ccNSO Council Meeting
 ICANN Meeting
 San Juan, Puerto Rico
 27 June 2007

 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. We'll start in a couple of minutes.
 Who is missing? Victor? Victor is not here. He's here, but he's not
here.
 Young Eum is not here at all. Mohamed is not here at all. Becky.
Where's Becky.
 Charles Sha'ban is -- no, five.
 Maybe we'll wait a little bit longer.
 While we're waiting, I just thought I would share with you that I was
attempting to contact Donna, who's in the GAC room, to ask her what
process we would use to send this report up to the board. Janis and I
need to actually write a letter, et cetera.
 So I IM'd her, "Are you there?" And there was no response, so I sent
a little message saying, "Asleep at your computer, I assume?"
 She was drafting the communique for the GAC, and of course her
computer was attached to the projector.
 [Laughter]
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So....
 Gabi, this version three or version two paper is the final version,
isn't it? For the one you sent this morning, without any preamble,
just the issues paper? Thanks.
 Hi, Victor. I think we're just missing Becky, if I'm not mistaken.
 We have me, Hiro. Young Eum is not here. Bernie, Bernie, Bernie, who
said he had a meeting that he would -- that should be finished, but if
it wasn't, I could do whatever I liked with his vote because he trusts
me.
 Bernie, Keith, Dotty, Victor, Paulos, Mohamed, Olivier, and the NomCom
is only Slobodan. Becky's missing.
 I think we should -- we will start.
 Welcome to the ccNSO Council meeting. We have an agenda. I'm going
to start with a nonagenda item and an apology. It has been pointed out
to me quite fairly by several people that this agenda has prepared 40
minutes ago. And I accept that. I apologize. It's partly a function
of the fact that often our agenda is driven by what happens in the
room. And it's also a function of the fact that recently, whereas we
used to have a sort of -- usually at least a three- or four-hour gap
between the end of the members' meeting and the start of the council
meeting, that because we've had so much to do, that seems to -- Ah,
Becky -- that seems to have disappeared. We will try to ensure at the
next personal meeting, we find a solution to that problem.
 The first item on the agenda is the joint ccNSO/GAC report.
 Now, the members yesterday -- it was clear consensus of the members
yesterday that this report could be sent to the board, and also the GAC
has resolved that it should be sent to the board.
 I'm a little bit unclear on what we actually do. I suspect what we do
is that Janis and I write a joint note that says, "Here is the report."
But I'll sort that out afterwards. But the purpose of this item is to
actually resolve that this report is accepted and sent to the board.
 Any discussion, comment, anything that anybody would like to say about
this particular issue?
 Okay.

Bart has actually drafted a suggested resolution. And so, Gabi, if you could maybe take a note of this, because it just needs a little bit of changing. But at its meeting -- the proposed resolution is:

At its meeting at the San Juan ICANN meeting on the 26th of June, 2007, members present endorsed the issues paper, selection of IDN TLDs associated with the ISO-3166 two-letter codes, a paper prepared by the joint ccNSO/GAC IDN working group.

The council resolves to adopt the issues paper as a ccNSO issues paper and submit it to the ICANN board jointly with the GAC as the GAC/ccNSO issues paper, titled, selection, et cetera.

So that's the proposed resolution. And it's -- if somebody would like to propose that as a resolution. Do I have a proposer, someone, anyone? Yes?

>> (inaudible).

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, Olivier, could we have the microphone -- sorry. Thank you.

Thanks, Don. That would be great. Sorry, Olivier.

>>OLIVIER GUILLARD: Sorry. Just to remind the procedure, if we adopt the paper, it will be sent to the member for a period of time? Or just --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. That's already happened. Because the paper -- the paper --

>>OLIVIER GUILLARD: Oh, so the period --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: We will send it to the GAC.

>>OLIVIER GUILLARD: If we adopt it, it will be sent to the board?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, that's right.

So can someone propose the resolution? Thank you, Hiro. Seconder? Thank you, Lesley.

All those in favor?

Anyone against. No, any abstentions? Sorry.

>> You may just send an e-mail that she is also opposed?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I apologize. Charles Sha'ban, who is not with us at this meeting, and Young Eum have both sent a note to say that they approve this particular item. So fantastic.

So thank you.

Okay. Now, the next item is the APTLD position paper.

