Operator: Thank you. I'd like to remind all parties the call is being recorded at this time. We may now begin.

Chris: Well, good afternoon, everybody. This is the meeting of the ccNSO City Meeting of the Council. It's better. Who do we have on the phone line? Patrick…?

Patrick: Patrick Posinas is on the phone.

Chris: Hi, Patrick.

Patrick: Hi.

Chris: Anyone else? Okay. So, everybody knows who – yes, Bart?

Bart: I'm pretty sure we'll be done in a few minutes.

Chris: All right.

Bart: We're almost done.

Chris: [Inaudible 00:56.2] It's Latin Americans. Soon they will own the US anyways so as Eric suggested so…So…Oscar doesn't have it…oh, yes. There's a chair there. Hi, Oscar, there you go.

Well, we don't - everyone knows everyone so that's cool. Let's get started. Patrick, you might – I'll do my best to remember that you are there but if you get missed out on anything, speak up.

Patrick: Okay, will do.

Chris: Thank you. The first item on the agenda is the formal confirmation of Approval of Minutes and Actions from the Council Call on the 9th of June, 2009. The Minutes have already been – no? They haven't? They haven't been. Okay, so that's not on the agenda then. Okay.

So, we very foolishly had a council call too close to a council meeting. But we will get those Minutes out to everybody as soon as we can. The second item on the agenda is Working Group Updates. The first one is The Delegation and Re-Delegation Working Group.

Am I doing that? Bart? Are you doing that?

Bart: No, you're doing that.

Chris: I'm doing it? Okay, and I'm doing that based on an email from Gabby, I think. Is that right? Okay, so, we decided in Mexico that we would set up a delegation and re-delegation working group. We approved the charter for that working group.

The next step is to confirm the working group members. We put out a call for members and we had the following - we had a number of volunteers. We had one, two, three - three from Africa. One, two, three, four from EU - no. Sorry, Asia Pacific. One, two, three, four, five from Europe plus two others. Two from Latin America and Dottie.

So, Leslie, did you want to take the…take the point on this one? I don't think so. Do you want - could we have the other mic on, please? Thank you.

Leslie: Okay. Yes, that's on.

Chris: It is now.

Leslie: Yes, Chris, as I briefly mentioned to you earlier, I'm aware that there are several other managers who would like to participate in the working group that's about whether we have the PDP. I would like to encourage us to consider making participation in this as wide as possible so that we get as many views in on this important subject.

Chris: Well, we can do that by…about how many members were there supposed to be from each region?

Bart: Two.

Chris: Two. Okay. Well, I think, look, given the importance of the topic and given that this is going to be a very kind of sort of working group with the people from the GAC watching and everything happening like that, why don't we appoint formally appoint members but have an open list and allow to attend calls, phone calls? That seems to me to be the most sensible way of doing it. And people can dip in and dip out if they would like to.

Anyone's welcome to contribute. Does that sound fair? Well, in that case then…I suppose we still need to actually have members, don't we?

Bart: Yes.

Chris: Well, is there any reason about why we can't just appoint all the people who have so far volunteered as members?

Bart: We could, but you only [inaudible 04:42.4]…

Chris: You'll need to amend the charter. Well, I don't think that's hard.

Bart: No…

Chris: So, let's do that then. It's easier than trying to figure who's going to be a member, that's for sure.

Bart: Yes…

Chris:	So, the members of - so the proposal would be then that the members of the delegation, re-delegation working group would be Vicar from South Africa, Palos from Malawi, Alloween from – what is .ml?
Bart:	Mali.
Chris:	Mali? Sorry, thank you. Keith Davidson from New Zealand, Dave Mann from Western Semar, Bill Samwich from Norway, Tanya Ling from China, André from Checkz Republic, Slova Dana from Serbia, Desireé from Gibraltar, Nigel from wherever he's decided to be from this meeting. Denzel West from .ms?
Bart:	Montserrat.
Chris:	Montserrat, oh, yes. And Kwan Kalasemi from Brazil -
Leslie:	Belize.
Chris:	Belize, I'm sorry. Brazil would cross S, wouldn't they? Shocking. And Oscar Robert from Mexico and Dottie from .di and me. The regional observers are all welcome and that stuff. So it's going to be a fun ride.

Can I just tell you all that I have - there was some - we asked Johannes Cochran to provide us with some observers from the governmental advisory committee which he has now done, Suzanne Santa and Giantha from Srilanka.

But, there was some disquiet expressed by some members of the governmental advisory Committee that ccNSO would dare to…to discuss the topic of delegation, re-delegation or perhaps more sensibly put actually. That is unfair. Are we not best to just leave well alone?

