

**Framework of Interpretation Working  
Group (FOIWG) Work Plan V4.1**

## 1. Background and Introduction

The Delegation, Re-delegation and Retirement Working Group (“DRDWG”) was created by the Country Code Names Supporting Organisation (“ccNSO”) Council to advise whether it should launch a Policy Development Process (“PDP”) to recommend changes to the current policies for delegation, re-delegation and retirement of country code Top Level Domains (“ccTLDs”).

The DRDWG has conducted an in depth analysis of the current policies and guidelines used by the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (“IANA”) and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (“ICANN”), and measured all published information pertaining to ICANN decisions and procedures relating to the delegation, re-delegation and retirement of ccTLDs.

Based on its findings and after extensive public consultation the DRDWG recommends to the ccNSO Council:

Retirement of ccTLDs

**The DRDWG recommends the ccNSO Council undertakes a Policy Development Process to develop policies for the retirement of ccTLDs.**

Delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs

**The DRDWG recommends that, as a first step, the ccNSO Council undertakes the development of a "Framework of Interpretation" for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. This framework should provide a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board on interpretations of the current policies, guidelines and procedures relating to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.**

**The results of the use of such a Framework of Interpretation should be formally monitored and evaluated by the ccNSO Council after a pre-determined period. If the results of this evaluation indicate that the Framework of Interpretation failed to provide logical and predictable outcomes in ICANN decision making, the ccNSO Council should then launch PDPs on the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.**

The ccNSO Council, at the March 2011 ICANN meeting, accepted the recommendations of the DRDWG as well as the charter for the creation of the FOIWG.

This work plan seeks to organize and schedule the work of the FOIWG.

2.

## Objective and scope

2.1. The objective of the Working Group is to develop and propose a "Framework of Interpretation" for the delegation and re delegation of ccTLDs. This framework should provide a clear guide to IANA and the ICANN Board on interpretations of the current Policy Statements.

### 2.2. Scope

Based on and taking into account the findings of and issues identified by the DRD WG as recorded in its Final Reports, the Working Group is tasked to develop interpretations of the Policy Statements to resolve the issues identified by the DRD WG in a consistent, and coherent manner.

Any proposal to amend, update or change the Policy Statements is outside the scope of this working group.

The IANA functions contract between the US Government and ICANN, including any contract implementation issues or procedures relating to it, are outside the scope of this working group.

3.

## Elements and issues identified by the DRDWG

### 3.1. Relevance for FOIWG of policy and procedure statements identified in the work of the DRDWG (by date)

The DRDWG identified a number of policy and procedure statements which have been applied to ccTLDs.

This section will review the policy and procedure statements identified by the DRDWG to determine which ones should be interpreted by the FOIWG when considering recurring or significant interpretation issues.

Note: It is unclear what rules apply to legacy ccTLDs (where the current delegee was selected prior to ICANN being created) which do not have any formalized relationship with ICANN and are not members of the CCNSO.

#### 3.1.1. RFC1591 (March 1994)

- 3.1.1.1. RFC1591 was published as part of the relevant RFC process in 1994.
- 3.1.1.2. RFC1591 is still supported by a majority of the ccTLD community as the policy basis for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.
- 3.1.1.3. ICP1 formally refers to RFC1591 as being a statement of policy for the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.
- 3.1.1.4. Recommendation: The FOIWG should include RFC1591 in the policy and process documents it interprets to generate recommendations.

#### 3.1.2. News Memo #1 (October 1997)

- 3.1.2.1. Applicable section: *“An additional factor has become very important since RFC 1591 was written: the desires of the government of the country. The IANA*

*takes the desires of the government of the country very seriously, and will take them as a major consideration in any transition discussion.*

*On a few occasions, the parties involved have not been able to reach an agreement and the IANA has been required to resolve the matter. This is usually a long drawn out process, leaving at least one party unhappy, so it is far better when the parties can reach an agreement among themselves.”*

- 3.1.2.2. Not approved by any process including any policy process at ICANN.
- 3.1.2.3. Not recognized by any significant number of ccTLDs
- 3.1.2.4. Policy elements contained in this document are also included in the GAC Principles 2005.
- 3.1.2.5. Recommendation: The FOIWG should not include News Memo #1 in the policy and process documents it interprets to generate recommendations.

