TRANSCRIPT

Internet Governance Review Group Telephone Conference
4 June 2014

Attendees:

Carolina Aguirre, LACTLD
Becky Burr, .us
Byron Holland, .ca (Chair)
Don Hollander, APTLD
Roelof Meijer, .nl

ICANN Staff:
Bart Boswinkel, ccNSO
Kristina Nordstrom, ccNSO

Apologies:

Peter Van Roste,
Keith Davidson, .nz
Katrina Sataki,
Barrack Otieno
Mathieu Weill

Byron Holland:	As we know this group is mainly to share and try to coordinate information, so I had a few items that I thought would be worthwhile talking about, but as an ad hoc sharing group, you know, feel free, please, to jump in or add your own items; there isn't a defined agenda, per se. And the other thing is the though Mathieu couldn't join us on this call, he is going to start to take the role of leading this call in the future, or leading this loose group in the future.

And I think given how much is happening, we'll just continue to have related items added to our dance (ph) card. I think it will be very important to have this call and to try to get more people on it more consistently, or more of the people on it more consistently. But like I said, Mathieu seems like he had a pretty good excuse this time. |
| Becky Burr: | Hi. |

Bart Boswinkel:	Hi, Becky.
Becky Burr:	Hello. Is that Byron? Are you still married?
Byron Holland:	Yes, Becky. I am. Thank you.
Becky Burr:	I'm glad to hear that. I'm really glad to hear that.
Byron Holland:	Yeah. I know. I probably kind of disappeared for a bit but, you know, it was a worthwhile investment for me, and I just (inaudible)--
Becky Burr:	I just think that return on investment would be pretty high.
Byron Holland:	Yes. God knows if it goes the wrong way it can be extremely expensive, right?
Becky Burr:	Yeah.
Byron Holland:	Yeah.
Becky Burr:	You know, putting aside the finances, this was too much work, and we are too busy.
Byron Holland:	Yes. Agreed. Just--
Becky Burr:	When you said, your attention and energy--
Byron Holland:	Yeah. Just for Don and Carolina, I had my 20th Anniversary just last--
Carolina Aguirre:	Great.
Byron Holland:	-- about a week ago, and I -- my wife and I, no kids, went to Jamaica for a week, which was absolutely wonderful and I did my best to not pay attention to anything to do with the Internet, which, I was moderately successful, but certainly not perfect.
Unidentified Participant:	We were not all that respectful.
Byron Holland:	That's true, actually. But anyway we digressed, but thank you, for asking Becky. Anyway, Becky, I was just saying, just as you got on, I have -- you know, this is a pretty loosely-affiliated group for coordinating the various threads, and as they continue to increase, and I think we can all agree that not only the number increasing, but the volume right now is getting pretty dramatic. But this call, it will be more and more important for those of us who are in this small group, to try as much as possible to make it, to try to continue to make sense of all the disparate but interrelated elements.

Anyway I have a few items that I thought would be worthy of talking about, one of course is the accountability element. Both how we are doing, what we are going to with any output, and the IANA Stewardship Transition, where we are at with that, and where we are going, perhaps how to spend our limited time in London, our limited already-allocated Internet Governance time in London. And unfortunately Katrina is not here, but she did an excellent list on all of the CCs, who is a ccNSO member, who is not and, you know, actually we have Don and Carolina on here, thinking about how we can get the regional organizations to help get those non-ccNSO members into the dialogue given it's an ICANN-centric forum, but how can we get them in and participating.

And the other element that I thought would be worthy of some discussion, is starting to think about how are we going to staff all of these different entities, and when I strategy staff I mean us as the ccNSO members, because if we have an accountability stream, an |

IANA stream, a steering group stream, and as we talked about in the previous council meetings, we also have the existing Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance, and we have, certainly, a strong proposal on the table for Cross Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition.

So I mean, right there, there's sort of five different, let's call them, working groups of one form or another.

Unidentified Participant: What's the -- it's a steering group, a CC steering group?

Byron Holland: No. I'm talking about the ICANN Steering Group.

Unidentified Participant: Ah.