Now, this is currently -- here we are.

This is currently a document, a position paper of APTLD, which has been formally sent to us. It has been endorsed by CENTR. And it has been endorsed by AFTLD.

It hasn't been?

>> (inaudible).

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's still under discussion. Okay. Fine. So AFTLD is still discussing it. And LACTLD is still discussing it. Fine.

At some point, hopefully, we will receive a note from the other region groups to tell us what they think. But in the meantime, what we agreed yesterday is that we would -- what the members agreed yesterday was that we would send this out to the members list, to our members list, for comment to see if we can head towards having this adopted as a ccNSO position paper. Okay?

So we need to resolve simply to do that, effectively. And we wouldn't be sending it anywhere, sending it to the board or anything, at this stage at all.

Olivier, you had your hand up.

Let me actually -- again, Bart has drafted some words.

At its meeting -- I should probably do the same as the other one.

At its meeting at the San Juan ICANN meeting on the 26th of June, ccTLD managers present were informed of the paper from the APTLD on top-level internationalized domains. The paper was also endorsed by the membership of CENTR.

The Africa -- the AFTLD and LACTLD regional organizations have still to determine their position.

The council resolves -- oh, now it's -- Theresa wants me. Look at that. I wonder what she's going to say.

Hang on. You are on the screen at the ccNSO Council meeting. Everyone says hello.

[Laughter]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Good.

The -- hi and bye.

The council resolves to pursue a ccNSO endorsement of the two-track approach, as suggested in the APTLD position paper. The paper is to be sent out for comments from the ccNSO membership.

I think that is probably sufficient for that.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Chris.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Lesley.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Can I just ask what the likely time scale would be for the other regional organizations to come to a determination on this? It just might be somewhat stronger from the ccNSO if we had gone through all of that process.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, of course.

Are you suggesting that we wouldn't send it out until we knew what the regions were saying or --

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Well, that depends on the time scale, which is why I was asking.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

Paulos, do you know -- can you give us any idea of how long APTLD is likely to take?

Can we -- what happened to the other mike?

Becky has it.

>>BECKY BURR: Mike goddess.

>>PAULOS NYIRENDA: I could propose to APTLD to have maybe a conference call within the next two weeks.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Excellent.

And, Patricio, for LACTLD?

>>PATRICIO POBLETE: We've just started discussing it, and won't be less than a week, because we are giving one week to the members to comment.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I understand.

>>PATRICIO POBLETE: And then we have --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: What should -- let's just say for the sake of discussion it's going to be three weeks.

Are we happy to wait for those three weeks and let the regions do their thing?

>>LESLEY COWLEY: That would be my suggestion. I think you'd end up with a much stronger position as a result.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Well, we are going to be having a council teleconference to discuss the regions' report. So we can -- in the next few weeks, so we can at that stage also reassess, if we need to, because the -- if the regions haven't come back to us.

Okay, well, in that case --

>> Acknowledge that we --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So the resolution should be, council resolves to pursue ccNSO endorsement of the two-track approached as suggested in

the APTLD issue paper. And we'll send the paper out for comments to the membership after hearing the positions of AFTLD and LACTLD.
 Can I have a proposer? Slobodan. Thank you. Seconder?
 Oscar, thank you.
 Excellent.
 Okay. I think I can leave this now.
 The next item is the appointment to the GAC -- to the ccNSO/GAC liaison working group. Now, the current situation is that the European region member of that was Bart Vastenburg, who is not involved anymore.
 So we -- the Europeans -- European members need to appoint a new member to that GAC liaison working group.
 Have you decided? Lesley, thank you.
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: Yes. The European ccNSO members unanimously propose Hilde Thunem of dot NM.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's marvelous. Congratulations, Hilde, you may live to regret it, but --
 So we need to -- as is the way with these things, we need to resolve to appoint Hilde to the GAC liaison working group. Yep, seconded. Excellent.
 Anybody -- everybody -- anybody against it? Everyone in favor? Yes. Excellent. Well done, Hilde.
 You need to liaise with -- Keith Davidson is the chair of that working group.
 That brings us to participation. And there are two headings under participation. One is user group, user group for the Web site. This is, again, just a formality that we need to tell Bart that it's okay for him to set up a ccNSO Web site user group. So, again, somebody propose that. An Ondrej. Thank you. Anyone against?
 The second one is more a matter of discussion, do we want, following on from today's members meeting, do we want to set up a working group -- a working group to work on participation issues? For clarity, the way that we do these things is, if we decide to do that, then we would appoint someone as the chair. We would then call for -- on the lists for volunteers. And probably we would say -- we would set a suggestion, like two people from each region or something. And once the group itself was formed, its first job would be to draft its charter, which would then be approved. And then they can get on with whatever it is that they need to do.
 Lesley, do you want to say anything about that?
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: Had I a number of people who weren't very happy speaking in public this afternoon but who have spoken to me since. So I think there is some interest, that there is also clearly some work to be done.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: On some of the ideas.
 I'd just like to make one point of clarification, though. Where I was coming from -- and I think where many people were coming from -- was about encouraging ccTLDs to participate in both regional groups as well as the ccNSO.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely.
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: Not one or the other.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.
 And it's not -- it's not a membership drive, as such. If people happen to want to join because they have participated, that is fine. But it's not about twisting people's arms to join. That's right?
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: Correct.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