I went to Sigmund this morning and explained that that may well be the case but until we have a look at it we don't actually know the answer to that. But that they shouldn't be worried that the - they shouldn't be worried that we were suddenly going to come out with a policy that the GAC principles weren't worth the paper they were written on or something like that.

So, I think they're feeling a little bit better now. She's good. So can we take that one as…as a result? Do we have to have a resolution for the members? No? Just that we recognize them. Excellent. Thank you. |
Palos:	Chris?
Chris:	Yes, Palos.
Palos:	The inactive guys, are guys are still observers?
Chris:	Say again?
Palos:	Non-active -

Chris: Non-active the same as observer, yes. Yes. Yes. That solves the problem there. Okay. Excellent. The next one. Sorry, Jana.

Jana: Sorry if I missed but this is a chair and the Vice Chairs are also here.

Chris: I'm sorry, the Vice Chairs, yes. Yes. That's the whole purpose of having Vice Chairs in the first place. The second item on the agenda - or the second item of the working group object rather is Strategic and Operational Plan Working Group update which I assume, Byron, that you will give us.   So, over to you.

Byron: Thank you. As most of you here will recall, we had a discussion at some length yesterday regarding the strap planning portion of our activities. We will be synthesizing the comments that came from that session over the next couple of weeks.

Chris: Just step back from it a little bit.

Byron: We will be providing that back to the community once we've synthesized those comments. In addition, we are going to be putting together a survey and asking some questions, questions that again, we anticipate falling out of the comments. That should be approximately four to six weeks before we circulate that back into the community.

            We hope to get as much response from all the various community members as possible to that survey. Once we get some results from that, the end goal there will be to produce those results for the Seoul meeting and again, continue engage the community in consultative process around what the key elements for the strategic plan should be from our perspective.

            Then as a committee encourage the community themselves, everybody individually to make submissions to the Strat plan. We are also looking at putting the results of that survey to the Council and then the Council potentially has the opportunity to do with it as it will.

            That is the update.

Bart: [Inaudible 09:48.3]

Byron: Oh, yes. Thank you, Bart. There is one last portion or component.   We have a relatively small committee and given the level of interest that we've heard and the level of effort that we've had to expend thus far and continually we will. We are looking for more volunteer members so we'd like to expand the group.

            All are welcome to join the group. You can submit your interest to Bart. Like I said, or Gabby, either/or, and we will be happy to welcome new members to the committee. Thank you.

Bart: Just to make sure, there is no need to change the charter.

Chris: Thank you, Bart. That's very encouraging news.

Bart: I know.

Carlos: There'll be a call for members?

Bart: Yes.

Chris: There will be a call for members. Can I just say, I was actually talking to Paul. I didn't hear if you said it. But you got to be out of work, to be on this committee, right? You've got to be prepared to put in because it's critically important.

          Now we're going to have a slight break in the formal proceedings because there's a man with a camera over there. Did you want to - can we have - can you give that microphone to Paul, please?

          Sorry, Patrick, you probably have no idea what's going on but there's a man with a large camera and a light and a CEO with a microphone.

Paul: It's their ego. What do you say?

Chris: Yeah.

Paul: As I –

Chris: I just want me to do my speech again, don't you?

Paul: Well, I know where you live. So, I just - sorry to interrupt but we are doing a sort of a day in the life of ICANN and we're using the opportunity to walk around and say "hello" to all different people in places so that people that are outside of ICANN or come to the web site and get a sense of what an ICANN meeting is like and who's involved and what makes thing happen?

          So this is the country code names supporting organization, members of that esteemed body and here is their Council. I'm not going to pass this to the Chair, Mr. Spain and he can explain what they do and who they are.

Chris: Thank you. That's very sweet of you, thank you. Yes, this bunch of very tired-looking people are in fact are the ccNSO Council. The ccNSO is a body and a supporting organization in the ICANN structure that represents country codes top level domain managers.

          We have a very narrow policy we have to deal with, matters of global policy that affects ccTLD managers. At least, we thought that was very narrow until IDNs came along and then we discovered that actually there's a huge amount of work to be done.

          That's basically what – one of our main things that at the moment is internalized domain names, ccTLDs. But we also work closely with the other supporting organizations and advisory committees.

          Okay?

Paul: It's a pleasure.

Bart: Our council is from all around the world.

Chris: Our council is from all around the world which is why they're so tired because they've come to Australia.

Paul: Thank you very much.

