Delegation and Redelegation Telephone Conference

7 January 2010

Attendees:

Bill Semich, .nu
Keith Davidson, .nz (Chair)
Eberhard Lisse, .na
Chris Disspain, .au (ccNSO Chair)
Slobodan Markovic, .rs
Martin Boyle, .uk
Young-Eum Lee, .kr (ccNSO Vice Chair)
Suzanne Senne, GAC representative
Desiree Milosevic, .gi
Jaap Akkerhuis, expert invited by the Chair
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi
Nigel Roberts, .gg
Patricio Poblete, .cl

ICANN staff experts Kim Davies Anne-Rachel Inne

ICANN Staff support: Bart Boswinkel Kristina Nordström Bernard Turcotte

Apologies:

Annebeth Lange, .no

1. Apologies

• The Chair noted that the only received apology for this call came from Annebeth Lange, .no.

2. Confirmation of Notes from 3 December Conference Call

 The Chair asked for comments or objections to the Notes from 3 December Delegation and Redelegation Call. No comments were noted.

3. Confirmation from ccNSO Council of Becky Burr as Co-Chair

Becky Burr's appointment as Vice-Chair of the working group was confirmed.

4. Project Plan

- It was noted that the Project Plan Document, was send out on 16 December. The group confirmed it was received and read.
- Keith Davidson asked if project plan covered concerns raised at previous call on overall objective and strategy in particular by Nigel Roberts.
- Nigel Roberts suggested that the group should start with the overall objective:
 to advise the ccNSO Council whether a ccPDP should be launched or not. To
 achieve its objective the Working Group should jointly come up with the most
 important topics for the Working Group and that any documents should be
 composed based on that discussion. Chris Disspain replied that this could still
 be done with the document Kim Davies produced on the current IANA work
 as a stepping-stone and an input reference.
- Eberhard Lisse pointed out the importance of starting at the beginning by defining some terms and general issues.
- Chris Disspain proposed that the Working Group members should look at Kim's document and share any comments to it with the group. He further proposed that the group conduct an analyses of the documents RFC1591, ICP1 and the GAC-principals and prepare a comparative analysis for discussion by the group. The Chair welcomed this and noted that using the summary, the group would be able to compare the documentation with Kim's overview and see how they match. Bernard Turcotte and Becky Burr were asked to work together on the comparative document.

Action 03-01:

Bernard Turcotte and Becky Burr to prepare an overview and comparison of documents: RFC1591, ICP-1 and the GAC-principals.

- Bill Semich pointed out that Kim's document about the current work of IANA should preferably be seen as a working paper rather than an official statement. Nigel replied that the document could be used a tool when the group figures out what issues need to be addressed rather then a document fully accepted by the Working Group. The group agreed that even though some suggestions for changes could be made to the IANA Document, it provided a basis for the upcoming discussions. Kim Davies noted that his document only includes a description of the current work of IANA and not any plans on future measures. He also welcomes any feedback that the group might provide to the document. The Chair encouraged the members to submit their comments to the IANA document in order for Kim to implement them into a second draft.
- Eberhard thanked Kim and IANA for the useful information provided in the IANA document.
- Chris Disspain suggested that it would be helpful if Bernard Turcotte could summarise the comments made to Kim's document in good time for the next Call. The Chair welcomed the suggestion and Bernard asked for the comments to be submitted before 28 January.

Action 03-02:

Bernard Turcotte to prepare a consolidated overview of comments on Kim Davies' document. To be most helpful comments should be submitted before 28 January.

Bill asked whether the overview that will be made by Becky and Bernard will
be integrated in the Delegation Process Draft. Becky replied that she would
rather see the overview as an input paper used in the work of developing the
Delegation Process Draft. Chris Disspain added that the question might be
easier to answer once the overview has been made and the comments to
Kim's document have been submitted.

5. IANA Procedures

• The Chair noted that this topic was already discussed in the previous point

6. Bill Semich Document

- The Chair asked Bill Semich to clarify the changes he made to draft topic paper. Bill replied that his efforts should be seen in light the light of his past as an editor. He further explained that the changes made to the document were more about making it more understandable than changing the substance and gave a few examples. The Chair noted that Bill's document was send out just prior to the call, so he did not expect any substantive comments on Bill's document. If members of the WG have comments they were requested to send them to the list.
- The group discussed whether or not a call on 28 January is necessary or if
 the discussion should continue on the list until 11 February. It was decided
 that Bart Boswinkel and Bernard Turcotte should inform the group within a
 few days whether a call on 28 would be useful from their perspective.

Action 03-03:

Bart Boswinkel and Bernard Turcotte to inform the Delegation and Redelegation Working Group members whether a call on 28 January would be useful.

7. Any Other Business

Bill Semich asked about the structure of the physical meetings in Nairobi. The
Chair replied that the arrangement will be the same as in Seoul, the group will
have two meetings, Monday and Thursday, on the same topic in order for as
many members as possible to participate. There will also be a workshop on
the Sunday on Delegation and Redelegation where anyone can raise issues
and questions on the topic.

Closure of the meeting