

ccNSO Council Conference Call

12 September 2007

Attendees:

Lesley Cowley, .uk
Chris Disspain, .au (Chair)
Keith Drazek, .us
Ondrej Filip, .cz
Hiro Hotta, .jp
Young Eum Lee, .kr
Paulos Nyirenda, .mw
Patricio Poblete, .cl
Charles Shaban
Dotty Sparks de Blanc, .vi

Observers:

Don Hollander, APTLD
Siavash Shahshahani, ALAC liaison
Peter Van Roste, CENTR

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel, ICANN
Gabiella Schitteck, ccNSO Secretariat

Apologies:

Mohammed El Bashir, .sd
Olivier Guillard, .fr
Slobodan Markovic
Oscar Robles, .mx

Introduction

The Chair started the meeting by giving an overview of the two discussion points on the agenda. Firstly, the launch of a PDP on IDN ccTLDs would be discussed and additional discussions on an interim/short track approach would follow.

He reminded the group that in a best case scenario the PDP would take 2 ½ years, in worst case it could take between 5 – 7 years.

It was explained that the reason for the best case timing is that the process is dependent to a great extent on face-to-face meetings. If the outcome is a recommendation that a mandated list needs to be created, another 3-5 years have to be added to go through an ISO process.

It also had to be considered that a “task-force” would need to be created to interact with the GAC and other ICANN constituencies so that they can deliver input to the policy process in a timely manner.

Launch of PDP on IDN ccTLDs

The Chair then explained that the purpose of the call is to agree that the Council in principle wants to launch a PDP on IDN ccTLDs and that a Request for an Issues Report shall be drafted.

The Proposed Request for an Issues Report would be drafted by the Chair and Bart Boswinkel and would be subject to the Council's approval at the next Council call.

The paper would be submitted prior to the call to give the Councillors some time to consult their respective communities.

Once the document has gained approval, the Council can resolve to launch the PDP.

Bart Boswinkel explained that it is important that the Request for an Issues Report is drafted carefully, as it is in fact defining the scope of the PDP and identifies the boundaries in which it can move.

Dotty Sparks de Blanc asked why the ccNSO needs to do a PDP if the ICANN board should come to the conclusion that IDN TLDs should be introduced.

It was explained that this is the only way to ensure that the ccTLDs control the policy under which ccTLD IDNs are introduced.

Patricio Poblete pointed out that some may argue that these new IDNs are not ccTLDs because they are not two letter codes.

The Chair reminded the group that the Issues Report is there to confirm that the proposed PDP is within the scope of the ccNSO. Both the Issue Manager and the ICANN General Counsel need to confirm that.

Bart clarified that the General Counsel, as well as other parties, have a clear role in the PDP in order to fulfil the checks and balances system. Only when the Issues Report has come back with a Counsel Opinion, the ccNSO will know where it stands with it.

Keith Drazek asked whether there isn't a risk that gTLDs start registering IDN ccTLDs far before cc's, if the ccNSO gets enmeshed in such a long process as the PDP.

The Chair confirmed that if there is consensus that an IDN ccTLD is still a ccTLD, then policy can only be set through a PDP. In respect to IDN gTLDs the ccNSO can only try to ensure there are enough safeguards in place to protect possible ccTLD names and that the objection process is satisfactory. The Council will also contemplate whether the interim approach would be an appropriate solution to combat the timing issue.

The Councillors were then asked whether they agree to request Bart Boswinkel and the Chair to draft the Request for an Issues Report. No objections were noted.

The Chair noted that with this approval, the Council had also agreed on the principle of launching a ccPDP. Once the Request for an Issues Report had been confirmed by the Council, the GAC, ICANN board and other appropriate parties will be informed thereof. A

first draft of the Issues Report itself will be presented to the ccTLD community and discussed at the Los Angeles meeting.

Dotty asked what kind of questions may be encountered in the development of the PDP.

Bart thought that issues such as the meaningfulness of a string, timelines involved or whether the topic is in the remit of the ccNSO might cause some discussions. He also pointed out that the introduction of new IDN ccTLDs will affect the ccNSO bylaws, which might need to be adjusted to the new circumstances. Will, for example, each new IDN country code become a ccNSO member so that a country like India will have 10 memberships?