### 3.1.3. ICP1 (May 1999)

3.1.3.1. From ICP1 : *“This document is a summary of current practices of the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority (IANA) in administering RFC 1591, which includes the guidance contained in ccTLD News Memo #1 dated October 23, 1997. It DOES NOT reflect any changes in policy affecting the administration of DNS delegations.”*

3.1.3.2. The DRDWG final report noted that:

- 3.1.3.2.1. ICP1 did contain significant changes in policy.
- 3.1.3.2.2. These policy changes were never approved
- 3.1.3.2.3. ICP1 has never been supported by the ccTLD community.
- 3.1.3.2.4. ICP1 has several elements which are now out-dated.

3.1.3.3. If the ICANN Board were to consider resolving to adopt ICP1, it would

have to request that the ccNSO complete a PDP for this. This would not be a useful or desirable process for the ccTLD community.

3.1.3.4. Given this situation it is probably best to take ICP1 at its face value where it states that it contains no policy changes vs RFC1591.

3.1.3.5. Recommendation: The FOIWG should not include ICP1 in the policy and process documents it interprets to generate recommendations.

3.1.3.6. ICP1 not being considered as a policy reference for the work of FOIWG does not imply that it will not be considered as an interpretation of those policies that do apply. As such ICP1 will be considered by the FOIWG as it develops its interpretations as per its charter.

#### 3.1.4. Sponsorship agreement decision by the ICANN Board (September 2000)

3.1.4.1. The ccNSO's DRDWG final report has recommended that the ccNSO council request that the ICANN Board officially remove this requirement given it has not been applied for a number of years.

3.1.4.2. Recommendation: The FOIWG should not include the Sponsorship agreement decision in the policy and process documents it interprets to generate recommendations.

#### 3.1.5. ISO3166-1 Exceptionally Reserved List decision by the ICANN Board (September 2000).

3.1.5.1. The ccNSO's DRDWG Final report on the delegation of ccTLDs noted that: "This policy decision failed to meet all of the requirements for policy development in effect at the time."

3.1.5.2. This decision has only been used once to approve the delegation of the .eu ccTLD.

3.1.5.3. At the time of the delegation of the .eu ccTLD there were several ccTLD 2 letter codes which were not on the standard ISO3166-1 list.

3.1.5.4. The delegation of IDN ccTLDs under the Fast Track Process has significantly increased the opportunities for the registration of ccTLDs beyond

the ISO3166-1 list.

- 3.1.5.5. There was never any significant opposition to this IDN ccTLD policy from the ccTLD community with the exception of not being consulted before its adoption.
  - 3.1.5.6. The ccTLD community has no significant and outstanding issues related to this policy.
  - 3.1.5.7. It is unclear what the FOI could contribute to this policy statement.
  - 3.1.5.8. Recommendation: The FOIWG should exclude ISO3166-1 Exceptionally Reserved List decision in the policy and process documents it interprets to generate recommendations.
- 3.1.6. No longer allowing individuals as delegees for ccTLDs (September 2001).
- 3.1.6.1. The ccNSO's DRDWG Final report on the delegation of ccTLDs noted that: "This policy decision failed to meet some of the requirements for policy development in effect at the time."
  - 3.1.6.2. There was never any significant opposition to this policy from the ccTLD community.
  - 3.1.6.3. The ccTLD community has no significant and outstanding issues related to this policy.
  - 3.1.6.4. It is unclear what the FOI could contribute to this policy statement.
  - 3.1.6.5. Recommendation: The FOIWG should not include No longer allowing individuals as delegees decision in the policy and process documents it interprets to generate recommendations.
- 3.1.7. GAC Principles 2005
- 3.1.7.1. The GAC Principles do not constitute formal ICANN policy, but provide advice to the ICANN Board regarding the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs. The GAC has stated that it expects the ICANN Board to follow GAC advice in its decisions, or to formally explain to the GAC why they have not followed that advice.

