ccTLD Delegation, Transfer and Revocation it completes. These reports should be published in a timely fashion, clearly identify the parties involved, describe its decision-making process and the facts relevant to its decision, including information that addresses all relevant aspects of the Framework of Interpretation recommendations.*

## 1- Introduction

In March 2011 the charter of the Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG) was adopted by the ccNSO Council. According to its charter the FOIWG is to develop and propose a "Framework of Interpretation" for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. This framework should provide a clear guide to the IANA Operator and the ICANN Board on interpretations of existing policies and guidelines, which are defined in the charter of the FOIWG as the following documents:

- RFC1591
- GAC Principles 2005

The scope of the FOIWG also clearly specifies that:

- Any proposal to amend, update or change the Policy Statements is outside the scope of the FOIWG.
- The IANA functions contract between the US Government and ICANN, including any contract implementation issues or procedures relating to it, are outside the scope of the FOIWG.

The FOIWG identified the following topics which will be considered individually and in the order presented:

- Obtaining and documenting consent for delegation and re-delegation requests.
- Obtaining and documenting support for delegation and re-delegation requests from Significantly Interested Parties (sometimes referred to as Local Internet Community or LIC).
- Developing recommendations for un-consented re-delegations.
- Developing a comprehensive glossary of the terms used for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.
- Developing recommendations for IANA reports on delegation and re-delegation.

In developing its Framework of Interpretation and recommendations, the FOIWG used the following approach for each of the 3 substantive topics (Consent, Significantly Interested Parties and Unconsented Re-delegations / Revocation). As a first step the FOIWG identified the applicable policies, guidelines and procedure statements and analysed all past cases of re-delegations with regard to consent. Based on this analysis the FOIWG identified the issues in the context of the applicable policies, guidelines and procedures. These issues were further analysed including an identification of the issues arising out of this analysis.

The interim results were presented to the community in Interim Reports to seek input and feedback, and at face-to face meetings with the community at public ccNSO and other meetings during the public consultation processes. After closure of the public comment periods on each of the topics, the FOIWG reviewed and analysed comments received. Based on these careful reviews and analyses, the FOIWG did not deem it reasonable and necessary to amend its interim interpretations and recommendations.

The Interpretations and Recommendations in each of the Final Interpretation reports have been consolidated and are included in this Final Report (section 2 and 3 respectively). As required by the charter, these full reports should be included in this Final Report, however In order to reduce the size of this report they are included by referencing the URL to these report (Annex A-C).

A high level description of the full process of consultations and deliberations for each of topics is included (section 4, Background and Process).

With regard to the Glossary, the FOIWG noted that this would be developed in parallel, and as part of the development of each of the three (3) substantive topics. As such the terms in the glossary became part of the Framework of Interpretation and recommendations. As to the last item - recommendations for IANA reports – the FOIWG decided this did not warrant a separate work item, as recommendations on reporting are contained as part of the interpretation and recommendations of each of the substantive parts.

The names of the members, observers, other liaisons and support staff and special advisors are listed on the webpage of the WG (see Annex D for a link to the webpage), where you can also find the charter (Annex E includes a direct link to the charter). Documents, Reference Material, Notes and transcripts of the meetings can also be found on the webpage of the group.

In accordance with its charter, the Final Report is conveyed to the chairs of the ccNSO and GAC to seek support from the ccNSO and GAC for the Recommendations and Framework of Interpretation contained herein.

## 2 - FOIWG interpretation of RFC1591

1. Note: RFC1591 only identifies three mechanisms available to the IANA Operator to assign or modify the management responsibility for a ccTLD:

- Delegation (section 3 of RFC1591)
- Transfer (section 3.6 of RFC191) and
- Revocation (section 3.5 of RFC191).

Other mechanisms may be available to the stakeholder community under applicable domestic law; however, those mechanisms might not be practicably available to the IANA Operator.

2. The FOIWG interprets “Delegation” (section 3 of RFC1591) to mean the process by which the IANA Operator initially assigns management responsibility or assigns previously assigned responsibility (after a revocation) for the management of a ccTLD.

2.1. Note: In the case of a delegation section 3.4 of RFC1591 requires that Significantly Interested Parties should agree that the designated manager is the appropriate party and that other Stakeholders have some voice in selecting the manager.

3. The FOIWG interprets the term “Transfer” (section 3.6 of RFC1591) to refer to the process by which the IANA Operator transfers responsibility from an incumbent manager to a new manager with the consent of both parties.

