

ccNSO Council Call

6 June 2006

UTC 12.00 Noon

Participants

Chris Disspain (Chair)
Patricio Poblete
Eva Frölich
Oscar Robles-Garay
Bart Vastenburger
Dotty Sparks de Banc
Bernard Turcotte
Charles Sha'ban
Slobodan Markovic
Paulos Nyirenda
Mohammed El Bashir
Hirofumi Hotta
Donna Austin

Apologies:

Keith Drazek
Eduardo Santoyo
Victor Ciza
Olivier Guillard
Young Eum Lee
Ondrej Filip

1. ccNSO/GAC Working Group

CD—Bart as far as I'm concerned nothing has happened [yes]. This is partly to do with the GAC reps on our working group having moved on so the GAC is struggling to reform this part of their working group. I am concerned that there may be an unwillingness by the GAC to discuss certain issues. I will talk to Sharil as the Chair of the GAC and see if we can resolve the issue.

BV—can we have a short call between Chris and the working group so we can get a better sense of what's going on and how we can get our own act together.

CD—the ccNSO members of the working group are Oscar, Keith, Bart, Paulos and ..

BV—would be useful if we could try to set up a half an hour to get up to speed again.

CD—Bart can you send a note to the working group [yes].

2. Budget WG

EF—recapped on the presentation from Theresa and Kurt in Wellington. After this we had a brief discussion about what elements are of benefit to ccs and what is not. Decided to send out questionnaire which we did on 20 April with a deadline of 11 May, we received 22 answers, with some good comments. That's where we are now. Hope to get more info from Theresa and Kurt, but haven't been able to find time to get the working group together to go forward.

CD—suggestion based on an email from Dotty. We've done a survey and had 22 responses, which is not bad. It seems to me that what we need to do in Marrakesh is throw a number out to the world as a starting point and start having a discussion about whether this is acceptable and work out how we get this number. I think this is what you're pushing for Dotty.

DS—absolutely.

EF—we have the information from the ICANN budget.

CD—is that about \$4m? Given there are three members of the WG on the call, would you be prepared to fix between you a starting point number, in consultation with Kurt, and run a session based on that number?

DS—you know what I think we need to do, we need to get to our end point number which is a ramp up over how many years (3 years) we need to call a spade a spade and state that in 3 years it will be x amount, but we are going to gradually get to this point, with this amount in year 1, year 2 and get to final point. That's what ICANN suggested and we don't have any other better suggestion.

PP—there is something else now, we know what DENIC is prepared to pay which provides a reference number.

CD—correct but this comes with a caveat. That number, which is \$85,000 US, is a number that has been characterised as a voluntary contribution pending resolution of how to Bernie has done some work and if you take the number of names under the management of .de and the amount they charge per name their contribution works out around .004% which would put Canada's contribution around \$2,000

BV—questioned the methodology applied?

CD—if you take number of names under management and what they charge, the number they pay and the % of that number. The classic example is that Argentina had 750,000 and charges 0, in theory there could be a cc that has 5 domain numbers and charges a lot for them...

DS—lets go backward, what's the banding method?

CD—there are several different models, but in general terms in the regional organisations its along the lines of xtr large, large, medium, small, very small and its an arbitrary figure. In the APTLD we've gone from 5 levels to 10 with the top level being \$25,000 and going down to 500. I'm aware of time and effort that this discussion has taken and I think this issue needs to be debated.

DS—that's too small.

CD—what I'm trying to say is that its pointless having the debate on the council, it must be with the members and others. If the working group and I can get together next week to put together a presentation to put to the meeting, then we can manage the debate.

DS—agreed

EF—agreed

BV—agreed

CD—does anybody violently object to the working group putting together the figure and going through with the suggested process.

DS—does anybody know current statistics on ccs?

CD—Bernie has those numbers. Donna can you, tomorrow morning our time, send an email out to the working group about suggested times and get a conference call later this week (yep).

DS—if we have the actual numbers we can see how they cluster and make suggestions from that.

3. ccNSO Secretariat

CD—what I want to know is what you want me to do. How does the council want to move this discussion forward.

DS—now that your role is expanding, do you think you need a secretariat?

CD—speaking for myself, I have always held the view that the need for a separate ccTLD secretariat, totally separate from ICANN is dubious. The role of the ccNSO is to interface with ICANN its not supposed to be a ccTLD trade union, we are an ICANN supporting organisation, that's our job and our role, and if you look at the gNSO their staffing is provided by ICANN and at ICANN's cost. ICANN provides us with a liaison which is Donna who does an enormous amount of work, should an additional person be independent or part of ICANN? The gNSO has Glen who does the secretariat, they also have Liz, Olof and Maria Farrell. The question is not do we need more people, it's do we have our own separate secretariat? We have an offer from Taiwan, where I struggle is what will a separate secretariat actually do?

DS—I can see that in the past they collected money which would be best done by a secretariat. In the past there was much more pomp and circumstance and placards and all that kind of stuff, and we've been operating without that. If you're going to a UN meeting it would be nice but we don't really need it.

CD—we started a session on moving forward, I think in Luxembourg, and I put up slides about do we really need one. Peter said we had already agreed that we need one so let's just get on with it. Sent out for expressions of interest and received one which was Taiwan who has provided a service to the APTLD and wwTLD. That's where we got to, baseline cost is \$60,000 a year which is employee cost and travel to meetings, take minutes, hand outs, send list around etc. and that's currently where we got to. I'm happy to pursue, but if we want to do this in Marrakesh we need to run a session on how we're going to pay for this. In the past, ccs like nz and au volunteer to pay for the bulk of the cost.