3.1.7.2. Recommendation: The FOIWG should include the GAC Principles 2005 in the policy and process documents it interprets to generate recommendations.

### 3.1.8. Fast Track for IDN ccTLDs (October 2010)

3.1.8.1. IDN ccTLDs are the subject of a ccNSO PDP and as such the FOIWG should not include this is the development of the FOI.

3.1.8.2. Recommendation: The FOIWG should not include Fast Track for IDN ccTLDs decision in the policy and process documents it interprets to generate recommendations.

### 3.1.9. Summary of recommendations

3.1.9.1. Policy and process documentation recommended for interpretation in the FOI:

3.1.9.1.1. RFC1591

3.1.9.1.2. GAC Principles 2005

3.1.9.2. Policy and process documentation not recommended for interpretation in the FOI:

3.1.9.2.1. News Memo #1

3.1.9.2.2. ICP1

3.1.9.2.3. Sponsorship agreement decision by the ICANN Board

3.1.9.2.4. ISO3166-1 Exceptionally Reserved List decision by the ICANN Board

3.1.9.2.5. No longer allowing individuals as delegees for ccTLDs

#### 3.1.9.2.6. Fast Track for IDN ccTLDs

3.2. Issues identified by the ccNSO DRDWG that require interpretation by the FOIWG.

3.2.1. Terminology surrounding delegations and re-delegations

3.2.1.1. This issue was only raised in the DRDWG Final report on Delegations.

3.2.1.1.1. From section 3.6.1 of the Final Report on Delegations we have: “The terminology for the entity to who a ccTLD is delegated has evolved over time from Manager to Sponsoring Organisation without any input from the ccTLD community, probably to line up with gTLD terminology. The term Sponsoring Organisation seems inadequate to many. This and any other naming issues, potentially including role accounts, should be reviewed in order to ensure they properly reflect the situation.”

3.2.1.2. Related topics and issues

3.2.1.2.1. Most other topics and issues to be considered by the FOIWG will be affected by the recommendations regarding this issue.

3.2.1.2.2. Specifically the term to be used for “Interested Party” will be affected by the recommendations regarding this issue.

3.2.1.3. Objectives

3.2.1.3.1. Identify all the terms that have been used to describe the parties involved in delegations or re-delegations (such as delegee, manager, administrative contact, technical contact, sponsoring organisation, LIC) and to which party it refers to from a functional point of view.

3.2.1.3.2. Produce a list of unique identifiers for all these parties identified.

### 3.2.2. Interpretation of consent

3.2.2.1. The Final Report of the DRDWG identified the following issues with this topic:

3.2.2.1.1. Interpretation of consent (communication that the transfer is agreed), by IANA's own admission, is highly variable depending on a number of factors including culture and the immediate physical security of the ccTLD manager.

3.2.2.1.2. This includes interpreting the failure to reply to an IANA email as consent in certain cases of re-delegations where the current manager has stated he does not support the redelegation request.

#### 3.2.2.2. Related topics and issues

3.2.2.2.1. Definition of an active administrative contact and procedures relating to the retirement of a ccTLD administrative contact.

3.2.2.2.2. The DRDWG noted that it believed that the concepts of consent (voluntary, involuntary and informed) need to be further explored and clarified during the development of the "Framework of Interpretation".

#### 3.2.2.3. Proposed Objectives

3.2.2.3.1. Establish a definition of consent.

3.2.2.3.2. Propose mechanisms for providing consent as defined (possibly different for delegation and re-delegation).

### 3.2.3. Definition of an active administrative contact and procedures relating to the retirement of a ccTLD administrative contact

3.2.3.1. The Final Report of the DRDWG, Section B3, identified the following issues with this topic:

3.2.3.1.1. There are no published rules which define how IANA can determine if an administrative contact is no longer valid and the documentation indicates IANA takes significant latitude in making such a determination.