3.1. The FOIWG interprets section 3.6 of RFC1591 to require that the IANA Operator only seek consent for a Transfer request from the incumbent manager and the proposed manager. The IANA Operator should not seek consent from the Administrative or Technical contacts.

3.2. The FOIWG further interprets section 3.6 of RFC1591 regarding *agreement* to the Transfer as requiring that the communication from the IANA Operator requesting a party’s consent should clearly state (a) what the party is being asked to agree to and (b) what steps the IANA Operator will or may take in response to the party’s (i) affirmative consent, (ii) affirmative refusal to consent, or (iii) failure to respond to the communication requesting consent. The IANA Operator should also advise the Manager to seek legal advice prior to granting consent. The requirement to secure informed consent does not obligate the IANA Operator to ensure that the party from whom consent is sought is informed about consequences not within ICANN or the IANA Operator’s control.

- For further clarity of what a party is being asked to agree to in a Transfer, the IANA Operator should clearly indicate it will undertake all steps necessary to transfer the incumbent manager’s role as trustee for the ccTLD (as the term is used in RFC1591) to the proposed manager, including, without limitation, changing the entry in the IANA database.
- **Note:** In RFC1591, the term “trustee” is used to describe the manager’s duty to serve the community, and not to describe the specific legal relationship of the manager to the delegated domain.

- For further clarity the IANA Operator should describe in detail to those parties what steps it will or may take in response to those parties' affirmative consent.
- The IANA Operator needs to establish and publish a procedure by which it will request a party's consent, the information that will be provided by the IANA Operator in connection with such a request, and the manner in which it will receive and document the party's response to such a request. The process used by the IANA Operator should create a formal record reflecting who provided the consent or other response, the status of the person providing the consent or response, and should demonstrate that a party's consent to a re-delegation is clear, informed, unambiguous, affirmatively expressed, and freely given, as each of those terms are defined.
- The IANA Operator should adopt the following criteria when evaluating the consent of an incumbent or proposed manager for a re-delegation request or from a proposed manager for a delegation request:
  - *Consent must be specific, informed, unambiguous, affirmatively communicated, and freely given.*
  - *For further clarity consent, by definition, must be voluntary. In practice, however, the IANA Operator will rarely be in a position to determine whether or not a party's consent is voluntary. The IANA Operator itself must be perfectly neutral and should not attempt to compel, threaten, or persuade the party to approve a request. Consent may be deemed by the IANA Operator in its reasonable discretion to be freely given if it is specific, informed, unambiguous, affirmatively communicated and acquired by the IANA Operator without threat or coercion.*

3.3. Note: The terms “re delegation” and “unconsented re delegation” are in common use by ICANN, the IANA Operator and the stakeholder community when describing the reassignment of a ccTLD manager. Given there is no reference to the term “re delegation” in RFC1591 and that there is no policy basis for an “unconsented re delegation” the FOIWG recommends that the term “re delegation” be replaced with the term “Transfer” and that the term “unconsented re delegation” be replaced with “Revocation followed by a Delegation”.

3.4. Note: In the case of a “Transfer” section 3.6 of RFC1591 requires that Stakeholder input should be considered and taken into account by the IANA Operator.

4. The FOIWG interprets the term “Revocation” (section 3.5 of RFC1591) to refer to the process by which the IANA Operator rescinds responsibility for management of a ccTLD from an incumbent manager.

4.1. Note: Section 3.5 of RFC1591 explicitly contemplates Revocation in appropriate cases involving “persistent problems with the proper operation of a domain.”

4.2. The FOIWG interprets RFC1591 to permit the IANA Operator to revoke a ccTLD



delegation in appropriate circumstances where the manager has substantially misbehaved (section 3.4 of RFC1591).

4.2.1. **Note:** RFC1591 identifies three mechanisms available to the IANA Operator to assign or modify the management responsibility for a ccTLD, namely Delegation, Transfer and Revocation. The FOIWG interprets RFC1591 to require the consent of an incumbent manager to any Transfer of responsibilities. If a ccTLD manager engaged in substantial misbehaviour is unwilling to consent, and the IANA Operator's informal efforts to address such misbehaviour are unavailing, Revocation is the only formal mechanism that remains available to the IANA Operator. Accordingly, the FOIWG interprets RFC1591 to permit the IANA Operator to revoke a ccTLD delegation in appropriate cases where the manager has substantially misbehaved.