>>PATRICIO POBLETE: But I suppose it won't be -- even though it's not a membership drive, we should also somehow state the case for joining. I mean, it's better if they join.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely. No, I absolutely agree. It's just that the -- and the charter will clear this up. There's nothing wrong with the charter saying looking at ways that are likely to increase membership. But the focus is on participation. And you do not need to be a member to participate.

I guess I'm open for discussion on whether we think a working group -- a participation working group is a good idea.

Anybody have any -- yes, Olivier.

>>OLIVIER GUILLARD: Just a question.

I think we had significant input from the community. Most of them were ccNSO members in the room, expressing why they became a ccNSO member. And that -- it's not very clear for me if the objective of the working group is to try to gather new members or if it's to try to have a better participation from the members who are already a member of the ccNSO.

So are we trying to have more members? Or are we trying to have more collaborative participation from those members that are already members of the ccNSO?

>>LESLEY COWLEY: I think you can break down participation into a number of headings. And we have people who are members who are in the room who don't currently participate. And, indeed, the method we used with IDN the other day actually was a very useful way of making addressing that issue going ahead.

There is also the issue about people who are not ccNSO members and don't participate at all. I think it breaks down into a number of different levels. But it was my assumption the issue was participation broadly.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So participation of every ccTLD, whether they're a member or not. And participation by becoming a member. All of them, everything, it's all included.

But you can't get any more clear than that, Olivier, until they've drafted their charter. So -- does anyone else have any comment?

So would somebody like to propose that we form a ccNSO participation working group?

>>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: I will.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Dotty.

>>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: I'd like to propose that we form a ccNSO working group for participation.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Dotty.

Seconded by anybody?

Thank you, Oscar.

Anyone against?

Everyone in favor. Excellent.

Now, next question, Lesley, who's going to chair it?

[Laughter]

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Would you chair it, Lesley?

>>LESLEY COWLEY: I'm happy to volunteer if anybody else would like.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Everyone --

>>LESLEY COWLEY: And I'm happy to participate.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It would be a bit difficult to make this happen and refuse to participate.

Does anyone object to that? Okay. Excellent.