Byron Holland: Where we are supposed to have representation on that steering group, and in fact we've talked about, in our submissions talked about, is that even appropriate and should there be more. So one steering group, possibly two Cross Community Working Groups, you know, just really to begin with, plus what are we doing with the accountability piece. So, a lot of separate but interrelated streams, each of which are going to require horsepower and people from us, and that--

Roelof Meijer: Hello?

Byron Holland: Hi. Who joined?

Roelof Meijer: Hello, this is Roelof.

Byron Holland: Hey, Roelof. Welcome.

Roelof Meijer: Thank you. Hello. Hello, everyone.

Byron Holland: Roelof, I was just talking about the number of different streams of related Internet Governance issues, of which all require -- will be requiring participating from our membership, and given how many there are concurrently, I think it's worthy about having some preliminary discussion about how we are going to staff those or allocate those, and when I say staff them, I mean by ccNSO members, not Secretariat staff.

So those are some of the subjects that I thought would be worth spending some time on in this call, if there is any other subjects, you know, feel free.

Bart Boswinkel: Byron, maybe it might be -- Sorry?

Byron Holland: Go ahead, Bart.

Bart Boswinkel: It might -- somebody else is --

Byron Holland: Roelof, do you want to say something?

Roelof Meijer: No. I was on mute. I didn't want to say anything.

Bart Boswinkel: I heard a voice coming in as well, and that was something different now. Maybe it's an idea to update, say, where we are with the different submission processes as well.

Byron Holland: Yes. So, in terms -- the first couple of items I had just suggested were around the accountability stream, as well as the IANA Stewardship stream. On the accountability piece we -- where the deadline is June 6th we -- because our process wouldn't allow to

actually put in a fulsome comment in the time that was allowed, we are strictly going to put in a placeholder comment, basically making note of that, and indicating that based on our process we will be submitting a more fulsome comment during the subsequent reply period, which is due by June 27th.

And there is -- Becky has drafted a piece right now, and that's going to have to -- that's going to go to the Council, and then also get more fully fleshed out, but with that we'll have until June 27th -- up to June 27th when we submit that. So that's on the accountability piece, but really right now, in the moment, we are strictly going to be putting a placeholder, recognizing that the comment period is too short for our SO to actually go through with the process to put feedback back in and that's a comment in and of itself.

And on the IANA Stewardship Transition, comments are closed now, we have a comment in there, and the other thing of note, and we talked about it on the last Council Call, is that there has been considerable discussion about a Cross Community Working Group likely catalyzed by the GNSO and the ccNSO, but certainly with welcoming participation by the other ACs/SOs, that would be focused strictly on the IANA Stewardship Transition. So it would be separate and distinct from the already existing Internet Governance CCWG.

Unidentified Participant: So, Byron, can I just ask a question about that, because I (inaudible) on the Registry Constituency call this morning, and I believe the content was on the call, and I could have made any -- there were two issues that they were talking about. One, they were talking about the IANA transition that has to include this kind of larger group, iStar, whatever, the (inaudible) constituencies, and then there's ICANN accountability thing and, you know -- I just had to ask them to back up a little bit, and (inaudible).

There was a comment on both of these things have been basically done. ICANN (inaudible) to top down, you know, you are trying to, like, forming the committee, and then asking people to comment on three for four issues. You know, that communities should be involved in forming the committee. And as sympathetic as I am, and I'm really down to the timing issue, you guys can always give time by trying to manage that, and it isn't the right answer, that there should be a sort of top-level coordinating committee from ICANN Community and maybe from, you know, some of the other, iStars, whatever, overseeing the whole process. So that somebody other than ICANN, which -- interested and how to -- is doing this. And Jon Robinson (ph) jumped in to say, well, no, and I think -- but you know Becky, but we are working on this, you know, proposal for a Cross Community Working Group to do that.

I, like you had the notion that that was really just a transition. IANA transition piece, but Jon seemed to be adjusting that the -- the Cross Community Working Group proposal was going to essentially be a top-level community steering group for the multistakeholder process for everything, including accountability as well as the technical transition stuff. So I gather that surprises you as much as it surprises me.

Unidentified Participant: Byron, this is (inaudible).

Becky Burr: Did we lose Byron?