4.3. The FOIWG interprets "misbehaviour" (section 3.4 of RFC1591) in this context to refer to conduct involving the failure of a manager to (i) carry out the necessary responsibilities of that role, or (ii) carry out those responsibilities in the manner required by RFC1591.

4.4. The FOIWG interprets substantial misbehaviour (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to involve misbehaviour (as defined above) that is either egregious or persistent and may include performing the necessary responsibilities of a manager in a manner that imposes serious harm or has a substantial adverse impact on the Internet community by posing a threat to the stability and security of the DNS.

4.5. The FOIWG interprets RFC1591 to limit the IANA Operator's authority to step-in to situations where substantial misbehaviour by the ccTLD manager (a) poses a risk to the security and stability of the DNS or (b) involves the manager's failure, after notice and a reasonable opportunity to cure, to perform the objective requirements (i.e., to be on the Internet, maintain IP and email connectivity, identify a technical contact and to identify an in-country administrative contact).

4.6. The FOIWG interprets RFC1591 to mean that the IANA Operator should not step in regarding issues of equity, justice, honesty, or – except insofar as it compromises the stability and security of the DNS – competency, and that such issues would be better resolved locally.

4.7. The FOIWG interprets the intent of RFC1591 to provide Revocation as the last resort option for the IANA Operator. The IANA Operator should use all means at its disposal to assist the manager to change conduct considered to be substantial misbehaviour by the manager. Revocation should only be considered if the IANA Operator reasonably demonstrates that the manager is unable or unwilling in an appropriate time frame to:

- Resolve specified material failures to carry out its responsibilities under RFC1591; and/or
- Carry out those responsibilities in the manner required by RFC1591

4.8. **Note:** The FOIWG believes it is consistent with RFC1591 (section 3.4) and the duty to act fairly to recognize the manager has the right to appeal a notice of revocation by the IANA Operator to an independent body.

4.9. **Note:** The FOIWG believes it is consistent with RFC1591 that If the IANA Operator revokes a delegation it should attempt, in collaboration with the significantly interested parties, to ensure the ccTLD will continue to resolve names until a suitable replacement can take over.

5. The FOIWG interprets “Significantly Interested Parties” (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to include, but not be limited to: a) the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD and b) any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions, or others that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s) including the incumbent manager. To be considered a Significantly Interested Party, any party other than the manager or the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD must demonstrate that it has a direct, material and legitimate interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s).

5.1. The FOIWG interprets the requirement for approval from Significantly Interested Parties (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to require applicants to provide documentation of support by stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for delegations and transfers.

5.2. **Note:** This interpretation should not be taken as implying the elimination or replacement of any of the requirements relating to Consent of the proposed and incumbent Managers.

5.3. **Note:** IANA reports on Delegations and Transfers should reflect consistent application of these FOIWG interpretations and should include the detailed results of the IANA Operator’s evaluation of Stakeholder input regarding the requested action.

6. The FOIWG defines Stakeholders in the context of the administration of ccTLDs to encompass Significantly Interested Parties, “*interested parties*” and “*other parties*” referenced in RFC1591.

6.1. The FOIWG interprets the requirement for “interested parties” to have “some voice” (section 3.4 of RFC1591) to require applicants to provide documentation of support by Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for Delegations.

6.2. The FOIWG interprets the requirement for “*concerned*” or “*affected*” parties in Transfers to communicate with the IANA Operator (section 3.6 of RFC1591) to require applicants to provide documentation of support by Stakeholders and for the IANA Operator to evaluate and document this input for Transfers.

6.3. **Note:** IANA reports on Delegations or Transfers should reflect consistent application of these FOIWG interpretations and should include the detailed results of the IANA Operator’s evaluation of Stakeholder input regarding the requested action.

7. The FOIWG interprets the requirement that there be an administrative and technical contact for each domain including, for ccTLDs, an administrative contact residing in the country (section

3.1 of RFC1591) to mean, as a general rule, that the manager must confirm, and the IANA Operator must be able to validate, that the administrative contact resides in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD. This establishes a clear intention from RFC1591 that there be local (in the country or territory associated with the ccTLD) presence.

7.1. **Note:** The FOIWG recognizes that there may be extenuating circumstances where it is impractical or impossible for the administrative contact to reside in the country or territory. ccTLDs that represent territories without permanent population will, by definition, not be able to meet the requirement.

7.2. **Note:** The requirement for an in-country administrative contact did not appear before 1994 when it was first introduced by RFC1591. Therefore this requirement may not be expected of ccTLDs established or last transferred before the publication of RFC1591.