So the -- that's the formal side of it. But what we will do is we will -- in the next day or so, we will send out a note, Gabi will send out a note saying this has been formed and looking for volunteers.
 I'm thinking -- Bart and I talked -- I'm thinking two people per region doesn't make it too unmanageable, ten?
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: That's fine.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: The interesting question is, do you have members only or do you have members and nonmembers?
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: I think it needs to be open to nonmembers.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Open to nonmembers. Very good. Excellent.
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: Also, make clear it's a working group.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, not a sitting around, doing nothing group.
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: Mm-hmm.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excellent. Oh, I'm sure you'll drive them to --
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: Distraction.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, to distraction.
 Excellent. Now, the next item on the agenda is the membership fee issue.
 This came up in the participation discussion.
 And it's something we can do now or not necessarily now, but something we can do soon if we choose to do so.
 >>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: May I ask a question?
 Can you be clear? That's a membership fee for the ccNSO body?
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Correct. The bylaws -- the ccNSO bylaws give us the -- give us the ability, if we choose to do so, to charge a membership fee. And the original reason for that was to -- because we assumed that we would be running our own secretariat and that that would therefore cost money.
 Now, currently, that is not the case.
 I have certainly been told by a number of people that the mention of the membership fee on the application form -- it doesn't matter that it's in the bylaws. It's more that it's in the application form -- causes an issue, and, in fact, one of the people who has applied for membership, which we're going to get to later, came to me first to check to make sure that -- how much would they have to pay. Not that they weren't prepared to pay, but how much would they have to pay. And were delighted to discover that they didn't have to pay anything.
 So it seems to me that what we could do is we could take the reference to the membership fee off the form and perhaps publish a note somewhere that says "Whilst the ccNSO has the ability to charge membership fees, it currently doesn't, and it currently doesn't have any intention to, and any change to that would be a matter for members to decide anyway."
 Lesley.
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: I'd just like to support that, but also add that maybe a commitment not charging a fee for a certain period of time.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: -- might be advisable.
 I note the recently posted ICANN budget has a 20% increase in funds from CC managers anyway. So maybe that will go some way towards --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: They live in hope.
 >>BECKY BURR: (inaudible).
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: What would you mean, we're going to hate American lawyers. Wait, you need the microphone.
 >>BECKY BURR: I think it would --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It should work.
 >>BECKY BURR: Is it working?
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hit it. Did someone turn it off or --

I think it's on the bottom.
 >>BECKY BURR: It's actually on.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Can we have the -- excuse me, could the sound man
please turn on the --
 >> We've got it.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, we've got it? Okay. They're too busy playing
on their computers.
 >>BECKY BURR: I -- now this one's not working.
 So I'll shout.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's you.
 >>BECKY BURR: It's me. Okay.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excuse me. Alex, we're having sound issues. Is
the -- is the roving mike turned on?
 >>BECKY BURR: It's on the bottom, but it's not working.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I mean on the --
 >> Hello, hello, hello.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Now you've got it.
 >>BECKY BURR: Could I just suggest that you leave -- that you put
that note that you're talking about on the application.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.
 >>BECKY BURR: So that everybody is clearly on notice that --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I agree.
 >>BECKY BURR: -- the CC has the ability to do it.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: I agree.
 What I suggest we do is that we -- it's rather a passive resolution
right now that we agree in the next week or so, we will work out the
rest of the wording on the form and work at how to structure the form
so that it's done properly. And then we can just pass it to the
council for approval and do it that way rather than actually decide
right now.
 But the principle that we take the reference out, I think is agreed.
 You are looking puzzled.
 >>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: I thought she just said we had you had put
it on there.
 >>BECKY BURR: What I said is you should put the note that you are
talking about, that there is no fee currently charged, but the council
has the -- or the --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Members have.
 >>BECKY BURR: Members have the ability to impose a fee --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, but --
 >>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: Subject is on --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: The subject is on there but what is not on there is
a clause that says "and I agree to pay a membership fee to the ccNSO."
Because you don't. There is no membership fee.
 Good. Excellent.
 The next one is a discussion point, which is the DNSsec.
 I just wanted to see whether the council felt that there was anything
that we should do following our discussions this afternoon in respect
to DNSsec, and I know that Ondrej wanted to say something.
 >>ONDREJ FILIP: The only point I wanted to raise, there is a clear
opinion of RIPE DNS working group, and I was wondering if also the
ccNSO community should have such opinions, such clear state, the
message that we would send to the ICANN board regarding the DNSsec
implementation or the root zone signings.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Anyone else?
 >>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: Well --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry. Stop for a second.

You didn't hear what Ondrej said?

Ondrej, would you say that again? We can't hear you. We can't hear each other.

Oh, that's not very good.

>>OSCAR ROBLES: Yeah, it's kind of --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It's because the speakers are over there.

>>ONDREJ FILIP: I just said we got a message from the RIPE DNS working group. They have a very clear position on the message they sent to ICANN board. And I was just thinking that we, as ccNSO community, should also do some statement on that. We should say at least if you want or we do not want to have the root signed and if we think this is urgent item or not.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Did you hear that?

>>LESLEY COWLEY: I did.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Dotty.

>>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: I think that it's inevitable that the root is going to be signed. And while we may not be prepared to make a statement about it right now, if we could put it to some technical people for a working group to at least be prepared to deal with it.

So it doesn't come up again as a new issue.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.