Byron Holland: Sorry. I was talking to myself on mute. So I would be surprised by that interpretation too, certainly any of the discussions that I've been party to have been about this being focused on IANA Stewardship Transition, but of course also recognizing that right now, it's an idea being talked about that would need to go to a broader set of folks for drafting and flushing out any framework. So whenever I have spoken about this, it has always been in a context of IANA Stewardship Transition, not broader accountability and any of the many other issues that could be discussed. But I think a first step is to -- Hello?

Unidentified Participant: Hi.

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. I still hear you, Byron.

Byron Holland: Okay. Sorry I got a long beep there.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah.

Byron Holland: I think the thing is, part of it is, we need to get something started. There is a suggested sort of frame in place, and that would just be a starting point where we could go really have this discussion but in a more bottom-up multistakeholder way.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Byron Holland: Completely separate and distinct from any top-down-imposed -- not imposed -- that's sounding more negative than I mean it to be, more top-down structured course of action as has been suggested by ICANN at this point. Does that make sense?

Becky Burr: Well, I mean, I frankly think that some things -- you know, that we kind of need something to break the large (inaudible) of the -- you know, ICANN, sort of putting out a structure, and to grow with the structure. And that, you know, something that essentially says, you know, at the very least, it's going to be a community real -- drafting the proposal status without the comment, as opposed to an ICANN-staff-only drafting process. And then your understanding is totally consistent with what my understanding was, but no matter what, we need to get something out there quickly, or time is just going to pass us by in terms of our alternate (inaudible), so I don't know.

I just -- I just wanted to confirm that I wasn't crazy in terms of what I thought we have been talking about. I'm not opposed to some kind of -- at the top, across all of the various work streams community, a steering group either, but I haven't heard that proposal.

Byron Holland: No. So all I can say is not, that's not part of the discussion that -- any part of the discussion that I've ended up being privy to. It's always been about IANA Stewardship, Cross Community Working Group, full stop.

Becky Burr: And do you have -- is there a current draft document that (inaudible/audio skip)?

Byron Holland: Yeah. There is actually. There is a current one that I think the GNSO has out there, and right at this second I don't know exactly where to point you to, but I will certainly push it out as soon as I get my hands on it.

Bart Boswinkel: Byron?

Becky Burr: Yeah, just--

Bart Boswinkel: Byron, Becky, that one was shared prior to -- if you are referring to the initial, say, draft of Cross Community Working Group, that one was shared just prior to the previous Council Call.

Becky Burr: Yeah.

Byron Holland: Yeah. And there was -- obviously some major -- I'm going to say major flaws with that one.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Yeah.

Byron Holland:	Because it spoke to -- with that -- you know, let's not maybe not drill into that because it is, it is also, I would say, a straw dog (ph) that's -- Okay, let's -- as you just said Becky, let break this log down, let's get something out there. More importantly let's get a Cross Community Drafting Team, or some such thing to get started on it, and get that multistakeholder process rolling. So I would say that's where it's at right now.
Bart Boswinkel:	It sounds really--
Roelof Meijer:	Byron, this is Roelof.
Byron Holland:	Hi, Roelof. Go ahead.
Roelof Meijer:	Byron, I don't know how-- about the others, but I can hear you very well, I can hear Bart, I could Becky talk, but I have no idea what she was saying. So could you just summarize (inaudible)?
Byron Holland:	Okay. Becky had indicated that she had been on a call with the GNSO Council this morning, and during discussion Jonathan Robinson, the Chair of the GNSO had indicated that some of the discussions that are being had about how do we create a truly bottom-up multistakeholder participating group into the process, what would its work include?

And the way she heard it this morning, that work was going to include all of the accountability elements as well as IANA transition-related elements. And that was different from what I had said before, and where here thinking as that, there would be, in a sense, two separate activities, one focused strictly on the IANA Stewardship stream of activity, and another separate and distinct one on the accountability piece.