8. The FOIWG interprets the requirement that the manager serves as a “trustee” for the delegated domain, “with a duty to serve the nation, in the case of a country code, and the global Internet community” (section 3.2 of RFC1591) to require the Manager to (i) provide mechanisms to allow for registrants and significantly interested parties to provide input regarding registration policies to the manager and (ii) to preserve the security and stability of the ccTLD, and (iii) to work with the IANA Operator to preserve the stability and security of the global DNS/Internet.

9. The FOIWG interprets the requirement that the manager be “equitable” to all groups in the domain (section 3.3 of RFC1591) as obligating the manager to make its registration policies accessible and understandable to prospective applicants, and to apply these policies in an impartial manner, treating similarly situated would-be registrants in the same manner.

10. The FOIWG interprets RFC1591 to require the IANA Operator, in the manager selection process, be satisfied that the proposed manager possesses the necessary technical, administrative and operational skills, judged by the standard of the ordinarily competent ccTLD manager (section 3.5 of RFC1591). This requires the prospective manager to demonstrate that he or she (or, if a legal person, ‘it’): (i) possesses the requisite skills to carry out the duties of a manager (skills test); and (ii) If designated, will have the means necessary to carry out those duties (including the ongoing responsibilities discussed above), upon receiving the appointment (executory preparedness test).

10.1. **Note:** Application to Incumbent Managers. It could arguably be asserted that RFC1591 could limit the IANA Operator’s authority to “step in” to the process of selecting a manager, on balance, the FOIWG interprets section 3.4 of RFC1591 to create: (i) an ongoing obligation on the manager to operate the ccTLD without substantial misbehaviour and (ii) a reserve power for the IANA Operator to “step in” in the event that the manager does “substantially misbehave.”

11. The FOIWG interprets RFC1591 to require the IANA Operator to avoid actions that undermine the stability and security of the DNS and/or the continuing operation of the ccTLD

(section 3 of RFC1591)

### **3 - Recommendations regarding Implementation:**

#### **Context for the FOIWG Final report recommendations**

The Country Code Name Supporting Organization (ccNSO) tasked the Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG) with developing and proposing a "Framework of Interpretation" for existing IANA policy and guidelines governing the delegation and redelegation (now Transfer) of ccTLDs. The FOIWG's goal was to give IANA and the ICANN Board clear guidance on the meaning and intent of RFC1591, in order to clarify existing policy and to facilitate consistent and predictable application of this policy.

In reviewing the FOIWG recommendations, it is important to keep the following context in mind:

- The FOIWG had no authority to develop or recommend new or changed policy, and the recommendations reflect the limited scope of the FOIWG's Charter. To the extent new or changed policy may be appropriate or desirable, it must be developed through a formal Policy Development Process (PDP).
- Recognising that ultimate authority on public policy for any country is its government and legislature, nothing in this Working Group's report is intended to, or should be taken to, constrain or limit applicable law in respect of matters relating to country-code top-level domain names in the country or territory represented by the particular two-letter code or IDN string, or in the state of incorporation/place of business of the IANA operator<sup>1</sup>.
- 
- Nothing in the Framework of Interpretation limits or constrains the applicability of the 2005 GAC "Principles and Guidelines for the Delegation and Administration of Country Code Top Level Domains".

#### **Recommendations:**

1. Regarding Consent, Significantly Interested Parties (SIP) and Unconsented Redelegations (Revocation):
  - The IANA Operator should adopt and implement the interpretations of RFC1591 provided by the Framework of Interpretation Working Group (FOIWG) as presented in this document.
2. Regarding IANA adoption and implementation of the FOIWG interpretations:
  - The ccNSO Council should consider a methodology to collaborate with IANA to develop content and other tools to educate and inform stakeholders about IANA's processes and procedures that are consistent with the FOIWG interpretations.

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/country\\_code\\_names\\_supporting\\_organization.pdf](http://www.ntia.doc.gov/files/ntia/country_code_names_supporting_organization.pdf)

- The IANA Operator should continue to publish a public report on each ccTLD Delegation, Transfer and Revocation it completes. These reports should be published in a timely fashion, clearly identify the parties involved, describe its decision-making process and the facts relevant to its decision, including information that addresses all relevant aspects of the Framework of Interpretation recommendations.