That's an interesting thought, because actually, we do have a technical committee, chaired by Eberhard, and we could simply ask the technical committee to provide us with some advice as to what we should actually be concerned about.

Is that a sensible idea?

Did you want to say something, Paulos?

You will need the mike.

>>PAULOS NYIRENDA: Yeah, I just wanted to mention that we also have the IANA working group, which can also look at this.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. There's both.

So I think what I would do is, I think the IANA working group is very specific to IANA. This is more of a general -- at the moment, it's more of a general question.

They can liaise with each other anyway, and Olivier and Eberhard do.

>>OLIVIER GUILLARD: Happy to do that.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

So Lesley.

>>LESLEY COWLEY: Yeah, I was just going to make the point that though it is called DNSsec and therefore sounds technical but the issue is actually a political one.

>>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: What did she say?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Although it's called DNSsec and it sounds technical, the issue is actually a political one.

Yes, it's a political one from the point of view of who is going to sign it. But it seems to me that it's a sort of technical one in the sense that then to advise us, at this stage, whether we care at this point from a technical point of view.

Because what seemed to be happening to me, anyway, is Jim Reid said look, we need to get this done. And Steve Crocker was saying it doesn't matter if we don't get it done.

Now, I suspect that Steve Crocker was saying it doesn't matter if we don't get it done because he doesn't want to deal with the issue of signing the root, but --

>>LESLEY COWLEY: I don't think that was entirely the case but Steve will speak for himself, I'm sure.

I think a number of registries, Nominet included, are developing
positions on this.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Right.
 >>LESLEY COWLEY: And the technical momentum to have something done is
there, certainly.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay.
 >>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC:Well, when the signing of the root first came
up, it didn't -- it wasn't a political issue. It came from the
technical people.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah, true. But it's become -- it's become a
political issue, I think.
 So are we okay, then, that we ask the technical committee to tell us
what they think our position should be in respect to signing the root?
 Okay. And we can go from there. Is that fair enough?
 So maybe we can have a session on this in Los Angeles and talk about
what it means for us and what we'd like to see happen.
 Because I know the Swedes, for example, are very keen to get --
because they have implemented it, they are very keen to get the root
signed. That may be where the pressure is coming from.
 Yes, Olivier.
 >>OLIVIER GUILLARD: Chris, will you kindly summary, what do we agree
on? Could you summary, please.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: We are simply agreeing to ask the technical
committee to advise us on what concerns we should have in respect to
signing the root zone, the DNSsec.
 But we will draft a note to the technical committee, which everyone
will have a look at, and we won't send it to the technical committee
until everyone is happy that the note addresses what it needs to
address.
 >>OLIVIER GUILLARD: As a suggestion, wouldn't it also be useful to
have an idea of where the CC community is with regard, individually,
with regard to DNSsec? And the members and CCs that are made tests and
that have had experience with DNSsec, so they know what the impact on
their -- of this new technology is. And if they have made experiments,
maybe it would be useful to have an idea.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely. But what I am saying is let's -- In
parallel.
 So what are you suggesting that we do?
 >>OLIVIER GUILLARD: Maybe to post a note and have some input from the
members about DNSsec. I don't know.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So we can do that.
 >>OLIVIER GUILLARD: I have no idea but --
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So two things, then. We will draft a net to the
technical committee and we will also draft a note to members asking
them to provide us with information.
 Paulos.
 >>PAULOS NYIRENDA: It's not absolutely clear to me who is going to
sign the Malawi zone. Are we saying this is already decided?
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Signing the who? The Malawi zone? You sign. Not
you personally, but --
 >>PAULOS NYIRENDA: Who is going to sign what?
 >>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: To be determined.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: We are actually talking about signing the root at
the moment. The root.
 Swedish ccTLD people have presumably signed dot SE, and Brazil and
Puerto Rico have signed dot BR and dot PR.
 Exactly.

So we will draft some stuff and get it out.

The next one is just regions. This is an administrative matter.

The current plan is that -- sorry.

The current plan is that when the public consultation period closes, we would have a meeting and resolve to send a report.

What Dave has suggested, and quite rightly, I think, is in fact what we should do is we should, at the close of the comment period, he should actually draft the document, the working group should actually draft the report that they want to go to the board, and then that is what we should be talking about and considering as a resolution, rather than actually -- Is that what your -- have I accurately said that, Dave?

