

## ccNSO Council Conference Call

31 July 2007

### **Participants:**

Becky Burr  
Lesley Cowley, .uk  
Chris Disspain, .au (Chair)  
Ondrej Filip, .cz  
Olivier Guillard, .fr  
Slobodan Markovic  
Patricio Poblete, .cl  
Bernie Turcotte, .ca  
Oscar Robles, .mx

### **Observers**

Don Hollander APTLD  
Peter Van Roste, CENTR  
Margarita Valdes, LACTLD

### **ICANN Staff**

Bart Boswinkel  
Gabiella Schitteck

## **1) Membership Applications**

### **1.1 Fiji**

An application for ccNSO membership has been received from .fj (Fiji). The IANA has confirmed that the application is in order.

15.01 IT WAS RESOLVED to approve Fiji (.fj) as a new ccNSO Member.

### **1.2 St Lucia**

An application for ccNSO membership has been received from Saint Lucia (.lc). The IANA has confirmed that the application is in order.

15.02 IT WAS RESOLVED to approve Saint Lucia (.lc) as a new ccNSO Member.

## **2) IDN ccTLDs – next steps following ICANN Board resolutions in San Juan:**

### **2.1 Answers to Issue Paper questions/overall policy approach**

The Chair noted that the ICANN board had passed a resolution during the San Juan meeting asking the ccNSO and other constituencies to provide it with responses to the published list of issues and questions that need to be addressed.

He further noted that there seemed to be consensus within the ccNSO that the only way to develop policy on this issue would be to launch a Policy Development Process (PDP).

*Bart Boswinkel* estimated that a full PDP would take at least 1 ½ - 2 years to complete, as its different steps would very much depend on ICANN meetings and possibly other face-to-face meetings especially so that the other relevant constituencies, such as the GAC, can be given an opportunity to be closely involved throughout the process.

Discussions were held on whether the launch of the PDP should be initiated by the ICANN Board, or the ccNSO Council itself. It was clarified that there would be no difference in terms of process if the PDP was initiated by the ccNSO, or the board.

*Lesley Cowley* suggested that the ccNSO should start the process itself, in order to save time. It would signal that the ccNSO is trying to make progress in a timely fashion, rather than making it more bureaucratic.

*Olivier Guillard* and *Bernie Turcotte* supported this view.

Bart Boswinkel was tasked to draft a Process Document, outlining which steps that needs to be taken and the estimated timing.

A formal resolution on launching the PDP will be discussed at the next Council Telephone Conference.

## **2.2 Consideration of interim approach**

The Chair noted the second ICANN Board resolution, asking the ccNSO and others to explore an interim approach of introducing ccTLD IDNs, whilst overall policy is developed.

He explained that the background was the APTLD paper, which also had been endorsed by CENTR. The paper made a suggestion to fast track the implementation of IDNs for countries that had a passionate and immediate need for IDN ccTLDs.

LACTLD members had, however, felt that established procedures should be used instead of ad-hoc mechanisms.

AFTLD has not yet expressed a position.

Given that the Board's request was to EXPLORE the possibility of an interim approach it was suggested that the ccNSO recommend to the Board the formation of a 'Committee' with the task to analyse the demand for ccTLD IDNs and see if some sort of interim release is a) necessary and b) feasible and c) (if yes to a) and b)) suggest a mechanism.

The Chair and Bart Boswinkel volunteered do some work on defining the set-up and mandate of the committee over the next weeks and would come back with recommendations in time for the next Council Telephone Conference.

*Patricio Poblete* asked whether the same result could be achieved by launching a short-form PDP on an interim approach rather than forming the suggested committee. He felt

that this could alleviate some of the concerns that some LACTLD members have concerning the use of ad-hoc methods.

The Chair thought that it could work, but the timing would need to be worked out first. He and Bart Boswinkel would come back to the issue for the next telephone conference.

### **2.3 APTLD Position Paper**

It was felt that the issue had been covered by the discussions on possible interim approach scenarios.

### **3) Regions Report**

*Bart Boswinkel* informed the Council that there are two reports for them to consider:

The first one was presented in San Juan and published for public comments. As no comments were received, the Regions Working Group would now like to submit it to the Council for approval.

The second report, which was posted to the councillors just before the meeting, is meant to be sent to the ICANN Board. It has only slight amendments, but has not been presented to the membership.

The Council decided that the Report to the ICANN Board is to be made public to members, with a 21-day possibility to comment upon.

If there are no substantive changes to it, it will be formally approved at the next Council meeting.

*Olivier Guillard* expressed some concern whether the report to the ICANN Board contains recommendations.

It was clarified that the report only contains one recommendation, suggesting that the ICANN Board initiates a task force in order to kick off their delayed review of the ICANN regions.

### **4) New ccNSO 'Discuss List'**

#### **4.1 Name of the list**

Patricio Poblete suggested calling the list *ccTLD Community List*.

The Chair will draft a charter for the list within the coming days.

#### **4.2 Who can join**

The Chair suggested that following persons can join the list:

- ccTLD Managers/ Admin Contact
- People on the ccTLD manager's staff approved by the ccTLD Manager/Admin Contact

- People on the ccTLD manager's Board
- Observers from Regional Organisations
- ICANN Staff by request and upon ccNSO Council agreement

It was also suggested that the names of the people on the email list should be published on an official list.

## **5) Simplified ccNSO Application Form**

The ccNSO Application Form has been redrafted to make it simpler and clearer. However, ICANN's lawyers still have to approve it, which means that some legal elements had to be kept.

The Councillors were asked to have a look at the form and to send any comments or thoughts to the list.

## **6) Survey on DNSSec**

*Gabriella Schitteck* informed the Council that a Survey on DNSSec was planned to be conducted over the next months. One action item from the previous Council meeting was to receive input from the community on what was done in respect to DNSSec. It was felt that it would be easiest to achieve this by launching a survey.

The Swedish Registry, who has already implemented DNSSec, will be asked for help in formulating the questions.

## **7) Root Zone Signing**

### **7.1 Input on Root Zone Signing to include IANA Working Group**

### **7.2 Request to IANA WG to work closely together with Tech WG on DNS sec**

The Council was informed that the IANA Working Group Chair will receive an email where the IANA Working Group is asked for help in providing input to the Council on Root Zone signing from a technical perspective.

## **8) Agenda and meeting structure for Los Angeles**

The agenda item was postponed for discussion during the next Council meeting.

## **9) IGF**

The Council was informed that a pre-IGF Advisory Group meeting will be held in Geneva in September. Several people from the community, including the Chair will attend. The IGF meeting itself will then be held in November in Rio de Janeiro, where one of the main sessions will be on Critical Internet Resources. No details of it are yet known, more information will be available after the September meeting.

## **10) Participation**

Bart has requested ICANN's regional liaisons to encourage participation in the Participation Working Group.

Gabi will send out an email to the Council, listing the volunteers so far and highlighting where the gaps are.

## **11) AOB**

The List of Actions had been sent to the Council prior to the meeting, for information purposes. If Councillors felt that any action item was missing, the ccNSO Secretariat should be contacted.

It was further noted that the next Council call will be held during the first week of September.

The Chair then closed the meeting.