#### 4 - Background and Process

The FOIWG was created by the ccNSO Council following the recommendations of the Delegation and Re-delegation Working Group (DRDWG)<sup>2</sup>:

***Recommendation 2: Delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs***

*The DRDWG recommends that, as a first step, the ccNSO Council undertakes the development of a “Framework of Interpretation” for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. This framework should provide a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board on interpretations of the current policies, guidelines and procedures relating to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.*

*The results of the use of such a Framework of Interpretation should be formally monitored and evaluated by the ccNSO Council after a pre-determined period. If the results of this evaluation indicate that the Framework of Interpretation failed to provide logical and predictable outcomes in ICANN decision making, the ccNSO Council should then launch PDPs on the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.*

“The charter of the FOIWG was adopted by the ccNSO Council at its meeting on 16 March 2011 and Keith Davidson of .NZ (former Chair of the DRDWG) was appointed as chair”. In June 2011 the charter was updated to reflect the participation of the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC).

As part of its work plan the FOIWG agreed that the only appropriate documented policies, guidelines and procedures that would be considered for interpretation are RFC1591 and the GAC Principles 2005<sup>3</sup>. The FOIWG also considered other relevant publicly available documentation

---

<sup>2</sup> The Final Report of the DRD WG can be found at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/drd-wg-final-report-07mar11-en.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> According to DRDWG and charter of the FOIWG the Policy Statements includes ICP-1 and GAC 2000 Principles as well. As the GAC 2005 Principles replaced the GAC 2000 set, they are not considered by the FOIWG.

With regard to ICP-1 the DRDWG noted that, in 1994, IANA published RFC1591 as its statement of current practice, in 1997 this was updated with ccTLD News Memo #1 and in 1999, ICP1 was published as its statement of current practice. Contrary to the statements contained in its header, ICP1 does contain significant changes in policies. These changes were never approved by resolution of the ICANN Board. The DRDWG analysis of RFC1591 versus ICP1 concluded that “This policy decision (implementing ICP1) failed to meet all of the requirements for policy development in effect at the time.

Further, in 2001 a majority of ccTLDs active in ccTLD management accepted RFC1591 and the principles it contained as appropriate policies, and these ccTLDs continue their support for these principles today (see [www.wwtld.org](http://www.wwtld.org) and [www.iatld.org](http://www.iatld.org) web archives). Neither News Memo #1 nor ICP1 (which integrates News Memo #1) were ever officially endorsed by any significant group of ccTLDs.

such as IANA Reports on Delegation and Re-delegation of ccTLDs or IANA process documentation to assist in determining if interpretation for a specific topic would be required to address the concerns raised by the DRDWG in its final report.

The FOIWG identified the following topics, which were be considered individually and in the order presented:

- Obtaining and documenting consent for delegation and re-delegation requests
- Obtaining and documenting support for delegation and re-delegation requests from Significantly Interested Parties (sometimes referred to as Local Internet Community or LIC).
- Developing recommendations for un-consented re-delegations
- Developing a comprehensive glossary of the terms used for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.
- Developing recommendations for IANA reports on delegation and re-delegation.

The FOIWG developed its first initial recommendations on the Interpretation of the existing policies and guidelines in the context of delegation and re-delegation requests in December 2011. As required by its charter, this report and subsequent initial recommendations were published as Interim report for Interpretation, to seek input and feed-back of the ICANN community. A full description of the processes for each of the subsequent topics is documented in each of the Final Interpretation Reports. An overview of the public comments, subsequent summaries and analysis of the comments received. And additional material, if any is included in Annex F

In order to keep the community abreast of the progress made, the FOIWG regularly published progress reports<sup>4</sup>, and provided updates and presented its findings to the ccTLD community and GAC during successive ICANN meetings since March 2011.

Finally, according to the charter of the FOIWG, the ccNSO and GAC would be requested to endorse or support each of the Recommendations of Interpretations Reports (on Consent, Significantly Interested Parties, and Revocation). As such the Recommendations for Interpretations on “Consent” was submitted to the ICANN Board of Directors in March 2012. However, taking into account the duration of the process and the need to ensure consistency across the sets of Recommendations of Interpretations, the ccNSO and GAC reached an understanding that endorsement or support would only be sought for the full set of Recommendations, as to be included in the Final Report of the FOIWG. The ICANN Board of directors was informed accordingly.

---

As the DRDWG excluded ICP-1, the FOIWG in accordance with its charter excluded ICP-1 as well.