But it appeared to her in this morning's GNSO call that those had been conflated and brought together. And my response was that's not my understanding. My understanding is that IANA transition -- IANA Stewardship Transition would be its own unique Cross Community Working Group. So that -- correct me if I'm wrong Becky, but in essence that was what you were saying. So I think that's what's Becky was saying. |
| Becky Burr: | Correct. |
| Roelof Meijer: | Okay. Thanks, Byron. |
| Byron Holland: | So it's a bit -- you know, I guess, like so many things, in the very early days, it's certainly has been messy and there's obviously, as we've just heard, some confusion in the messaging and understanding over the next very short period, and I'm talking within the week. We are going to have to get a crisper understanding of where we are at on this, and be able to bring something forward to our Council, just to begin with, and I'm sure the GNSO as well. And then it was, at least to date, my understanding that if we can get organized in a general agreement, i.e. GNSO, ccNSO, then we'd be in a position to invite other SOs and ACs to join us in this more bottom-up endeavor than we are seeing from ICANN right now, with the steering group effort around IANA transition.

So that is definitely not sort of a crisp plan of action by any stretch at this point, but given where we are at in the process, that's what I'm seeing and hearing, and expect to have greater clarity and more to share, literally, within the week. So that in a sense brings both the accountability and the stewardship agenda items that I'd suggested for this call, and I think that pretty much covers them, unless there are any other questions or comments. |
| Carolina Aguirre: | Byron, this is Carolina. I do have a comment. |

Byron Holland:	Please, go ahead.
Carolina Aguirre:	So for ICANN London, what ICANN will do is, they will basically communicate how the steering committee will be shaped and what we are discussing now is that actually the -- I mean, the process is not exactly being a multistakeholder or capturing the comments received by ourselves, I mean by the community.
Byron Holland:	I think that's correct. You know, my sense or my view is, ICANN has created a process that, to some degree, was probably a straw dog, which was the Steering Group, and it very clearly articulated who would be on it, and how many people from each community, et cetera.
Carolina Aguirre:	Yeah.
Byron Holland:	And then sought comment on it, of which there were -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- but I think there was something like 1,000 comments on it.
Carolina Aguirre:	Yes. Amazing, yeah.
Byron Holland:	Yeah. Many of which shared some of the elements that Becky just talked about, about not being happy about a, very much, top-down, fairly rigid, and already-composed structure, i.e. the Steering Group. So that's ICANN's perspective on how it would be run and what the composition would be. What we are really talking about with a potential Cross Community Working Group, is this would be something self-formed by the communities, of which right now, ccNSO/GNSO, would be likely leadership, or catalytic organizations, because we comprise the registries, right? I mean we are the directly-affected parties.
Becky Burr:	Yeah; the most directly-affected parties.
Byron Holland:	That's right and this is not meant to be a grab or anything, it's just somebody has to start it, so it makes sense we would, and then bring in SSAC, ALAC, the GAC, et cetera, to also participate. And through that kind of a Cross Community Working Group be able to -- and this is to be determined, so what I say -- you know, what I'm about to say is strictly an idea, I have no sense if this would be the case, but if the Cross Community Working Group puts forward a report, then perhaps it goes into whatever the ICANN structure ends up being, feeds into the working -- or the Steering Group, but then all those constituencies and the members of those constituencies and the Cross Community Working Group, could also have the opportunity to take that work, make it their own, and feed it in separately.
	I mean, that's how I could see it working. And the reason I say that is, the model we had with the SOP, I thought was actually a pretty good model, in that the SOP itself fed directly into -- in that case, the ICANN Strategic Operating Planning process, but many of our members and registries, basically took the SOP's work, cut and pasted it or copied, or made it their own in some way, and sent it in on their own. So they took all of the heavy-lifting that the SOP did and, in a sense, leveraged in the input process.
Bart Boswinkel:	Byron, this is Bart.
Byron Holland:	Go ahead.
Bart Boswinkel:	Maybe as an alternative, this is what you see as well, say, with the FOI, and in the past with the IDNC, and with the new Cross Community Working Groups is that you see that these working groups report to the participating SOs and ACs and they then allow -- as a result, either the Working Group itself or the SOs and ACs submit it.

