

## **Delegation and Redelelegation Telephone Conference**

*28 January 2010*

### Attendees:

Jaap Akkerhuis, expert invited by the Chair  
Becky Burr, NomCom appointee to the ccNSO Council  
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)  
Chris Disspain, .au  
Eberhard Lisse, .na  
Slobodan Markovic, .rs  
Desiree Miloshevic, .gi  
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw  
Patricio Poblete, .cl  
Nigel Roberts, .gg  
Bill Semich, .nu  
Kathryn Reynolds (on behalf Byron Holland), .ca

### ICANN Staff Experts:

Kim Davies

### ICANN Staff Support:

Bart Boswinkel  
Kristina Nordström  
Bernard Turcotte

### **1. Apologies**

- The Chair noted that apologies were received from Martin Boyle, Suzanne Sene, Annebeth Lange, Erick Iriarte, Anne-Rache Inne and Oscar Robles.

### **2. Approval of agenda**

- The Chair asked for comments to the agenda. No comments were noted and the agenda was approved.

### **3. Approval of Notes from 7 January**

- The Chair asked for comments to the Notes from the Delegation and Redelelegation Working Group Telephone Conference on 7 January. No comments were noted and the minutes were approved.

### **4. Approval of Revised ccNSO DRD WG Project Plan v1.7**

- The Chair asked for comments to the revised version of the DRD WG Project Plan 1.7, re-drafted by Bernard Turcotte in order to make it more comprehensible. No comments were noted and the Project Plan was approved.

## 5. Comparison on documents RFC1591/ICP1/GAC Principles

- The Chair encouraged the group to discuss the comparison drafted by Becky Burr and Bernard Turcotte on RFC1591, ICP1 and the GAC Principles. *Bill Semich* welcomed the document and suggested that a comparison with the draft criteria for delegating Top Level Domains, provided by IANA, be added to the document. The Chair agreed and asked Bernard to add the IANA procedures to the document as a next step.

### *Action 04-01:*

Bernard Turcotte to add a comparison on the IANA Procedures to the drafted Comparison Document on RFC1591, ICP1 and the GAC Principles.

- The Chair noted that due to the shifting timing of the calls coupled with the shifting attendance, it will generally take two calls to come to a decision in any important matter.
- *Eberhard Lisse* pointed out that the document still does not define what a domain or ccTLD is, nor who owns them and stressed the importance of these issues being sorted out since there might be a difference in opinion between the IANA and the ccTLDs and requested this be noted in the minutes of the meeting. *Nigel Roberts* noted that the definition of the ccTLD must be done first in order to be able to define ownership.
- *Bill* referred to early discussions within ICANN stating that IANA should be a service provider to the ccTLD managers and not the other way around. He further noted that any definitions would have to be inclusive to all ccTLDs. The Chair agreed that this issue must be sorted out and decided that this is best done in a face-2-face meeting.
- *Nigel* suggested that the older documents RFC920 and RFC881 on the development of the Domain Name System might be useful to look at. Becky Burr and Bill Semich supported this suggestion. *Kim Davies* informed the group that he will shortly share another discussion paper with the group that includes the historical aspect.

### *Action 04-02:*

*Kim Davies* to share another discussion paper with the group that includes the historical aspect of ccTLD delegations as soon as possible.

- *Chris Disspain* said that in order to reach an objective definition of a ccTLD, the group would have to recommend the ccNSO to launch a PDP on the subject.
- The Chair asked Bernard Turcotte to make a summary of the relevant points in RFC920 and RFC881 and include it in the comparison document and to distribute it on the list for comments.

*Action 04-03:*

*Bernard Turcotte* to make a summary of the points in the documents RFC920 and RFC881 that are of relevance to the Working Group and to distribute it on the list for comments.

## **6. IANA Procedures Document**

- The Chair noted that this topic was discussed under the previous agenda item and asked if there were any further comments to the subject.
- Kim Davies pointed out that IANA is looking to post a version of the procedures document for community review on the ICANN website as soon as possible.

## **7. Deadline for comments on IANA and Comparison Documents**

- The Chair suggested that the group read the Documents once more and submit comments before 4 February. The group agreed and Bart Boswinkel was asked to send a note to the list about the new deadline.

*Action 04-04:*

*Bart Boswinkel* to send a note to the Delegation and Redelegation Working Group list about the new deadline for submitting comments to the Comparison Documents.

## **8. Documents to be publicly posted prior to Nairobi**

- The Chair suggested that a progress report should be posted prior to the Nairobi meeting, drafted by himself, Becky Burr, Bernard Turcotte and Bart Boswinkel.

*Action 04-05:*

The Chair, *Becky Burr*, *Bernard Turcotte* and *Bart Boswinkel* to draft a progress report for the Nairobi Meeting.

- *Nigel Roberts* asked about the opportunities to participate remotely in the Working Group Nairobi Meetings. *Bart* offered to look into it and get back to the group as soon as possible.

*Action 04-06:*

*Bart Boswinkel* to find out the options for remote participation in the Delegation and Redelegation Working Group meetings in Nairobi.

## **9. Nairobi Workshop**

- The Chair confirmed that there will be a Delegation Redelegation Workshop in Nairobi on Sunday afternoon.

## 10. Confirmation of upcoming meetings

- Following Delegation and Redelegation meetings were confirmed by the Chair:

Teleconference 11 February, 01:00 UTC

Teleconference 25 February, 09:00 UTC

Workshop, ICANN Nairobi Sunday, 14:30 - 16:30 local time

WG meeting ICANN Nairobi Sunday, 17:00 - 19:00 local time

WG alternate meeting ICANN Nairobi Thursday, 11:30 - 13:30 local time

## 11. Any other business

- *Bill Semich* asked about the further steps for the Delegation Process Paper. *Chris Disspain* suggested that the paper should be revisited after the studying of the RFC documents.
- The Chair thanked everyone for being on the call and the meeting closed.