Chris: Thanks, Paul. Okay, so…where were we? Oh, okay. Two three, ccNSO GAC as a working group, that case update which he's going to post. He's been running around getting new members for the ccNSO GAC as a working group. He appears to have done that rather successfully. He should be able to post the details in the next day.

           Technical working group which I guess is me. I had a meeting with some of the members of the technical working group on Sunday. I said to them that following the discussions that we had had in the Council we thought it was probably time to beef up the technical working group.

           When it was originally set up it was chartered to two things really. One was to organize Tech Day and the second one just got slightly lost in the organizational Tech Day was to start considering writing a handbook on ccTLD management that could be used as a resource by the community.

           Now, for that to happen and for it to also to do some interfacing liason with Diana because now we don't have the eye on the liason working group anymore. Truly, it needs to be a) the charter to these three redone because it doesn't currently cover that, and it needs to be re-peopled so that it's got more people so that there's less work for one or two individuals to do.

           So they all agreed that that was fine. So basically Bart and Eberhart and Norm will work on the charter, get that to us and then once we have approved that which we can do on a telephone meeting. It doesn't have to be on a face to face meeting. We will then put out a call for new members of the tech committee, and away we go.

           Is that all right with everybody? Excellent.

           André, Meeting Program Working Group.

André: Yes, thank you, Chris. I think I had a presentation during the meeting so I will not repeat it. It - we just started to work immediately. We have about ten members plus Gabby supporting us. We have members from - all members are presented of TLDs and original organization as well. Now we have those three talking friends and mainly working an email list.

           And actually, I will take the opportunity to how I can speak. I will just remind all the members of the working group that we have a physical meeting just after this meeting is closed. So please stay in the room.

           Yes, that's all.

Chris: Thanks. Well, as I said yesterday, I think it's been fantastic. I think this meeting has basically been evidence of the fact that we needed to have one of these things and now that we've got it we better keep on doing it. So, thank you.

Geographic Reasons Working Group, we had a report from Dave on and I don't think we have anything to say about that. It's out of our hands so…looking forward to the next one, Dave, when you'll be six months behind, instead of three months behind.

Which brings me to Item Three on the Agenda which is the Establishment of an *Ad Hoc* Working Group for Draft Emergency Response Plan. Who's going – who – which one of you is going to…Becky? Okay, cool. Congratulations, Becky. You'll need a microphone. Just move that one across.

So, this I imagine is a result of the session - one of the results of the session today. So…

Becky: Yes, as part of our discussions earlier today with respect to preparing an emergency – an information security incident response plan and beefing up our abilities to respond to things like Conficker in the future. We'd like to create a working group which may or may not need a charter to begin to develop the plan and to begin to develop the resources that would be part of that incident response plan.

Chris: thanks, Becky. I think it does need a charter but I think the charter simply needs to say it's an ad hoc working group because it's ad hoc therefore. But I think by our rules we probably do it. Leslie…

Leslie: Yes, I concur a charter so that there isn't confusion of the technical working group, for example.

Chris: Yes…

Leslie: So that's there a limited scope to find within the niche.

Chris: Yes. Yes, but it doesn't need to sort of have seven different members of the regions, etc. It's just – it's going to coalesce around –

Leslie: Right –

Chris: It'll coalesce around an incident rather than around a work plan, I suppose is really the point.

Leslie: I guess my point is as people on working groups change, you can kind of forget what the purpose of what the working group was.

Chris: Yes. Oh, it definitely needs a purpose. Yes, no – it definitely needs a purpose.

Becky: It definitely needs a purpose.

Chris: Yes. Far too many to get to the microphone otherwise Patrick won't be able to hear you.

No, no. Bart behind you. Behind you. That's behind you there. That's it. Turn around. Well done. Yes.

Bart: Thank you.

Roloff: The basic idea is that this working group will produce a final report by the Seoul meeting.

Chris: Okay…

Roloff: So that needs to be in there as well and it will be not only for say, ccTLD managers. I think there will be a broader involvement or experts from ICANN as well.

Chris: Okay. So, fine. So, clearly something needs to be drafted and that needs to be done quickly and then we need to have a Council Call to just to agree it or email or whatever to agree it. Okay.

Roloff: Okay.

Chris: Okay. Excellent. Are we comfortable to just take that step that we'll start the ball rolling with that? Good.

Now, Geographic Names. Those of you who have access to your emails will have seen a note called Input ccNSO Detailed Process and it is a document that was drafted by Hilda and Anavette and has been seen by Martin and Roloff, and Leslie, I guess.

Anavette and Hilda said to me this morning, "Should we send up our resolution again to the Board about geographic names?" And I said, "Well, yes, we can but on the other hand…maybe what we should do is try and capture some of the essence of the discussion that we had this morning, and see if we could get that across.