Byron Holland:	Agreed. And like I say, I'm not being prescriptive on this at all, because I think that will be the work of the CCWG itself on how they are going to best leverage the work that they do, but yeah that makes good sense. So, Carolina does that -- does that actually answer your question. Okay.
Carolina Aguirre:	Yes. No, no, it does. It does, I mean, I'm -- yes, I'm curious and I'm just thinking, I mean, whether -- I mean -- and I hope it does have an impact, and that just sort of keeping to the schedule won't, I don't know drive the process into a little bit to the margin because an announcement has to be made in London, and we are only two-and-a-half weeks away from that.
Becky Burr:	Well I think -- I totally agree that (inaudible) real spinning mode here.
Byron Holland:	Yeah. I mean to use the phrase, what is it? Storming, forming and norming, we are still in the storming phase, right, which is without a doubt a bit chaotic and not clear, but like I said, within the next week we are going to have to get clear so when we roll into London, we are going to be able to start to do the heavy lifting and the real work on this, whatever "this" specifically ends up being. But you know, there is a skeleton draft of the Charter, it's definitely got some holes and problems with it, but it's a start and we, I think, need to get going with the cross -- an initial Cross Community Drafting Team, and then move forward to then offload whatever comes out of that, to a Cross Community Working Group and there, really capture the essence of the bottom-up participation.
	Don, you wanted to say something?
Don Hollander:	I do. Thank you very much. So, there was -- to make sure that I understand there was a proposal that came out the 8th of April, and I think that's what you're saying is still the only thing that's on the table, that calls for submissions on the 8th of May. There were a lot of submissions, and there has been no revised program. Is that correct?
Byron Holland:	That is certainly my understanding unless any of the ICANN staff -- I haven't seen anything.
Becky Burr:	No there -- I don't think that there has been anything. I do think based on Bruce's (ph) input this morning that at least some members of the Board are aware that there is this Cross Community Working Group proposal, but it's not learning much on their -- you know, it's not very high on their agenda at the moment, until we get something in.
Byron Holland:	And the other thing, Don, just as a piece of information, Theresa has reached out to all the SO/AC Chairs, and organized a call for tomorrow afternoon, and the title of the call is on the status of the process relating to the (inaudible) Stewardship. So we've been given nothing more--
Unidentified Participant:	(Inaudible)--
Byron Holland:	And it was only organized very, very recently, so that suggests to me--
Becky Burr:	Yeah.
Byron Holland:	--something is happening, but other than the title of the meeting invite I have nothing more to offer until the meeting tomorrow afternoon.
Don Hollander:	So that sounds to me that ICANN has digested the 1,000 or so submissions and is now ready to -- now has a second go at it, and they want to start socializing it. So that makes sense.

Byron Holland:	Yeah, that's--
Don Hollander:	What you are -- what you are suggesting with these Cross Community Working Groups, I think is the approach that the IAB and several other of the submission said, which is, why don't you leave it to us and our respective communities to come up with some solutions, and instead of having a steering group driving it, have a -- change it to a coordinating group that would bring in, sort of like an accordion, brining in the information of what's happening in each of the three affected communities, and then letting them share and then taking that back. Does that sound right, or am I missing something again?
Byron Holland:	No. I think that's -- I think that's about right. Yeah?
Becky Burr:	Yeah. I mean we don't know--
Don Hollander:	And the Cross Community -- let me just finish -- your Cross Community Working Group is focusing just on the names perspectives, so not numbers or protocols. Is that also correct?
Byron Holland:	Certainly not protocols, and yes, I would say it's the name space, although having, you know, it would make sense to have some RIR participation in the Cross Community Working Group. Potentially, I'm not prescribing it, but I wouldn't be averse to it on first thought.
Don Hollander:	Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure that I didn't miss something that had come out of this jumble, so that's okay. I'm happy with that. Thank you.
Byron Holland:	Becky, did you want to say something?
Becky Burr:	No -- I wanted to say, I mean, we just don't know whether ICANN is going to go for, or let us come to you with a solution as opposed to, you know, you are creating instructions, or--
Byron Holland:	Correct.
Becky Burr:	And we are supposed (inaudible) the call tomorrow, Byron, that you think may involve--
Byron Holland:	I'm just going strictly by the title which I read to you, so it would seem they have some message to deliver, although I literally don't know anything more than the title of the meeting yet, and that's tomorrow at 2:00 Eastern Time. And all SO/AC Chairs have been invited. So I mean I'll be happy to share what comes out of that when it comes out.
Becky Burr:	So why were -- I don't think that would be here--
Byron Holland:	Yeah.
Becky Burr:	That's on--
Byron Holland:	It's scheduled for a 30-minute call, so it sounds like it's -- I don't know they must have some sound -- some push sound bites they want to deliver, because I haven't been on a few SO/AC calls, and it's hard to believe I'd get anything done in 30 minutes, but that's what's scheduled.
Becky Burr:	All right. Well I'm just so -- for what it's worth, I'm having drinks with Theresa Swinehart this evening. And if I get any suggestions about what's going on I will pass them on.