3.2.3.1.2. Additionally there are no published rules as to what IANA should do once it has determined that the administrative contact is no longer valid especially with respect to a re-delegation request.

3.2.3.1.3. There are a number of documented cases where the IANA report simply states that the administrative contact is no longer valid without providing any evidence to support this affirmation. Once IANA has affirmed that an administrative contact is no longer valid IANA seems to no longer be bound to seek any consent from the registry with respect to re-delegation requests.

3.2.3.2. Related topics and issues

3.2.3.2.1. The recommendations for this topic will probably impact the Terminology topic.

3.2.3.2.2. The recommendations for this topic will probably impact the IANA Reports topic.

3.2.3.3. Objectives

3.2.3.3.1. Review the requirements for points of contact for delegation and re-delegation.

3.2.3.3.2. Define points of contact for delegations and re-delegations.

3.2.3.3.3. Define procedures for the management of points of contact.

3.2.3.3.3.1. This should include procedures and responsibilities of the

delegee and IANA to ensure points of contact are valid and functional.

3.2.3.3.3.2. This should include procedures for IANA when it determines that a point of contact is no longer valid or functional.

3.2.4. Interested Parties (or Local Internet Community) support for delegations and re-delegations.

3.2.4.1. The Final Report of the DRDWG identified the following issues with this topic:

3.2.4.1.1. Although ICANN has used a number of different terms as a substitute for “Interested Parties” over time (without embarking on any formal consultation or seeking advice from the stakeholder community) the implied definition of these terms seemed to have remained relatively clear until the recent transition to the term “Public Interest” (IANA Report on the re-delegation of .co in November 2009).

3.2.4.1.2. An analysis of all approved delegation and re-delegation requests published by ICANN indicates a significant degree of inconsistency in applying the “Interested Parties” requirement. This includes the approval of a number delegation and re-delegation requests which have no documentation indicating any support by Interested Parties.

3.2.4.1.3. The analysis of all delegation and re-delegation requests approved by ICANN has also identified a clear trend that the “Interested Parties” requirement evolved to “Interested Parties and Government Support” and then further evolved to “Government Support, and Community Support, if available”. There have been no documented changes to the relevant policies and guidelines, and no formal consultation or advice sought from the affected stakeholder community.

3.2.4.2. Related Topics and issues

3.2.4.2.1. Clear relation to the terminology topic and issues.

### 3.2.4.3. Objectives

3.2.4.3.1. Clarify the terminology as per the recommendations from the topic and issues on terminology.

3.2.4.3.2. Define what constitutes meeting the requirement for interested parties for a delegation or re-delegation application.

### 3.2.5. Unconsented re-delegations.

3.2.5.1. The Final Report of the DRDWG identified the following issues with this topic:

3.2.5.1.1. No procedure for re-delegation of a ccTLD without the consent of the incumbent operator.

3.2.5.1.1.1. Both of these documents (RFC1591 and ICP1) discuss the revocation of a delegation by IANA, for cause, followed by a delegation to a new operator.

### 3.2.5.2. Related topics and issues

3.2.5.2.1. Topic and issues on the definition of consent

3.2.5.2.2. Topic and issues on the definition of an active administrative contact and procedures relating to the retirement of a ccTLD administrative contact

3.2.5.2.3. Topic and issues on the Interested Parties (or Local Internet Community) support for delegations and re-delegations.

### 3.2.5.3. Objectives

- 3.2.5.3.1. Define if the rules allow for an un-consented re-delegation of a ccTLD or simply a revocation followed by a delegation.
- 3.2.5.3.2. Define the conditions under which a revocation can occur.
- 3.2.5.3.3. Define the conditions under which an un-consented re-delegation can occur (if applicable).
- 3.2.5.3.4. Define guidelines to insure that requirements are met.