BT—I think your first point is right, I'm unclear if this is going to buy us more at this point, we are doing quite well, the meetings are organised, votes taken in a timely manner, may need someone to physically chase down votes etc

CD—which Donna is currently doing

BT—but we don't take that many formal votes. Considering we're having such a great success in working out how

DS—suggest they employ a secretary for Donna.

CD—yes, ICANN will do that if asked. Does anyone else...

BV—does it make an extra threshold for other members to join, whether you use an independent secretariat as opposed to ICANN? Would it make a difference for non-members thinking of joining?

DS—yes in two respects, if they have to pay for it and how independent of ICANN they wish to stay.

PP—I think that when people say that they want an independent secretariat they want some romantic notion, we have worked well without one for sometime. We could state that the current situation is working well at this point in time, and consider later if the circumstances change.

CD—to go back to BV's point, I agree, but we are an organisation which has 51 members and this decision should be based on what they want not on those who may join. I agree with PP that it is not a decision that is set in stone. Suggest we put the discussion on the agenda for Marrakesh.. I think we need to have the discussion and have someone other than me chair that session, perhaps BT could do that, and actually go through the process that the council thinks this is where things are at, could use another person and we're happy for ICANN to do that? Agreed? [Yes]

4. Tech sharing working group

CD—this is an update. The group will stick to the technical side and work on a charter, which hopefully will be ready for approval by Marrakesh. The group would come up with technical pointers about how ccns could look at managing themselves. Once that is done there could be a push from the group, with consent of the members, to look outside the technical. The Chair of the working group needs to be approved by the Council, which will probably happen in the next day or two.

5. Membership application (.gp)

CD—we have a membership application from .gp (Guadeloupe). It comes from the right address and IANA has confirmed that there is no dispute with regard to the ccTLD.

CD— We need to approve membership, so unless no-one objects I'll write to them tomorrow and welcome to ccNSO [no objection].

DS—what's the membership number?

CD—51. While we're on that subject, can I deal with voting on the members' resolution. The current situation is the vote will close on 16 June, we have 15 votes received, all in favour. We need to reach 25. From the council, Paulos, Ondrej, Keith, Dotty and Eduardo have not voted.

DS—thought it was cut off?

CD—no that was council. Will send a note out tomorrow to the regional members saying the following members in your region has not voted please follow up. We're doing okay, but we need more before the deadline.

DS—so is the timeframe for this resolution passing is prior to Marrakesh.

CD—the ICANN public debate is running in parallel and closes on 16 June, and the board meeting in Marrakesh will hopefully pass a resolution on the final amendment and this completes the process

6. Update on IGF

CD—the members of the advisory committee met in Geneva, progress has been made. There will be a meeting in Athens at the end of October, a 4 day meeting, the first of which will be welcoming and general session of overarching issues—security and human rights. Second and third days—4 half day sessions, security diversity, and a couple of other things, last day will be wind up of emerging issues and a closing ceremony. Workshops will be running on the side such as the OECD on spam. There was a major push by some to have critical infrastructure on the agenda which is code for ICANN. Some of us said this was inappropriate. ICANN in conjunction with RIRs will run an educational forum at the IGF. It is intended that the ccs will be part of this workshop, present 3 or 4 different models on how things will be run.

DC—how big?

CD—the expect over 1000 delegates, including representatives of governments, civil society and non-govt organisations. They are expecting organisations such as ICANN, ITU, OECD, ISOC etc but it is completely open.

PN—are the normal rules that have been used for WSIS apply?

CD—no, there will be no speeches, making statements of government positions, the agreement is that any organisation or government who wishes to make a statement can do so before the conference on a video, which will be run on a loop at the conference.

PN—what is the expected focus of the forum?

CD—you mean outcomes? None. There will be notes of what's been said, it will be webcast and there will be scribes. The chair will be a representative of the Greek government. It is not intended to be any resolutions or outcomes, it will be discussion. As this is the first, it is critically important that it be seen as a discussion. It is likely to be another Advisory Committee meeting between now and October.

PP—what's your feeling about what we as ccs should be doing? Should we attend the meeting in Greece?

CD—from the point of view of protecting the way ccs are managed, I don't think it is necessary for large numbers of ccs to attend so long as those who do attend can represent ccs, but if you have a particular interest in diversity or security, issues outside of ICANN, it would be useful to attend.

CS—heard recently that some governments are trying to have parallel meeting at IGF. Something sent to Secretary General along these lines.

CD—seen that, but you can't stop the governments from having a meeting.

CS—sure, just wanted to mention and have to leave the call.

CD—the 4 themes for the 4 half days are openness, security, diversity, access if a cc has a particular interest in those issues then should be there, but if its just management of ccTLDs then that could be handled by a number of ccTLDs being there who know what they're doing. So if you look at those 4, none of them generally sit within what we deal with at ICANN, but they may sit within our ccTLD purview.

7. Agenda for Marrakech

CD—I will draft an agenda and if someone has anything to put on the agenda please let me know. It would be good to identify an issue to have someone in to talk about, so if you think of anything please let me know.

Meeting closed: UTC 13.15