**28 June 2006**

**Minutes**

**Attendance**
Chris Disspain (Chair)
Ondrej Filip
Slobodan Markovic
Paulos Nyirenda
Eva Frölich
Dotty Sparks de Blanc
Bernie Turcotte
Patricio Poblete
Oscar Robles-Garay
Keith Drazek
Hiro Hotta
Victor Ciza

**Apologies**
Olivier Guillard
Young Eum Lee
Mohamed El Bashir
Bart Vastenburg
Charles Sha'ban


**1.    NTIA Notice of Inquiry**

The Council considered whether it wished to provide a submission to the NTIA. However, given the tight deadline of July 7 for submissions the Council agreed to encourage ccNSO members and ccTLD members generally to make submissions to the Inquiry.  The submissions are made public.  The Notice of Inquiry can be found at:
http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/frnotices/2006/NOI_DNS_Transition_0506.htm

**2.    ICANN Regions**

The Chair noted that this is a very complicated area and suggested, given this and we know that there will be an ICANN review, that the Council submit advice to ICANN on the terms of reference stating the issues we would like addressed in the review.  Ideally, a task force should be formed to look at the regions from scratch.

Bernie Turcotte asked how is it we know that ICANN will be reviewing this.  The Chair advised that it is in the bylaws to be reviewed every 3 years.  In the past it has been an internal staff review, with public comments.

Dotty Sparks de Blanc noted that she liked the idea of at least allowing self-selection among territories and commonwealths and islands and people based on geography, culture and language.  Is it possible for us to structure a proposal to ICANN to suggest that we think it would be useful to do that?

The Chair advised that the way the bylaw is currently drafted, where there is doubt about the region in which the country sits, the country has the right to choose. In order for it to be effective, we would have to define what the word 'doubt' means. We could do this but perhaps we should keep it as a backstop and first try to fix the problems for all time in the ICANN review.

Bernie Turcotte noted that if we wait for the review, it doesn't prevent this option, but by just going with the option it may restrict the review. He asked if we are just trying to fix this within the ccNSO or for all of ICANN. If we are going forward on the regions, we should try to get buy in from the GAC.

The Chair advised that it's the review of the regions within ICANN so it is more than us, and it would be good to have a joint approach with the GAC.

Bernie Turcotte considered, given that going for the more general review does not prevent anything else, why don't we try for the big thing and vote for a global review.

11.01  IT WAS RESOLVED that the ccNSO Council prepare a submission to ICANN on the terms of reference for the review in an effort to ensure that the review is conducted in a way that the ccNSO concerns about the regions are addressed.

Proposed by Eva Frölich
Seconded by Bernie Turcotte
Passed unanimously

## 3. ICANN Budget

The Chair advised that we need to instruct the Budget Working Group to move forwards with developing a set of guidelines to be published. Is there any comment on that [no]?

11.02  IT WAS RESOLVED to instruct the Budget Working Group to prepare a set of guidelines for approval by members. The guidelines to be based on the self-select banded method discussed in the members meeting.

Proposed by Dotty Sparks de Blanc
Seconded by Eva Frölich
Passed unanimously

## 4. Technical Working Group

The Chair advised by way of update on this issue, that the Chair of the Working Group Eberhard Lisse, sent a note congratulating everyone on the presentation. You'll recall that David Archbold said there had been some discussion about whether this working group should cover policy as well and in what order. Having listened to the audio from the meeting Eberhard says "the more I think about this "policies found useful" the more I start finding myself agreeing with your position. The problem just remains that it is very difficult to decide in what order we are going to do this." The current suggested resolution is simply that we approve the charter, Could approved the charter and say to the working group that if they can do some work on agreeing policy matters we could reconsider an amended charter.

Patricio Poblete asked why the last part necessary. Can't any member come to the Council with a request for a policy process?

The Chair agreed this is the case but this is not about ccNSO policy, the current intention of the working group is to prepare a handbook on technical matters, but David's point is it would be useful to have policy matters included as well.

David Archbold pointed out that Section 2.2.2 of the charter provides a reference to policy issues. Rather than make a big issue of this now, the Council should pass the resolution.

11.03 IT WAS RESOLVED to approve the charter of the technical working group and instruct the working group to proceed in accordance with its charter.

Proposed by Ondrej Filip
Seconded by Hiro Hotta
Passed unanimously

## 5.     IANA Working Group

The Chair advised that Olivier Guillard, as Chair of the Working Group, has said that the current charter as it is adequate at this point in time. The Charter was adopted by the group the 21st April. The work plan before Sao Paulo includes adopting and if possible implementing a mechanism to review and renew IANA WG membership.

The target is to have initiated appropriate action to cover the whole scope of the charter.

Note also that the WG have been asked to react to new issues such as iso-3166 consistency.

## 6.     ccNSO Secretariat

The Chair advised that we need to pass a resolution to go to a members vote. Yesterday we suggested that there should also be a second resolution to approve TWNIC as the Secretariat if members are in favour of an independent secretariat. However as this may make the resolution more complicated.

Bernie Turcotte believed the resolution should include somewhere that it will be paid for by the ccNSO.

The Chair advised that he had intended to have an explanatory memo to say we did this, here is the EOI, the response, the bylaw and now we need to make a decision.

Bernie Turcotte said that some may not read this, so I think we need to include ccNSO members need to pay for this.

Patricio Poblete noted that this seems a little confusing, we're inclined not to have our own secretariat, perhaps we should pass a resolution saying that and have that subject to members ratification.

Bernie Turcotte noted that if the Council thinks that is the feeling of those who were here at the members meeting, then that should be the way to do it.

Paulos Nyirenda asked if we could raise the issue that the current process is working well.

The Chair noted that this will be in the report, but it's difficult to put statements in a resolution.  Should the Council decide today that it thinks given all the circumstances that everything is going okay for now, then it is open to members to object under our internal processes?

11.04  IT WAS RESOLVED to continue with current arrangements and not appoint an independent secretariat at this time.  This will be reviewed again in 12 months time.

Proposed by Bernie Turcotte
Seconded by Oscar Robles
Passed unanimously

The Chair advised that members will be given seven days to consider the resolution and in the event that there is no objection, the resolution will be considered adopted.

Paulos Nyirenda considered that it would be to the benefit of members to advise that it is the intention of Council to ask ICANN to provide resources for a secretariat.

The Chair agreed that he will ask ICANN to provide a staff member, and a performance based review will be undertaken in 12 months time.

**7.    ccNSO Work Plan**

The Chair advised this it is his intention, with Donna's assistance, to review the current status of working groups and establish which are still active and where further work is required and then will report back to Council.

Paulos Nyirenda suggested that it would be worthwhile to have information about the working groups posted on the website.

The Chair agreed and advised that he had been discussing this with Donna and will follow up in the next few weeks.

11.05  IT WAS RESOLVED  that the Council should ask the Chair and Acting Secretariat to review each working group, check its status, and consider in consultation with members whether any new working groups are required and report back to Council in two month's time with the intention of creating a work plan for the next 12 months.

Proposed by Ondrej Filip
Seconded by Eva Frölich
Passed unanimously

Meeting closed 10.55