

ccNSO Council Meeting

27th June 2007

Attendance:

Becky Burr
Victor Ciza
Lesley Cowley
Chris Disspain (Chair)
Keith Drazek
Ondrej Filip
Olivier Guillard
Hiro Hotta
Slobodan Markovic
Paulos Nyirenda
Patricio Poblete
Oscar Robles-Garay
Doty Sparks de Blanc

Absent:

Mohamed El Bashir
Young-Eum Lee
Eduardo Santoyo
Charles Shaban
Bernie Turcotte

1) Joint ccNSO - GAC Report

The Chair started the meeting by asking the Council to resolve that the IDN Issues Paper Report be presented to the ICANN Board given that both ccNSO and GAC members had reached consensus on the Report.

14.01 IT WAS RESOLVED that the Council adopts the aforementioned Issues paper as a ccNSO Issues paper, and submits it to the ICANN Board in close cooperation with the GAC as the GAC ccNSO Issues paper Selection of IDN ccTLDs associated with the ISO 3166-1 two letter codes.

2) APTLD Position Paper

The Council then discussed APTLD's Position Paper on the Introduction of IDNs. The paper has been endorsed by CENTR. AFTLD and LACTLD are currently discussing it. ccNSO members had on the previous day agreed that the paper should be sent to the ccNSO members list for comments in order to find out whether it can be adopted as a ccNSO position paper.

Lesley Cowley asked what the likely time scale would be for AFTLD and LACTLD to determine their position on the paper. She pointed out that the paper would gain a much stronger position if the regional organisations have been consulted before posting it.

After conferring with Paulos Nyirenda and Patricio Poblete, it was estimated that it would take about three weeks to receive a reply from AFTLD and LACTLD.

14.02 IT WAS RESOLVED to pursue a ccNSO endorsement of the two-track approach as suggested in the APTLD Position Paper. The paper will be sent out for comments to the membership after gaining positions from AFTLD and LACTLD.

3) Appointment to GAC Liaison Working Group

The Chair notified the Council that a replacement for the European position on the GAC Liaison Working Group is needed, as Bart Vastenburg is no longer involved.

Lesley Cowley advised that the European ccNSO member unanimously proposed *Hilde Thunem*, .no, to the GAC Liaison Working Group.

14.03 IT WAS RESOLVED to appoint Hilde Thunem as the European representative to the GAC Liaison Working Group.

4) Participation

4.1 Usergroup for Website

Following the member's discussion on setting up a ccNSO Website Usergroup:

14.04 IT WAS RESOLVED to instruct Bart Boswinkel the setup of a ccNSO Website Usergroup and call for volunteers.

4.2 Participation Working Group

The Chair commenced discussions on the setup of a ccNSO Participation Working Group. He suggested that the group should include two people per region and that the first task of the group would be to draft its charter.

Some discussion occurred on the objectives of the Working Group; whether its purpose should be to gather new ccNSO members, or to try to get ccNSO members to participate more in the ccNSO activities.

Lesley Cowley clarified that the working group's aim at would be to encourage participation in general, including in the regional organisations.

The Chair added that the actual goals and objectives will be set out in the Working Group charter, but that it will focus on participation, for both members and non-members.

It was suggested that the Working Group is to be open for non-members as well.

14.05 IT WAS RESOLVED to form a ccNSO Working Group on Participation

14.06 IT WAS RESOLVED to appoint Lesley Cowley as the Working Group chair.

The ccNSO Secretariat will send out a notification to the ccNSO email list about the setup of the new Working Group on Participation and calling for volunteers.

5) ccNSO Membership Fee

The Council was asked whether a change to the Bylaw clause on ccNSO membership fees should be considered. The Chair clarified that the fee was currently \$0 and that the issue arose during the participation discussion, where it was stated that the mention of

ccNSO membership fees causes an issue for some prospective members. He further explained that the original reason for having the clause was because it was assumed that the ccNSO would be running its own secretariat, which currently is not the case.

The Chair therefore suggested taking the current reference to the membership fee off the form and publishing a text with the information that whilst the ccNSO has the ability to charge membership fees, it currently doesn't, and it doesn't have any intention to. Any change to that would also be a matter for members to decide.

Becky Burr and *Lesley Cowley* stressed the importance of keeping a reference to a fee, noting that any fee change would need to be agreed by ccNSO members.

It was agreed that the text for the application form would be formulated over the coming weeks.

6) DNSSec

The Chair asked the Council if it felt that there was anything that the Council should do, in the light of the earlier discussions held on DNSSec.

Ondrej Filip pointed out that there is a clear opinion of the RIPE DNS Working Group and he suggested that the ccNSO community also should think of formulating a position on Root Zone signings – whether the community supports signed roots or not and whether it is an urgent issue, or not.

Dotty Sparks de Blanc suggested consulting with technical people first, such as the ccNSO Technical Working Group, which can advise the ccNSO on what concerns there are and what steps to take.

It was also suggested that the Technical Working Group should liaise with the IANA Working Group on the topic.

Lesley Cowley pointed out that the issue also has a political nature and that several registries are developing positions on it individually.

Olivier Guillard suggested finding out what the cc community has done so far individually regarding DNSSec, and to take part of their experiences on the matter.

It was therefore decided that the ccNSO Council will draft a note to the technical community, asking them for advice on what concerns there are in respect to signing the root zone.

In parallel, an email will be sent to members, asking them to provide information on their work with DNSSec.

It was also suggested that a session would be held on this at the next ccNSO Meeting in Los Angeles where further steps would be decided.

7) Regions Working Group Report

The Chair notified that when the public consultation period closes for the Regions Working Group Report, the Council will receive a Draft Report which the Council will discuss. The aim is to consider a resolution stating it may be sent to the ICANN Board.

8) Observers List

The Council was asked whether it would support the setup of a new ccNSO 'Observers' email list. The list will be open to every ccTLD manager and their appointees.

It was explained that such a list would be used as the authoritative ccTLD managers list thus facilitating the dissemination of information.

It was agreed to proceed with setting up the list and contacting all ccTLD managers to ask if they would like to be included on the list.

It was also agreed that Observers List was not an appropriate name for the list, since it was both for members and non-members.

9) Applications to the ccNSO

A number of ccNSO membership applications have been received.

An application has been received from Guyana (.gy). IANA has confirmed the application is in order from their perspective.

14.07 IT WAS RESOLVED to approve Guyana (.gy) as a new ccNSO Member.

An application has been received from Morocco (.ma) and has also been confirmed as in order by IANA.

14.08 IT WAS RESOLVED to approve Morocco (.ma) as a new ccNSO Member.

The Chair further advised that applications had been received from St Lucia (.lc) and Fiji (.fj). These applications need clarification before the Council can consider them.

The Council agreed that the ccNSO membership application form should be revised and simplified.

10) AOB

Paulos Nyirenda pointed out that an application from .mu (Mauritius) has been marked as "pending" on the ccNSO website for over three years.

The Chair clarified that something had not been in order with the initial application and corrections were required, but never received.

The application should be corrected from 'pending' to "New Application Required".

The Chair then closed the meeting.