Discussion on Interim/Short Track Approach

Patricio drew attention to the fact that the IDNC Track document is inconsistent, as its introduction says its goal is to introduce IDN ccTLDs, whilst the main body of the text says that the feasibility and need of a fast-track approach first needs to be explored and only if found necessary will be initiated.

The Chair agreed and suggested to add “*subject to it being necessary*” to the introduction.

He said that the intention is to send out a proposed draft letter to ccTLD managers asking if they are interested in an interim approach.

The meeting was then opened for general discussions on the short track approach.

Don Hollander asked what will decide what constitutes “a lot” versus “a little” interest in having an IDN ccTLD fast-track approach and whether the population of a country would have an influence on that.

The Chair replied that his personal opinion was that it would be persuasive if passionate responses are received from 12 – 14 active ccTLDs. The size of the population is only secondary to the matter.

Should, however, the response be very poor, then the ccNSO should not go ahead with the process.

Lesley Cowley underlined that she would find it very hard having a discussion on the issue without knowing what the demand or interest is from the community. A research on the matter would be helpful in forming the debate. Therefore the letter to ccTLD managers should be sent even if the Council decides not to look at the interim measure any further.

Peter Van Roste informed that a research amongst CENTR members had shown that 4 ccTLDs had an interest in a fast-track approach.

Don estimated that around 20 APTLD members would have a strong interest in a fast access to IDN ccTLDs.

Siavash Shahshahani expressed his concern that gTLDs will get a head-start with launching IDN gTLDs so that people will rather choose a gTLD in local script than a ccTLD, once it has been launched.

The Chair pointed out that the ccTLDs have the chance to ensure there is a robust objection process and reservation lists in place to secure that the interests of the ccTLDs are protected. He also reminded the group that a gTLD Workshop on the new gTLD process will be held at the Los Angeles meeting, which also will be open for ccTLDs.

He envisaged that the gTLD IDNs will probably be ready to be launched by the Paris meeting in June 2008. Should the ccNSO decide to follow the fast-track scenario, a limited number of ccTLD IDNs would also be ready to be launched at the same time.

However, he also warned that not everyone in the community will be comfortable with a non-PDP fast track approach, such as LACTLD members. He reminded the group that LACTLD had raised concern that a short-track approach would disregard the PDP that ccTLDs had been fighting very hard for to have in place.

The letter which is to be sent to ccTLD managers on the fast-track approach was then discussed. The Chair made it clear that the Council will need to approve the letter at the next Council meeting before it is sent out. This means that it will also be sent out after the formal PDP has been launched.

The letter will make clear that the delegation of IDN ccTLDs will be subject to current IANA delegation rules and that the fast track approach may mean that cc's have to limit the IDN ccTLD to only one territory. The phrasing of the letter will be made very simple, so that it is easy to understand for everyone.

AOB

The Chair informed the meeting that a draft agenda for the Los Angeles meeting will be sent out shortly by the ccNSO Secretariat. He highlighted that an IDN meeting with the GAC is envisaged to take place on Sunday, 28th at 14.00.

Lesley asked how *Bernie Turcotte* would be thanked for serving on the ccNSO Council.

The Chair said that Bernie will be asked to join the Council meeting in Los Angeles by telephone so that the Council can thank him then.

The Chair also reminded everyone that a Call for Nominees needs to be made in order to replace Bernie. Only Canada and Puerto Rico are entitled to nominate a candidate.

The ccNSO Secretariat was instructed to check the timings to see whether a call for nominations can be launched soon so that the new Councillor can take seat at the Los Angeles meeting.

The Chair noted that the next ccNSO Council meeting will be held on Tuesday, 2nd October. The two main agenda points will be the formal launch of the PDP, as well as discussions on the fast-track approach. Other, unrelated issues will, however, also be included in the agenda.

The Chair finally encouraged the Councillors to send any questions, comments or input on any of the documents either to the Council list, or directly to him. The input will be collated and will be dealt with during the next call.

The Chair then closed the meeting.