

## ccNSO Council Call

14 December 2005

### **Participants**

Chris Disspain (Chair)  
Charles Sha'ban  
Donna Austin  
Dotty Sparks de Blanc  
Hirofumi Hotta  
Mohammed El Bashir  
Ondrej Filip  
Oscar Robles-Garay  
Patricio Poblete  
Paulos Nyirenda  
Slobodan Markovic  
Young Eum Lee

### **Apologies:**

Ali Drissa Badiel  
Bernard Turcotte  
Eduardo Santoyo  
Eva Frölich  
Fernando Espana  
Giovanni Seppia  
Olivier Guillard

### **1. Accountability Framework Guidelines**

CD—advised that one comment had been received as a result of the call for comments on the AFWG Interim Report. This was from Oscar Moreno who agreed with Eberhard Lisse's comments highlighted in the document.

CD suggested that the Council agree to publish the guidelines noting that they will be open to continuing improvements and suggestions.

DSB—asked does that mean we are approving them. [Yes] Will individual documents be framed between ICANN and managers around the guidelines?

CD advised that it was his understanding that they would be used as a starting point for discussions. Some cc managers may want more, some less, others are comfortable with what is in their now.

CD advised that in accordance with the Rules of the ccNSO, Item 6 Veto or Ratification of Council Decisions

- 6.1 The Council is required to publish to the appropriate ccNSO lists, all of its decisions and resolutions within five days of making them.
- 6.2 The Council decisions will not become operational until seven days have lapsed since publication
- 6.3 If during that seven day period, 10% or more of the members notify the Council Chair of their objection to the decision, it shall automatically trigger a membership vote to ratify or veto the decision.

On this basis, the Council can make a decision to publish them as guidelines, and if no members object then they become the guidelines 7 days later.

It was resolved that Council publish the AFWG Interim Report (attached) as guidelines for ccTLD managers to consider when discussing an accountability framework with ICANN. Further, it was acknowledged that the guidelines may change over time.

## **2. Secretariat**

CD—advised that he had sent out a document earlier today to everyone regarding the cost of secretariat as prepared by TWNIC. Taiwan agreed to provide the secretariat at a cost of approximately \$60,000 for a year: Travel \$18,000 for 2 members to attend 3 ICANN meetings; \$16,800 salary; \$13,500 training; \$2,000 auditing; \$3,200 website design; \$5000 promotion; \$1,500 other. The workshops may or may not be relevant to the ccNSO. The next step is to canvass members to see if there is enough willingness to pay for our own secretariat. Chris suggested that a note be sent to members regarding the cost and members be asked to indicate what sort of contribution they would be prepared to make.

DSB raised the question of whether there was a need for a Secretariat given the work currently being done by Donna to support the ccNSO.

CD said that historically the argument had been that if ICANN provided the support to the ccNSO then that would give them some control.

There was general agreement that things had moved on since then and that the current arrangement was working well. It was also noted that the gNSO is supported by Glen De Saint Géry from ICANN staff and no other secretariat service is provided.

It was noted that some members of the ccNSO would probably be prepared to pay the majority of the cost of the secretariat; however, a concern was raised that an additional membership fee cost could be considered by some as another barrier to joining the ccNSO.

It was agreed that one of the things that would be necessary is website maintenance and there was some discussion about software which could be used to provide a link between the ICANN ccNSO site and a separate ccNSO site. It was noted that the current ccNSO site hosted by TWNIC is not up-to-date. Input would be welcomed on this.

The costs identified for training would need to be unbundled and explained. While it was agreed that the training could be important, it is perhaps more appropriate to have this as a separate project.

It was agreed that CD would draft a note to members setting out the TWNIC proposal and explaining what the secretariat would do for the ccNSO and what is already being done by Donna. The note should also set out a suggested fee band structure and request members to confirm their willingness to proceed. CD will send the draft to the Council for comment and input.

### **3. Council elections—African region councillor stepping down**

Paulos advised that the African representatives would discuss this issue over the next couple of weeks and would provide advice to the Council on the way forward.

### **4. ICANN Board appointment—Demi Getschko's term**

It was noted in Vancouver that Demi's board term expires in June 2006 and whether to reappoint or hold an election was deferred for a later council meeting.

PP—advised that he had been discussing this issue with his Latin American colleagues and there is widespread support for asking Demi to continue for another full term. He also noted that Demi is willing to continue.

It was agreed that CD would send a note to all councillors advising that Demi has indicated a willingness to serve another term on the ICANN Board, and asking Council members if they supported the re-nomination of Demi to the Board position.

PP—asked what the process was if the Council agreed to this approach.

CD—advised that given any resolution is subject to objection by members, the council can pass a resolution re-appointing Demi which will only become active once the members objection period expires.

[Resolved to reappoint Demi Getschko to the ICANN Board for a further three year term]

## **5. IDNs**

HH agreed to send a note to the council list setting out the process for progressing the IDN issue with the gNSO over the next few weeks or so.

## **6. Nominating Committee**

CD—advised that Michael Silber has indicated a willingness to serve again as the ccNSO's appointment to the 2006 Nominating Committee. CD noted that most ACs and SOs have re-nominated the same persons as there are some benefits in taking knowledge forward from the previous year. On this basis it may make sense to reappoint Michael to the position.

There was general agreement to this approach and it was agreed that CD would send a note to all councillors seeking agreement to Michael's reappointment as the ccNSO representative on the 2006 Nominating Committee.

[Resolved to re-appoint Michael Silber as the ccNSO representative on the 2006 Nominating Committee]

Other Business

A chorus of Merry Christmas to all closed the meeting.

Meeting closed: 11.45