FOI - Significantly Interested Parties (SIP's)

In our Interim Report on “Support of Significantly Interested Parties for ccTLD Delegation and Redelegation” the Framework of Interpretation Working Group ('FOI-WG') defined 'Significantly Interested Parties' to include, without limitation: the government or territorial authority for the country or territory associated with the ccTLD and any other individuals, organizations, companies, associations, educational institutions or others that have a direct, material, substantial, legitimate and demonstrable interest in the operation of the ccTLD(s) including the incumbent manager. Interim Report, Section 7.1.1
GAC responded on 22 June 2012 to the Interim Report and the FOI-WG responded after due analysis in November...

GAC... citing Section 7.1.2.3. of the Interim Report, which calls on IANA to "develop, publish, and document its compliance with procedures for consideration of input from Stakeholders, taking into account the nature of the commenting party’s interest in the delegation, transfer (uncontested re-delegation), revocation, and operation of the ccTLD and the relevance, substance and weight of such input." In the view of the GAC, this could undermine the government’s "ultimate public policy authority," referenced in Section 4.1 of the GAC Principles...

Of course in the ordinary scheme of things where the "Administrative Contact resides in country, the government/public authority will have the practical ability, consistent with applicable law and due process requirements, to exercise ultimate public policy authority with respect to a ccTLD.

In those cases, and assuming that a prospective ccTLD manager possesses the requisite technical skills, the FOI-WG agreed that the IANA functions manager should not duplicate or second-guess processes and procedures established under applicable law for selecting a ccTLD manager, particularly where those processes and procedures take into account the “views of all local stakeholders” in accordance with Section 7.1 of the GAC Principals
In our Nov 2012 reply to GAC the FOI-WG noted that

The GAC Principals do however envisage that situations may arise where this is not the case... In such situations (and our letter listed several as clear examples, it was agreed that there is a need to determine whether or not the views of Stakeholders, including 'Significantly Interested Parties', have been considered.

And so to this end the FOI-WG proposed to the GAC and then actioned that it clarify the Interim Report recommendation that “IANA develop procedures for consideration of input from Stakeholders” by noting that the IANA functions manager should not duplicate or second-guess processes and procedures established under applicable law and due process requirements, particularly where those processes and procedures take into account the “views of all local stakeholders.”