### 3.2.6. IANA vs. applicable law and legislation for a ccTLD

- 3.2.6.1. This issue was only a consideration in the .iq re-delegation report by IANA and was not raised in the final report of the DRDWG.
- 3.2.6.2. The issue of applicable law vs. the delegee and its representatives will be considered under the topics of un-consented re-delegations and the definition of an active administrative contact.
- 3.2.6.3. Given the issue associated with this topic should be addressed by the FOIWG in their recommendations on other topics the FOIWG should decide if it needs to consider this issue after the related issues have been completed.

### 3.2.7. IANA Reports

- 3.2.7.1. The Final Report of the DRDWG identified the following issues with this topic:
  - 3.2.7.1.1. A high degree of variability in the information provided to support any specific recommendation.
  - 3.2.7.1.2. Any lack of information supporting a decision is not consistently noted or explained.
  - 3.2.7.1.3. The format and type of information contained in the public IANA reports has changed frequently, sometimes significantly, without any consultation with, or notice to, the stakeholder community.

3.2.7.2. This should be the last element to be completed by the FOIWG as it will have to consider the recommendations for all other issues developed by the FOIWG.

3.2.7.3. Objectives

3.2.7.3.1. Define the elements which the public version of an IANA report must contain for a delegation, re-delegation and un-consented re-delegation.

3.2.8. Order or processing

3.2.8.1. Terminology surrounding delegations and re-delegations

3.2.8.2. Definition of consent

3.2.8.3. Definition of an active administrative contact and procedures relating to the retirement of a ccTLD administrative contact

3.2.8.4. Interested Parties (or Local Internet Community) support for delegations and re-delegations.

3.2.8.5. Unconsented re-delegations

3.2.8.6. IANA vs. applicable law and legislation for a ccTLD (if applicable)

3.2.8.7. IANA Reports

4. Methodology

- 4.1. Deal with topics in a serial fashion
- 4.2. Staff prepare documents which are commented by the wg.
- 4.3. Perform public consultations for at least 30 days on draft recommendations.
- 4.4. Publish a progress report at least 2 weeks prior to each ICANN meeting.
- 4.5. Present topic recommendations for approval at least two weeks prior to an ICANN meeting.

5.

Schedule based on ICANN meetings (all dates are Fridays):

5.1. Prior to Singapore meeting June 19<sup>th</sup>, 2011

5.1.1. Hold at least one teleconference of the wg prior to the ICANN meeting

5.1.2. Obtain approval for the FOIWG Work Plan

5.1.3. Begin work on the Terminology Topic.

5.2. Singapore - week of June 19<sup>th</sup> 2011

5.2.1. Half-day meeting of the FOIWG on Thursday June 23<sup>rd</sup> PM, to consider the following topics:

5.2.1.1. Work Plan (if not yet approved).

5.2.1.2. Terminology topic.

5.2.1.3. Consent topic.

5.2.1.4. Valid administrative contact topic.

5.3. Between Singapore and Senegal meetings (June 24<sup>th</sup> 2011 to October 21<sup>st</sup>, 2011 – 17 weeks)

5.3.1. Schedule of meetings for this period will be determined in Singapore and will be a mix of weekly and bi-weekly meetings.

5.3.2. Terminology

5.3.2.1. Complete work on Terminology topic by July 22<sup>th</sup>. 2011

- 5.3.2.2. Publish Terminology consultation on August 5<sup>th</sup>, 2011 (duration = 4 weeks)
- 5.3.2.3. Begin preparing recommendations for publication September 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2011
- 5.3.2.4. Publish recommendations by September 30<sup>th</sup>, 2011 (3 weeks prior to Senegal meeting).
- 5.3.2.5. Publish results of public consultation.
- 5.3.2.6. Prepare presentation on recommendations for ccNSO and GAC.
  
