

ICANN – CCNSO – FOIWG

Meeting Notes (draft) for 1 November 2012, 11:00 UTC

1. Present / apologies

ccNSO:

Ugo Akiri, .ng
Martin Boyle, .uk
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)
Chris Disspain, .au
Stephen Deerhake, .as
Dejan Djukic, .rs
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Nigel Roberts, .gg
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi

Other Liaisons:

Maureen Hilyard, ALAC
Cheryl Langdon Orr, ALAC
Cintra Sooknanan, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

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

Apologies:

Eberhard Lisse, .na

2. **Agenda – Approved**

3. **Meeting notes for 18 October 2012 – Approved.**

4. **Revocation V4.2 (Note: Points have re-ordered to match the order of the document instead of the order in which the points were discussed)**

4.1. 5.2.4.1

4.1.1. MB and NR agree with proposal by CD to remove references to Public Office definitions of misbehaviour – may be used as a footnote.

4.1.2. KDavidson noted there was general agreement to remove the word “roughly”

4.1.3. MB still has problems with “willful”.

4.2. 5.2.4.2

4.2.1. CD unclear this refers to an exhaustive or partial list.

4.2.2. MB should “indifferent” be considered. Also either-or of the definition.

4.2.3. Disagreement between MB and NR. Should be discussed off-line.

4.3. 5.3.2.1.1 – No agreement

4.3.1. MB feels it is to limited only to refer to the technical aspects (use of the word “service” in section 3.5 of RFC1591.

4.3.2. CD and NR do not support interpreting RFC1591 as a Living Document.

4.4. 5.3.2.2 – No agreement

4.4.1. JA noted no ccTLD allows access to its Zone File. NR agreed and requested correction. BT agreed.

4.5. 5.3.2.3 – No agreement

4.5.1. NR noted that “responding to requests” may be referring to DNS requests vs the proposed interpretation of IANA requests. BT agreed both could be valid and that this is up to the WG to come to a conclusion on.

4.6. 5.3.2.4 – No agreement.

4.6.1. Re: “easily checked” MB, NR and SD note that such an interpretation cannot be supported in the current context (note: this was one of the difficult points of ICP1 for ccTLDS).

4.6.2. CD noted that although this is difficult it may be better for the WG to come to an interpretation of this point vs not addressing it and leaving it open to interpretation by others.

4.6.3. NR “Primary and Secondary servers have IP connectivity” must be carefully and properly interpreted because word for word this is not currently applicable. Supported by CLO and JA. The Chair noted that Primary and Secondary should probably be interpreted and Authoritative – generally supported.

4.7. 5.3.2.5.3 – No agreement.

4.7.1. Issues around the use of IANA etc.

4.8. 5.3.3 – not reviewed – need to complete review of 5.2.5 first.

5. Responses to the GAC on SIP

5.1. Generally supported.

5.2. The Chair will forward to the GAC.

6. Other Business

6.1. None?

7. Conclusion of the meetings

7.1. 12:55 UTC

8. Next meetings

8.1. 15 November 2012 – UTC 19:00

8.2. 29 November 2012 – UTC 03:00

8.3. 13 December 2012 – UTC 11:00

8.4. 24 January 2013 – UTC 19:00

8.5. 7 February 2013 – UTC 03:00

8.6. 21 February 2013 – UTC 11:00

8.7. 7 March 2013 – UTC 19:00

8.8. 21 March 2013 – UTC 03:00

8.9. 7 – 11 April 2013 ICANN 46 - Beijing