Byron Holland:	Okay. Well, you may get a sneak preview ahead of us then.
Becky Burr:	Yeah. I don't know. I don't know.
Byron Holland:	Okay. So that, I think is probably as much as we can glean on those issues at the moment. And the other -- the other couple of other things that I'd suggested that we could talk about on this call, were about reaching out to the non-ccNSO CCs, and I think most of us have seen the list that Katrina created which indicates membership in the ccNSO versus non-members. So how are we going to help facilitate and reach out to make sure that the non-ccNSO members are, at the very least, well aware of this, and hopefully encourage participation in this process, and obviously to me, the ROs probably have the best reach into those non-ccNSO members. So since we have a couple of you here, if you have any thoughts on how we might best be able to do that, and actually even just within your own regions, are you able to actually contact all of those -- all of your regional CCs?
Becky Burr:	Non-members--
Byron Holland:	Yeah, non-ccNSO members.
Becky Burr:	Yes. Or even, I mean, non -- like TLD or other regional (inaudible) members. I mean, that's the challenge--
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes.
Becky Burr:	Well I've been in touch with some CCs that were sort of like asking like -- I mean like -- may be around like TLD for a while, but they haven't actually joined the organization, and today we have two new members, and will be announcing them shortly. I mean, from Guyana (ph), which is great because they are not ccNSO members, and Trinidad & Tobago, which, it's a ccNSO member that's -- But I've also been contacting, independently, ccTLD from the Caribbean, which is the region where we have the greatest problems in like TLD, in terms of outreach and was -- I'm expecting a response from them, and the idea is to invite them to our meeting in Aruba in November. I mean to make it, sort of as open as possible to -- even to non-ALAC (ph) TLD members.
	That's what we are thinking about now, I mean, but we don't a strategy, and it's not something that we have yet formally discussed at Board level, but these are the news on my side.
Unidentified Participant:	(Inaudible)--
Byron Holland:	Okay. And Don, how about yourself?
Don Hollander:	So APTLD has a meeting scheduled September 15/16, in Brisbane, which is coincident with the APNIC Meeting. We have written to all our -- a formal invitation to all our members in case they need it for a visa or internal process, inviting them to the meeting. Pointing out that we will having extensive discussion about the NTIA Transition Program. And we have written to the same, or similar letter to all non-members of APTLD in the region, and we have been -- we will be working with the ICANN liaison Vice Presidents, going through on a country-by-country basis of who is who, and how do we engage them, and how do we bring them to the meeting.
	So our current focus is Brisbane, and our desire is to get every PTLD from the Pacific to attend, and to get every ccTLD from South East Asia to attend. So those are sort of the two neighbors, and to get them involved in the discussion. Does that help?