- 5.3.3. Continue work on Consent Topic
- 5.3.4. Continue work on Valid Administrative Contact Topic
- 5.3.5. Prepare and publish progress report by September 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2011 (3 weeks prior to Senegal meeting).
- 5.3.6. Prepare face to face meeting of the FOIWG
  
- 5.4. Senegal – week of October 23<sup>rd</sup> 2011- Recommendations on Terminology
  - 5.4.1. Presentations on Terminology Recommendations and Progress Report
  - 5.4.2. Half-day meeting of the FOIWG on Thursday October 27<sup>th</sup>, 2011 to consider the following topics:
    - 5.4.2.1. Consent topic.
    - 5.4.2.2. Valid administrative contact topic.
    - 5.4.2.3. Interested Parties Topic
    - 5.4.2.4. Un-consented re-delegations Topic
  
- 5.5. Between Senegal and LAC meetings (October 28<sup>th</sup> 2011 to March 2<sup>nd</sup> – 19 weeks)

5.5.1. Schedule of meetings for this period will be determined at the Senegal meeting and will be a mix of weekly and bi-weekly meetings.

5.5.2. Consent

5.5.2.1. Complete work on Terminology topic by November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011

5.5.2.2. Publish public consultation on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011 (duration = 4 weeks)

5.5.2.3. Begin preparing recommendations for publication January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012

5.5.2.4. Publish recommendations by February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).

5.5.2.5. Publish results of public consultation.

5.5.2.6. Prepare presentation on recommendations for ccNSO and GAC.

5.5.3. Valid Administrative Contact

5.5.3.1. Complete work on Terminology topic by November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011

5.5.3.2. Publish public consultation on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2011 (duration = 4 weeks)

5.5.3.3. Begin preparing recommendations for publication January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2012

5.5.3.4. Publish recommendations by February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).

5.5.3.5. Publish results of public consultation.

5.5.3.6. Prepare presentation on recommendations for ccNSO and GAC.

5.5.4. Continue work on Interested Parties Topic

5.5.5. Continue work on Un-consented re-delegations Topic.

5.5.6. Prepare and publish progress report by February 17<sup>th</sup>, 2011 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).

5.5.7. Prepare face to face meeting of the FOIWG at the next meeting.

5.6. LAC – week of March 11<sup>th</sup> 2012- (Recommendations on Consent and Valid Administrative Contact)

5.6.1. Presentations on Consent, Valid Administrative Contact and the Progress Report

5.6.2. Half-day meeting of the FOIWG on Thursday March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012 to consider the following topics:

5.6.2.1. Interested Parties Topic

5.6.2.2. Un-consented re-delegations Topic

5.7. Between LAC and EU meetings (March 16<sup>th</sup> 2012 to June 22<sup>nd</sup> 2012 – 14 weeks)

5.7.1. Schedule of meetings for this period will be determined at LAC meeting and will be a mix of weekly and bi-weekly meetings.

5.7.2. Interested Parties

5.7.2.1. Complete work by March 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012

5.7.2.2. Publish public consultation on April 6<sup>th</sup>, 2012 (duration = 4 weeks)

5.7.2.3. Begin preparing recommendations for publication May 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012

5.7.2.4. Publish recommendations by June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).

5.7.2.5. Publish results of public consultation.

5.7.2.6. Prepare presentation on recommendations for ccNSO and GAC.

- 5.7.3. Continue work on Un-consented re-delegations Topic.
- 5.7.4. Begin work on IANA Reports Topic on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012.
- 5.7.5. Prepare and publish progress report by June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).
- 5.7.6. Prepare face to face meeting of the FOIWG at the next meeting.
  
