

ICANN – CCNSO - FOIWG

Meeting Notes (draft V1) for 6 October 2011 – 21:00 UTC (Final)

1. Present / apologies

ccNSO:

Ugo Akiri, .ng
Becky Burr, NomCom (Vice Chair)
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)
Chris Disspain, .au
Stephen Deerhake, .as
Daniel Kalchev, .bg
Eberhard Lisse, .na
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Kathryn Reynolds, .ca
Bill Semich, .nu
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi

GAC:

Frank March
Ana Neves

Other Liaisons:

Cheryl Langdon Orr, ALAC

Staff Support and Special Advisors:

Jaap Akkerhuis, ICANN / ISO
Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
Kim Davies IANA
Kristina Nordström, ICANN
Gabiella Schitteck, ICANN
Bernard Turcotte, ICANN

Apologies:

Martin Boyle, .uk
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Suzanne Radell
Nigel Roberts, .gg

2. Meeting notes
 - 2.1. Meeting notes for 22 September 2011 – accepted.
3. Significantly Interested Parties
 - 3.1. BS noted that the title of section 3 only refers to policies while it contains the GAC Principles which are not ICANN policies but advice to the ICANN Board. It was generally agreed that the title should properly reflect this.
 - 3.2. EL requested that all the types of parties mentioned in section 3.4 of RFC1591 be included in the issues of section 3.1.1.1
 - 3.3. EL requested that the word “all” be included in 3.2.2.1 as per the original GAC text.
 - 3.4. General agreement that section 4 should carry a note that it is for information and that these procedures cannot be considered as policy statements by the FOIWG.
 - 3.5. General note that 6.6.2 is incorrect given ICANN officially came into being in 1998, and the reference to ICANN should be struck.
 - 3.6. General agreement that there should be an email consultation of the wg to define a term which specifies the contractor who performs the IANA function vs the IANA function. BB and BT will take this on.
 - 3.7. BS and others did not agree with the wording of 7.1.1 and this will be reviewed by BB and BT.
 - 3.8. EL and BS disagreed with the wording of 7.1.2. BB has proposed some amended language which will be included in the next version.
 - 3.9. EL and BS objected to 7.1.3.2 as being policy making. This was generally supported and it was agreed to strike this clause.
 - 3.10. It was generally agreed that section 7.1.4 was overly specific and should be amended to reflect the core interpretation of a requirement for public consultation.
 - 3.11. BS proposed amended text for section 7.1.5 which was generally supported.
4. FOIWG Progress Report for Dakar
 - 4.1. Accepted for publication.
5. Public consultation on Consent
 - 5.1. Accepted for publication.
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. 13 Oct at 05:00UTC (SIP)

8. Conclusion of the meetings

8.1. The meeting was concluded at about 22:50 UTC.