

ICANN – CCNSO - FOIWG

Report (final) for 11 August 2011 – 13:00 UTC

1. Present / apologies

ccNSO :

Becky Burr, NomCom (Vice Chair)

Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)

Chris Disspain, .au

Stephen Deerhake, .as

Daniel Kalchev, .bg

Eberhard Lisse, .na

Patricio Poblete, .cl

Nigel Roberts, .gg

Bill Semich, .nu

GAC:

Frank March

Liaisons:

Cheryl Langdon Orr, At-Large

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN

Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Martin Boyle

Paulos Nyirenda, .mw

Kathryn Reynolds

2. Meeting report for 4 August 2011

2.1. The report was accepted.

3. Terminology Paper

3.1. Given the slow progress on this topic the Chair proposed to the working group that the approach to this topic be changed. It is proposed that a glossary of terms be built up over the course of the work of the working group and that this be approved and presented at the end of the FOIWG process. This was unanimously accepted. KDavidson will work with BT to adjust the work-plan for presentation to the working group at its next meeting.

4. Consent Paper (FOIWG-Consent-V2.0BT)

4.1. Work picked up at section 6.5.

4.2. Sections 6.5 - What is an Incumbent Manager being asked to agree to in a re-delegation

4.2.1. NR noted that the list was a set of actions which were the result of an incumbent manager accepting to transfer its ccTLD but not what it was agreeing to. The list is useful but the mechanics should be cleared up possibly using “and this approval usually causes the following to happen”.

4.2.2. KDavidson and BT will rework this section for the next meeting

4.3. Section 6.6 - What is a Proposed Manager being asked to agree to in a Re-delegation

4.3.1. This section will be edited to be coherent with section 6.5

4.4. Section 6.7 - What is a Proposed Manager being asked to agree to in a delegation

4.4.1. Will be edited to be coherent with sections 6.5 and 6.6.

4.5. Section 6.8 - How should the Incumbent Manager in a re-delegation communicate its agreement to IANA.

4.5.1. CD suggested that standard legal wording for this should be used.

4.5.2. KDavidson and BT will edit.

4.6. Section 6.9 - How should the Proposed Manager in a re-delegation communicate its agreement to IANA.

4.6.1. Will be edited to be coherent with section 6.8.

4.7. Section 6.10 - How should the Proposed Manager in a Delegation communicate its agreement to IANA.

4.7.1. Will be edited to be coherent with sections 6.8 and 6.9.

4.8. Section 6.11 - Who should be asked to approve Delegation and Re-delegation requests.

4.8.1. BT noted that this section is in its original form from the first version of the document and needs updating.

4.8.2. NR noted that the concept of AC and TC approval for re-delegations is an invention of IANA and does not match the requirement for manager approval found in RFC1591.

4.9. Section 6.12 - Documentation of approvals in IANA Reports on Delegation and Re-delegation.

4.9.1. General support for the concept which needs to be made coherent with the updates in the other sections from 6.5 to 6.11.

4.10. Section 7 – Recommendations

4.10.1. Section 7.1.1 is no longer necessary

4.10.2. The other recommendations were supported.

5. Report on the ad-hoc working group on property

5.1. BB has not yet provided a formal document summarizing the results.

6. Any other business

6.1. No participants had any other business

7. Future Meetings (all meetings are 2 hours unless previously specified otherwise)

7.1. 1 Sep at 21:00UTC (Continue with consent, start Valid Admin Contact)

7.2. 8 Sep at 05:00UTC (Final review of consultation on Terminology, continue Valid Admin Contact)

7.3. 22 Sep at 13:00UTC (Finalise Valid Admin Contact)

7.4. 6 Oct at 21:00UTC (Finalise everything for Senegal)

7.5. 13 Oct at 05:00UTC (Spare just in case)

8. Conclusion of the meetings

8.1. The meeting was concluded at about 06:30 UTC.