- 5.8. EU – week of 24 June 2012 – (Interested Parties)
  - 5.8.1. Presentations on Interested Parties and the Progress Report
  - 5.8.2. Half-day meeting of the FOIWG on Thursday June 28<sup>th</sup>, 2012 to consider the following topics:
    - 5.8.2.1. Un-consented re-delegations Topic
    - 5.8.2.2. IANA Reports Topic
  
- 5.9. Between EU and Toronto meetings (June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012 to October 12<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – 15 weeks)
  - 5.9.1. Schedule of meetings for this period will be determined at EU meeting and will be a mix of weekly and bi-weekly meetings.
  - 5.9.2. Un-consented re-delegations
    - 5.9.2.1. Complete work by June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2012
    - 5.9.2.2. Publish public consultation on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2012 (duration = 4 weeks)
    - 5.9.2.3. Begin preparing recommendations for publication August 24<sup>th</sup>, 2012

- 5.9.2.4. Publish recommendations by September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).
- 5.9.2.5. Publish results of public consultation.
- 5.9.2.6. Prepare presentation on recommendations for ccNSO and GAC.
  
- 5.9.3. Continue work on IANA Reports Topic.
  
- 5.9.4. Prepare and publish progress report by September 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).
- 5.9.5. Prepare face to face meeting of the FOIWG at the next meeting.
  
- 5.10. Toronto – week of October 14<sup>th</sup> 2012 – (Un-consented re-delegations)
  - 5.10.1. Presentations on Un-consented re-delegations and the Progress Report
  - 5.10.2. Half-day meeting of the FOIWG on Thursday October 18<sup>th</sup> 2012 to consider the following topics:
    - 5.10.2.1. IANA Reports Topic
    - 5.10.2.2. Final Report of the FOIWG
  
- 5.11. Between Toronto and AP meetings (October 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012 to April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013 – 24 weeks)
  - 5.11.1. Schedule of meetings for this period will be determined at the Toronto meeting and will be a mix of weekly and bi-weekly meetings.
  - 5.11.2. IANA Reports

- 5.11.2.1. Complete work by December 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012
- 5.11.2.2. Publish public consultation on January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013 (duration = 4 weeks)
- 5.11.2.3. Begin preparing recommendations for publication February 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013.
- 5.11.2.4. Publish recommendations by March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).
- 5.11.2.5. Publish results of public consultation.
- 5.11.2.6. Prepare presentation on recommendations for ccNSO and GAC.
  
- 5.11.3. Continue work on Final Report of the FOIWG.
- 5.11.4. Prepare and publish progress report by March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).
- 5.11.5. Prepare face to face meeting of the FOIWG at the next meeting.
  
- 5.12. AP – week of 7 April 2013 – (IANA Reports)
  - 5.12.1. Presentations on IANA Reports and the Progress Report
  - 5.12.2. Half-day meeting of the FOIWG on Thursday April 11<sup>th</sup> 2013 to consider the following topic:
    - 5.12.2.1. Final Report of the FOIWG
  
- 5.13. Between AP and AF meetings (April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 to July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013 – 13 weeks)
  - 5.13.1. Schedule of meetings for this period will be determined at the AP meeting and will be a mix of weekly and bi-weekly meetings.
  - 5.13.2. Final Report of the FOIWG

- 5.13.2.1. Complete work by April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2013
  - 5.13.2.2. Publish public consultation on April 26<sup>th</sup>, 2013 (duration = 4 weeks)
  - 5.13.2.3. Begin preparing recommendations for publication May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2013.
  - 5.13.2.4. Publish recommendations by June 21<sup>st</sup>, 2013 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).
  - 5.13.2.5. Publish results of public consultation.
  - 5.13.2.6. Prepare presentation of Final Report for ccNSO and GAC.
- 
- 5.13.3. Prepare and publish progress report by March 15<sup>th</sup>, 2013 (3 weeks prior to next meeting).
  - 5.13.4. Prepare face to face meeting of the FOIWG at the next meeting.
- 
- 5.14. AF – week of 12 July 2013 – (FOIWG Final Report)
    - 5.14.1. Presentations of FOIWG Final Report and Progress Report
    - 5.14.2. Final meeting of the FOIWG