Byron Holland:	Yes, absolutely. Okay. And then, I guess you'll be able -- so you have a pretty good list too that's -- so for further messaging you can and should be able to reach out to them. Is that fair to say, or is that overstating it?
Byron Holland:	That is very optimistic.
Byron Holland:	Yeah. Okay.
Don Hollander:	We have a list and over the past six months we've been reaching out to everyone, and sometimes the emails work, and sometimes the phone numbers work, and sometimes they don't. So there are, as you can imagine, CCs that are just not -- are just -- perhaps one man down, they just--
Byron Holland:	Mm-hmm.
Don Hollander:	They are an adjunct to somebody's normal business. They are a pain in the butt in terms of the host business. They don't want to know about it, and it's there and they do it, and it's somebody's job to make sure that nothing breaks. They are not -- they are not active -- not active managers.
Becky Burr:	Yes. I tend to have the same perspective as Don, with respect to the smaller registries in the Caribbean region, because we do contact them on a yearly basis every time we organize our technical workshop, we have a hands-on trend during the week, and we invite non, like TLD members, but whether or not their members are not there, they are all invited to come and join, and benefit from the training. So we do contact them yearly for that workshop, and they usually -- I mean, it's very difficult to get people to move even if you offer some travel assistance and some -- for the smaller registries it's very difficult to leave the operations, or sometimes, as Don mentions, the email doesn't work, the phone doesn't work, and other times it does, and other times it works--
Don Hollander:	Right.
Becky Burr:	-- but they cannot leave -- they cannot the desk, so I mean that's a reality. So there will be challenges, I mean. And maybe not even e-participation tools will be enough, so we have to see -- we have to really work more on that matter.
Byron Holland:	And Bart, do you know from the IANA perspective, how accurate their contact information is?
Bart Boswinkel:	Not really. What might be worth pursuing is we might ask Xavier (ph) for a list, because shortly, the CFO (ph) will send out letters to all ccTLD, and that's -- that one is more accurate.
Byron Holland:	Okay.
Don Hollander:	That's a good way to get them to step up, to ask them for some money.
Bart Boswinkel:	No. It's nothing to do with that, Don.
Don Hollander:	Oh, it's not the ccNSO contributions?
Bart Boswinkel:	As you know, the ccNSO doesn't want a contribution.
Don Hollander:	All right, I'm sorry then.

Bart Boswinkel:	This is -- this is an email list and some of you were aware in the past, which I can use, which is more accurate than the IANA database one, because it reflects -- and it's directed at more at the administrative people within the ccTLD. It will be used shortly for invoicing, and for a letter asking (inaudible) a voluntary contribution to ICANN, but maybe Xavier is willing to share it so we can use, say, this group, and others can use it because it's the most up-to-date list.
Don Hollander:	Mm-hmm. Okay.
Byron Holland:	Well, we are going to have -- you know, I'll take this to the Council, but we are going to have to sort out some way, and have some participation by -- you know, I don't want to say working group, but some kind of group to try to consolidated this and have the ccNSO do some outreach to non-ccNSO members to try to at least-- like I say -- educate them, follow on the work the ROs are already doing, but also reach out to those who are not a part of LDRO (ph) Constituency.
Bart Boswinkel:	Byron, and the rest. If you look at the numbers, you talk about say -- I think at the end of the day you talk about 40 ccTLDs are not member of either the regional organizations or of the ccNSO. Most of them are located in the Caribbean and Asian Pacific or in -- yeah, in the Pacific area; and also in Africa. These are the -- yeah, these are the real issues.
Becky Burr:	Yes.
Bart Boswinkel:	So I think, say, the big--
Don Hollander:	I have made contact with a few and they say, yes, thank you for keeping me appraised, and let them know if anything of interest happens. So we are reaching out.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah. But the point is, I think it's a -- it's focusing the effort, I think the real focus should be on these 40, because through either the combined efforts for the regional organizations and the ccNSO, you reach the others.
Don Hollander:	And the ICANN Vice Presidents, Regional Vice Presidents.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yes. That could be part of the solution. I fully agree, but it's first of, say, the regional organizations and the ccNSO, at either in London, start to focus on how to reach these 40. So these are the -- that's the real issue, and the Regional Vice President could play a role there.
Byron Holland:	Yes. So I would think one of the things we are going to need on the Council Agenda for London, is a path forward in terms of how we hope to actually execute on outreach and increase the participation.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah.
Byron Holland:	So why don't we park that for now and make sure that as an agenda item it ends up on the Council's Agenda for London.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah.
Byron Holland:	Okay, being somewhat conscious of time, we've got about 10 minutes left. Are there any subjects that folks wanted to raise? And I do have one that I touched on at the beginning, which is around making sure we have enough of the right people on all of these various streams of activity. And, you know, given how many streams of activity there are, it's going to require a reasonable number of people, so have that -- some preliminary

