

Quick meeting notes for the DRDWG meeting of April 8th, 2010

1 - Apologies

- Anne-Rachel Inne, ICANN
- Martin Boyle, .uk
- Annebeth Lange, .no

Present at the meeting:

- Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)
- Paulos Nyirenda, mw
- Eberhard Lisse, .na
- Bill Semich, .nu
- Chris Disspain, .au (ccNSO Chair)
- Becky Burr, NomCom Appointee
- Patricio Poblete, .cl
- Jaap Akerhuis, expert invited by the Chair
- Suzanne Sene, GAC
- Young-Eum Lee, .kr
- ICANN Support Staff:
 - Bart Boswinkel
 - Kim Davies
 - Kristina Nordström
 - Bernhard Turcotte

2 - Review of agenda (approval)

- Exchange items 3 and 4 proposed by KeithD – no objections

3 – New documents

- General discussion around a proposal by KeithD to group the issues analysis for delegations, redelegations and retirements together for the Brussels meeting. KeithD has forwarded an email to the wg outlining the possibilities (captured here)

Where we are:

- Completed comparison between the policies and guidelines RFC1591, ICP1 and GAC Principles

- Completed analysis of all accessible decisions on delegations, redelegations and retirements

Initially I had wanted to break the work for this working group into more manageable chunks, hence the initial 3 tranches proposed to deal with delegations, retirements and finally redelegations. My desire was on the same basis as the methodology of eating an elephant – you can only do it one bite at a time!

However, the excellent and rapid work from Bernie analyzing the ICANN decisions on delegations, retirements and redelegations indicates that it is increasingly difficult to look at the arising issues in isolated silo's of delegation, retirement and redelegations, especially since a number of decisions are highly interlinked between two or sometimes all three of these topics.

Where to from here:

We have two distinctly different work paths we could now choose to follow, namely:

1. We stick with the original plan to produce a report and issues paper on the subject of delegations, for the Brussels ccNSO meeting. Then proceed to the subject of retirements for the Latin America meeting and finally redelegations for the 1st 2011 meeting.

or

2. We develop a draft “issues” paper, from Bernie’s analysis, that highlights where decisions made on delegations, retirements and redelegations have apparently deviated from the policies and guidelines RFC1591, ICP1 and the GAC Principles. Our presentation in Brussels would then be to discuss the issues, see if there are potentially any further issues arising, and then to set a path to prioritizing these issues and debating their relevance. Depending on the outcome, we could then either break back into the 3 separate activities of delegations, retirements and redelegations, or alternatively deal with the three issues simultaneously. Of course any reports would be “chaptered” at least into the 3 separate categories, and some chapters may take longer to finalise than others.

On the WG call just completed, there were points raised both for and against both these options.

I would now propose some debate on the list as to which option we should follow, and since we have another WG call in 7 days time, finalizing which is the preferred option on that call. Personally I am more strongly in favour of option 2, as I think our work has advanced at a pace that I hadn’t thought possible, and think we are in a comfortable position to do this.

4 – Schedule to Brussels

- Discussion of previous point touched on this also.

5 – Other business

- None

6 – Adjournment

- Next meeting is in 7 days on April 15th, 2010 at 06:00UTC