<sup>4</sup> The progress report are available at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foiwg.htm>

## 5 – Members of the FOI working Group

### ccNSO:

Ugo Akiri, .ng  
Martin Boyle, .uk  
Becky Burr, .us (Vice Chair)  
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)  
Chris Disspain, .au  
Stephen Deerhake, .as  
Dejan Djukic, .rs  
Daniel Kalchev, .bg  
Dmitry Kohmanyuk, .ua  
Desiree Miloshevic, .gi  
Eberhard Lisse, .na  
Lesley Cowley, .uk (ex-officio)  
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw  
Patricio Poblete, .cl  
Nigel Roberts, .gg  
Bill Semich, .nu  
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi  
Denzil West, .ms

### GAC:

Heather Dryden (GAC Chair)  
Jayantha Fernando  
Frank March  
Alice Munyua  
Suzanne Radell

### Other Liaisons:

Maureen Hilyard, ALAC  
Cheryl Langdon Orr, ALAC  
Cintra Sooknanan, ALAC  
Carlos Aguirre, GNSO

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN

Kim Davies IANA

Elise Gerich, IANA

Kristina Nordström, ICANN

Gabriella Schitteck, ICANN

Bernard Turcotte, ICANN



## Annexes

**Annex A** Final report on consent:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foiwg.htm>

**Annex B** Final report on SIP:

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foiwg.htm>

**Annex C** Final report on Unconsented Redelegations (Revocation)

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foiwg.htm>

**Annex D** List of Members, Observers and support staff of the WG

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foiwg.htm>

**Annex E** Charter of the FOIWG

<http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/charter-foiwg-07jun11-en.pdf>

## Annex F Overview Publication of main documents

Consent			
Report	Publication date	Closure date (if applicable)	URL
Public Comment Interim Report	12 October 2011	1 December 2011	<a href="https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/foiwg-interim-report-2011-10-12-en">https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/foiwg-interim-report-2011-10-12-en</a>
Summary and Analysis	10 February 2012		<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-foiwg-interim-report-10feb12-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-foiwg-interim-report-10feb12-en.pdf</a>
GAC Comments on Interim Interpretations Consent	31 January 2012		<a href="http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/draft-gac-comments-foiwg-interim-report-on-consent-31jan12-en.pdf">http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/draft-gac-comments-foiwg-interim-report-on-consent-31jan12-en.pdf</a>
Response on GAC Comments	08 March 2012		<a href="http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccnso-reply-gac-comments-foiwg-report-on-consent-08mar12-en.pdf">http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccnso-reply-gac-comments-foiwg-report-on-consent-08mar12-en.pdf</a>
Final Paper	27 February 2012		<a href="http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foiwg-consent-final-27feb12-en.pdf">http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foiwg-consent-final-27feb12-en.pdf</a>

Significantly Interested Parties (SIP)			
Report	Publication date	Closure date (if applicable)	URL
Public Comment Interim Report	3 February 2012	20 April 2012	<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/foiwg-interim-report-2012-03feb12-en.htm">https://www.icann.org/en/news/public-comment/foiwg-interim-report-2012-03feb12-en.htm</a>
Summary and Analysis	22 May 2012		<a href="https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-foiwg-interim-report-2012-22may12-en.pdf">https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/report-comments-foiwg-interim-report-2012-22may12-en.pdf</a>
GAC Comments on SIP Report	26 September 2012		<a href="http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/gac-comments-foi-interim-report-sip-26sep12-en.pdf">http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/gac-comments-foi-interim-report-sip-26sep12-en.pdf</a>

<b>FOIWGG Response GAC Comments on SIP</b>	2 November 2012		<a href="http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi-reply-gac-sip-02nov12-en.pdf">http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi-reply-gac-sip-02nov12-en.pdf</a>
<b>Final Paper</b>	30 September 2014		<a href="http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi wg.htm">http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi wg.htm</a>

<b>Revocation (Unconsented Redelegaton)</b>			
<b>Report</b>	<b>Publication date</b>	<b>Closure date (if applicable)</b>	<b>URL</b>
Public Comment  Interim Report	28 October 2013	31 January 2014	<a href="https://www.icann.org/public-comments/foi-interim-2013-10-28-en">https://www.icann.org/public-comments/foi-interim-2013-10-28-en</a>
Summary and Analysis	12 February 2014		<a href="http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-foi-interim-28oct13/pdfTqO07E12Eq.pdf">http://forum.icann.org/lists/comments-foi-interim-28oct13/pdfTqO07E12Eq.pdf</a>
Final Interpretation Report	30 September 2014		<a href="http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi wg.htm">http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foi wg.htm</a>