

**1. Present / apologies**

ccNSO:

Ugo Akiri, .ng  
Martin Boyle, .uk  
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)  
Stephen Deerhake, .as  
Dejan Djukic, .rs  
Daniel Kalchev, .bg  
Desiree Miloshevic, .gi  
Patricio Poblete, .cl  
Bill Semich, .nu

Other Liaisons:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr, ALAC  
Carlos Aguirre, GNSO

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO  
Bart Boswinkel, ICANN  
Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Kim Davies, ICANN  
Eberhard Lisse, .na  
Nigel Roberts, .gg

**2. Meeting notes for 10 November 2011 – were accepted by all.**

**3. Significantly Interested Parties V2.8**

- 3.1. Section 7.1.1.1 was accepted by all.
- 3.2. Section 7.1.1 was edited and accepted by all.

3.2.1. The text “including the incumbent manager” was added to the end to the

original text.

3.2.2. The adjective “substantial” was added after the adjective “material” in the original text.

3.3. Given these changes a version 2.9 of the SIP paper will be provided for 8 December meeting for final approval by the working group.

3.4. Public consultation – once the SIP document is finalized staff will prepare a public consultation document similar to the public consultation document on consent and will submit it for acceptance to the wg for its first meeting in January 2012.

#### **4. Public Consultation on Consent**

4.1. There have been no valid comments (only 1 spam). The consultation will close 1 December.

4.2. GAC input will be accepted until mid-January 2012.

#### **5. General discussion on revocation**

5.1. Section 3.5 of RFC1591

5.1.1. BS noted that there would need to be a procedure which would allow the incumbent to correct any inadequacies prior to any revocation procedures being undertaken.

5.1.2. There is no further information available in the documentation as to what “doing a satisfactory job of operating the DNS service for the domain” or “persistent problems with the operation of the domain” imply.

5.1.3. BT tasked with investigating if there is anything in the new gTLDs material which could assist the working group in this area.

5.2. Section 3.4 of RFC1591

5.2.1. There is no further information available in the documentation as to what “substantially miss-behaved” of “IANA stepping in” imply.

5.2.2. BS noted that IANA “stepping in” probably implied revocation.

5.3. Section 7 of the GAC Principles 2005

5.3.1. It is unclear if or how this ties in to the previous points.

#### **6. Future Meetings**

6.1. The next meetings of the WG will be on Thursday 8 December 21:00 UTC (teleconference).

**7. Conclusion of the meetings**

7.1. The meeting was concluded at about 14:00.