

Response of ICANN's CEO & President to enquiry chair of the DRD WG.

Included are the response and the email enquiries

Dear Keith,

The Board is committed to having the minutes of Board meetings accurately reflect the record of the conversation, unless the Board determines according to the Bylaws that matters are not appropriate for public distribution. There is the possibility that some delegation discussions contain sensitive information that the Board determines is necessary for a private discussion, as noted for the discussion of the .ng delegation.

While there was unanimous consent to engaging in the private, non-recorded discussion there, and the minutes were unanimously approved, your letter highlights the need for more consistent reporting of Board non-disclosure decisions. As seen in the minutes of the 23 June 2010 Board meeting on a non-delegation topic,

<http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-23jun10-en.htm>, that reporting has already been addressed and improved.

Another possibility for the brevity of minutes is the fact that no discussion occurred (.co delegation; .tz delegation). Where delegation/redelegation decisions are relatively straightforward, there is the possibility that the Board will not have discussions prior to a vote, and will proceed with the item on a consent agenda. As of the 22 April 2010 meeting, the Board materials relied upon by the Board in taking decisions are publicly available. Particularly as it relates to delegations, there is a certain amount of information that is redacted from those Board briefing materials pursuant to the Documentary Information Disclosure Policy. In response to the Accountability and Transparency Review Team recommendations, ICANN will soon be producing a document specifically discussing the basis for redactions of Board briefing materials that may provide further information.

Though there are some delegations for which no discussion is had, or the deliberations are taken in private, there are recent examples of minutes of delegation/redelegation discussions that document a return to more fulsome detail. For example, certain delegation actions taken on 28 October 2010 ( <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-28oct10-en.htm>) are discussed in detail. On 5 August 2010, the Board took action on certain delegations within its consent agenda, and then addressed further delegation issues with a discussion recorded within the minutes. See <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/minutes-05aug10-en.htm>.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue,

Warmly,

Rod

On 2/1/11 8:47 PM, "Keith Davidson" <> wrote:

>Hello Rod and Peter,

>

>I am concerned that I have not yet received a response to my email to  
>you initially on 9 June 2010, or my reminder on 30 November 2010.

>

>The ccNSO Delegations & Redelegations Working Group is now finalising  
>its work and will be submitting its final report to the ccNSO Council at  
>the March ICANN meeting.

>

>It worries me that the lack of response from ICANN to this matter would  
>need to be specifically noted in this final report, so am writing again  
>to enquire when I could anticipate receiving your response.

>

>Kind regards

>

-----

>Keith Davidson

>Chair - ccNSO Delegations & Redelegations Working Group

>

>On 1/12/2010 1:29 p.m., Rod Beckstrom wrote:

>> Thanks Keith- We will look into it and come back.

>> Warmly,

>> Rod

>>

-----

>> On 11/30/10 2:51 PM, "Keith Davidson" <> wrote:

>>

>>> Hello Rod and Peter,

>>>

>>> On 9 June I wrote to you regarding an issue of concern to the ccNSO  
>>> Delegations and Redelegations Working Group, which I chair.

>>>

>>> As the work of this group is in its final stages, receiving a response  
>>> to this letter is important for the completion of our work.

>>>

>>> Could you please therefore provide ICANN's response at your earliest  
>>> possible convenience?

>>>

>>> Kind regards

>>>

>>> Keith Davidson

>>

>> Warmly,

>>

>> Rod

>>

>> Rod Beckstrom

>> President and CEO

>> ICANN - One World. One Internet.