	discussion around that. But are there any other topics that folks wanted to raise? Hearing none, but you are free--
Bart Boswinkel:	Byron?
Byron Holland:	Yeah.
Bart Boswinkel:	Byron, sorry. Just one for the others, say, there is this suggestion from the Drafting Team, or from a few from the Drafting Team, that you sent a -- because you didn't touch upon that one; a letter directly to Steve and Fadi on the processes, and the lack of response time.
Byron Holland:	Yes. And I will -- I will send that out.
Bart Boswinkel:	Yeah. The others I'm not aware of it.
Byron Holland:	Okay. Well, as part of a comment on the fact that ICANN's processes as articulated are sufficiently constraint from a timing perspective, that the comment periods don't even allow for us a ccNSO, and the other SOs and ACs I believe, but certainly, most importantly us, to go through our defined process to create the community comment. So in a sense, by definition the ICANN process has actually short-circuited our ability to provide comment, and hence as I mentioned earlier, we are only going to, for the June 6th deadline, provide a comment that says, the timing was too short, and we reserve the right to make comment during the reply period. In addition to that, I'm going to send a letter direct to Steve and Fadi, Steve Crocker and to Fadi, prospectively making that same comment in, certainly, a more fulsome way.
	But I will share that with the Council in the next day or so, before it goes out, and in a sense have a negative option. If anybody has a real problem with it, they can provide me feedback, but really that's the essence of what I'm going to say. But I don't think it's, I don't think it's controversial; it's basically stating the fact. Hey, your process doesn't allow us to run our process, so how do you expect us to get any facts in, or any comments in.
Becky Burr:	That's even the case for regional organizations, I mean, we could only -- it's only Board members who have managed to comment to whatever -- a comment on the accountability framework, with these deadlines, and (inaudible) members.
Byron Holland:	Right and--
Becky Burr:	We couldn't consult our members with that kind of -- with that kind of timing, so.
Byron Holland:	And that, in a sense is -- you we made -- as a ccNSO Council, we provided that comment coming out of Singapore, but that didn't allow the full membership to have its, you know, full voice--
Becky Burr:	(Inaudible)
Byron Holland:	And I've already had a comment, with direct comment to me question now like, "Why would -- why would you do that?" Now it really was a -- the emails that I received personally, it was a -- it was literally, it was an honest question, why were you doing it that way, and when explained it was -- you know, then it was understood and then acknowledge. But we don't want to be doing that too often. So that's the nature of the email that I intend to send to Steve and Fadi, but I will circulate it before it gets sent.
	So the final note then we -- as I mentioned we will have a number of streams of activity that we are going to have to make sure we resource effectively, there's going to be a call

for volunteers, and while we have had, in a sense, probably a little bit of a lull, in workgroup activity over the last couple of ICANN meetings, though the SOP and FOI continue to grind out lots of work. There has been a little bit of a lull, but I expect over the next one to two ICANN meetings, you know, there will be a number of workgroups formed, as well as the requirement for us to participate in other venues such as the steering -- the ICANN Steering Committee if, in fact, that goes forward, but assuming at this point that it does.

So, certainly those of us who are interested and informed as anybody almost, by default, in this group is, we are definitely going to have to figure out, strategically, how we best distribute the resources that we have to maximum effect. And that doesn't preclude doing a call for volunteers and getting other people involved, but we are also going to want to make sure that each of these sets of activities has people on it to maximize the effectiveness of the ccNSO.

So I'll leave that with you almost more as food for thought in terms of how we are going to do that, and where you might like to participate. But we are going to need the folks who are interested and experienced and have some time to step up and participate in these streams of activity over the next while.

And hopefully, also, encourage our peers who might not necessarily put their hand up to begin with, encourage your peers to get involved, our peers to get involved. Because you can't -- well, (a) it can't be the same handful of folks who tend to cover these issues, because there's just going to be too many running concurrently, requiring too much time, and we need to get more people more involved in these interrelated topics.

And with that, unless there's any finial or closing comments, let's say our hour is drawing to a close.

Becky Burr: Thank you, Byron. Thank you, all.

Byron Holland: Okay. Thank you, folks--

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. Thank you, Byron. (Inaudible) -- Yeah.

Byron Holland: --and we will -- we will talk again soon. And see you -- see you shortly in London.