>>DAVE ARCHBOLD: You may be confused. It may just be the draft report.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes. So what is going to happen, before the consultation finishes, before we do anything else, you are going to give us a draft port and we will sit down and talk about it. And that is just for clarity.

We have two more items. The first one is this idea of having an observers' list. And actually setting up a mailing list for the ccTLDs that are not members.

Does anyone want to talk about that?

>>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: Can you say who these people are?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: ccTLD managers who are not members.

The concept being currently we are relying on a series of different methodologies for getting information out, and if we have one place where people know they can go, that should work. And so the idea would be that Bart would send a note to every ccTLD manager, and then he would be accused of being a spammer, but he would send a note to every ccTLD manager, and saying the ccNSO has setup a ccNSO observers' list. As a ccTLD manager, you can be on this list. Would you like to be on it ?

Oscar.

>>OSCAR ROBLES: Would this be open only to ccTLDs?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, yes.

>>OSCAR ROBLES: Technical and administrative contact or --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

>>OSCAR ROBLES: -- who ever --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Nominated by the ccTLD.

So I'm not anticipating that you say only one person from a ccTLD can be on the list. But you put a point of contact. The point of contact says, "I want A, B, and C on the list." Okay?

>>PATRICIO POBLETE: This wouldn't be a read only list; right?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, no. This is a participation list.

>>PATRICIO POBLETE: This would be a list for the people that are not in the members' list; right?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: It would be -- Well, I would actually say it's everybody.

>>PATRICIO POBLETE: Everybody, okay.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah.

>>PATRICIO POBLETE: So probably service is not the right name.

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, probably not, and we need to think of a decent name for it.

You are looking puzzled again, Dotty.

>>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: These are members who are not members --

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: These are ccTLD managers -- what we need is a definitive list of ccTLD managers that we can use as a mailing list.

Currently, there isn't one, so --
>>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: Well --
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well what?
>>DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: It seems to me that we're tying in nicely with the membership drive.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, yes, it may very well do. But all we're actually talking about is setting up the list, so....
Anyone --
(sneeze).
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Bless you.
Anyone got a problem with that? Any more discussion?
Yes, Oscar, and Lesley.
>>OSCAR ROBLES: No problems, just maybe we should consider a revocation membership or servership or something like this?
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sorry, we should consider?
>>OSCAR ROBLES: Someone may have to tell us when a specific person should not be part of this list anymore.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, sure. Absolutely.
>>OSCAR ROBLES: Because of change of --
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Absolutely. And the ccTLD manager can do that.
Yes, Lesley.
>>LESLEY COWLEY: A question just to --
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: We have lost the....
Extraordinary. We seem to have lost the roving mike again.
It will be batteries.
>>LESLEY COWLEY: Just to correct Dotty's point, this isn't a membership drive.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No.
>>LESLEY COWLEY: And secondly, I'm a little bit confused. Is this the sort of son of the WWTLD list? Maybe that's a controversial point, but --
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. It's -- I'm not -- It's nothing to do with the WWTLD list. This is something us actually having a formal list for members and nonmembers, ccTLD managers, that we can send stuff to and know where it is going. Because right now, we actually don't know where it's going.
>>LESLEY COWLEY:Yeah.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: So that's the purpose of it. And it's a clear --
>>LESLEY COWLEY: Thank you.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Is that okay?
>>SLOBODAN MARKOVIC: (Inaudible)
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, it's a discussion list.
And what we will do, one of the current problems is trying to manage the discussion is really hard because it happens on so many lists and it makes life almost impossible, because some people have seen it, some people haven't seen it. And so -- okay.
>>PATRICIO POBLETE: But I mean, we as an organization will stop posting materials to the WWTLD list?
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: That's entirely a matter for you. Sorry, would we stop posting? No, no, I'm very happy to copy --
>>PATRICIO POBLETE: So the discussion --
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, the discussion list is the discussion list. If people want to discuss it on the WW list, that's a matter for them.
What I'm seeking to do is to find a definitive forum in which we can have mail discussions. And that's it, really. And we can do that by setting up our own list.
Paulos.

>>PAULOS NYIRENDA: Are we clear on who is an observer?
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. "observer" is the wrong word.
This is for all, all ccTLD managers who choose to be on this list.
So there will be some who will say no, I don't want to be on the list,
and that's fine. That's a matter for them. But this is going to be
the definitive list for ccTLD managers. That's it.
Okay?
I don't care what we call them. Call them Gary and Kevin.
Yes, Olivier.
>>OLIVIER GUILLARD: As I think about it, it would be a good idea,
maybe, to have a list of lists on the Web site
[Laughter]
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: All right --
>>OLIVIER GUILLARD: So everyone knows what's going on.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Let's have a list list. Absolutely. You are
absolutely right. We should have a note on the Web site saying, "This
is what this list is for," et cetera. But we will get there.
Finally, unless there is any other business, I have a number of
membership applications.
The first one, the first one is from Guyana. The University of
Guyana.
>>: Are they becoming a member?
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: And Kim Davies from IANA has confirmed that the
application is from the right people and that -- which is what we have
to do every time we get an application. Has confirmed it's from the
right organization and there are no problems and no issues with Guyana.
Sorry?
>>LESLEY COWLEY: It sounded like IANA.
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Oh, IANA, I'm so sorry
[Laughter]
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, we had an application -- well, actually -- did
it say Guyana in the trans- -- yeah, it did say Guyana. I say Guy-ana
but is it or Gee-ana? I don't know.
Interestingly enough, we had a problem with the application form Kent
Crispin from ICANN was testing the form and he said, "Well, I'm going
to have to send in an application," so he sent in an application for
the redelegation of Australia to himself, which was put in the Spam, I
think.
So that application can be approved by the council because it's in the
right format, and Kim has confirmed that there are no issues.
So may I have someone propose the approval of -- thank you, Lesley.
Seconder? Thank you, Ondrej.
All those in favor?
(hands raised).
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you all very much. Marvelous.
The next one is from Morocco.
It's from the national telecom regulatory agency, which is the
sponsoring organization, signed by one of their directors.
And again, in this particular case, Kim has confirmed that there are
no issues with that.
It's from the right place, and it's signed by an authorized party.
So again, maybe I could have a proposer -- Olivier. Slobodan, thank
you. And Victor, thank you.
So all those in favor?
(hands raised).
>>CHRIS DISSPAIN:Marvelous.

We have two more, just for noting because we can't deal with them today.
 One from St. Lucia.
 The problem is the ccTLD manager for St. Lucia is actually the University of Puerto Rico. The admin contact has put in the application but the admin contact is resident in St. Lucia, which is fine, but IANA advises that we, indeed, to get a formal note from the University of Puerto Rico to say that they are fine with that.
 We've tried to do that, but the guy is on holiday, so we should get that in a few days and then we should approve that application.
 It will enrich Puerto Rico.
 And finally we have had one from Fiji which I'm sure also is going to be fine. It's just it is not in a correct format yet so I can't take -- I have to get back to them and say you need to make some changes to the application form.
 >>PATRICIO POBLETE: Have we ever had an application come in the right form the first time?
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, never.
 Yes, we have, Patricio. But I think we will probably -- given that we are going to be changing the form to take some bits out, and I think we will also look at making the form easier to understand and deal with than it currently is.
 Is there any other business that anyone would like to raise?
 Yes, Paulos.
 >>PAULOS NYIRENDA: Just a question I received from members. Dot MU is pending in our list for the last three years. I don't know if there is a decision on it.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: No. It's in the wrong list. It should actually be in the "needs a new application" list instead of being in the pending list.
 So it needs to be -- This is the -- This is --
 >>PAULOS NYIRENDA: Mauritius.
 >>CHRIS DISSPAIN: Mauritius. We had an application from Mauritius from a very long time ago, and we sent a note back saying there's some corrections that needed to be made and I can't actually remember what they were now, but I can check that.
 And -- but it states -- instead of being moved into the new application needed list, it's remained in the pending list.
 So we need to get the Web site people to take that out of the that list and put it into the new application needed list. Okay?
 Anybody else? Any business at all?
 Okay. Bart and Gabi and I will draft now the members' report, which we'll send out to the list.
 The ccNSO public forum report is due to happen at 8:55 tomorrow morning.
 And I think that's all we have to do.
 Okay? Okay.
 So in that case, I will formally close the meeting of the ccNSO Council and thanks, everybody, for coming.
 That's it.
 (5:45 P.M.)