"That generic names are generic names and country names are one thing. Countries are not as generic." So, I think, I mean, I'm happy to do this now but others may not be. You may because it's not short. So, would it be okay if we said we'll read it? And we'll perhaps email the list if we all agree? Is that okay? Could we try it?

Microphone, please, Dottie.

Dottie: Can you just present a few conceptual issues?

Chris: What, from the document - from the document?

Dottie: On the subject?

Chris: Well, okay, so it's about the fact that there under the current proposal you could have a country name as a gTLD provided you have the consent of the government or presumably it actually is the government themselves who are requiring that. And we say that we think that the mere concept of having a country name as a gTLD makes no sense.

	Because, it's not a generic top level domain. It's a country top level domain and they can't be generic. We have concerns that – Do you want it again? Go ahead.
Leslie:	I was just going to make the point that we discussed this quite fully earlier and at our previous meeting.
Chris:	Yes…
Leslie:	And, I think the sentiment is that that advice and the resolutions from the Council were ignored.
Chris:	Yes.
Leslie:	And this is a further version.
Chris:	Then I'm misunderstanding –
Leslie:	Building on that…
Chris:	Yes. Okay. So I think, I mean, Dottie, it's as you know, we discussed it this morning and Leslie's right. I mean, we need to find another way to communicate the message because communication clearly wasn't' working. So, when you get a chance to read it, it basically says why we think it's completely inappropriate for countries to be gTLDs. Okay?
	So, what I'd like is to be able to see if we could maybe by the end of tomorrow…yes, because I can say to the Board when I do my ccNSO Report we are finalizing a note to you. By the end of tomorrow we could actually have agreed on the list and then we can send it out to them. Okay?
Bart:	As a letter from the Council…?
Chris:	As a letter from the Council, yes. Okay. This is going really well, so far. IDN Fast Track Conclusions. I'm not entirely sure what this – what I'm supposed to do about this one but this is…
Roloff:	If you have no conclusion…
Chris:	Well, we have no conclusion?
Peter:	If you have no conclusions, but if you want to discuss it further…that's why I put it on the Agenda.
Chris:	Yes…does anyone want to talk to and say anything formal about the IDN Fast Track or have we just had enough of it? You haven't had enough of it. I know you haven't had enough of it. You will never have enough of it. Okay.
	Look, I think - just for what it's worth, I think that we are getting close to some sort of resolution. Peter did say this afternoon, now this it's the third time it's being said, the money is actually less important than the actual agree to abide by the protocols.

Given that, there seems to be a general acceptance, certainly at least in the IDN community that the current sort of wording, whether it's a tape box or whether it's a document is livable with, it may be that that's done. And it's just now a case of seeing if we can come up with the right words to express the voluntary nature of the - any payment.

But other than that, I think that's where we are. Yes, Jan. Can you grab a microphone, please? Thank you. It's on.

Jan: Yes. What I heard is this morning, actually Curt said in Seoul meeting we're actually targeting the delegation, the first delegation for Fast Track ccTLD IDN. ccTLD IDN is going to be in the middle of next year. So I'm wondering what are we going to do during this eight month period after Seoul meeting?

Chris: I have no idea. And quite honestly, if every time somebody says something about timing, you take it to heart and start worrying about it. We're - you're going to spend all of your life in a state of complete panic.

I don't - all I can tell you is the same thing I told you today which is that there is a process that will need to be gone through, and I don't know how long that will take. Assuming the Boards signs off on it in Seoul, there is - they need to have an application process so that the application process will have been set up and presumably, within a reasonable time after Seoul, they will open for applications and it will then go through the process. That process will take however long it takes and then we'll go into the IANA process which takes as long as it takes.

But, if – there's no way you're going to get anything other than that because I can't think. I guess that's the…

Leslie: I was going to suggest maybe the Council could just note the continued need for urgency.

Chris: Oh, we can do that.

Leslie: On this matter…

Jan: Yes, because it seems to me they have very clear idea on what time is going to be so that's why I'm wondering.

Chris: Why do you think that?

Jan: Because he said, "clearly" it's going to be. Of course it's not estimated. It's going to be in the middle of next year? So…

Chris: Okay, well, all I can say is that – and thank you, Leslie. I think that's what we should do. we should not the fact that we still require the urgency. I can't comment, Jan, because I don't know. and every time I ask I get the same…the same response which is where we're working on that, and until we've actually got the implementation – until we know what the final steps are in the implementation plan we can't actually tell you.

Jan:	Could we do anything about it? Or…you know…
Chris:	You can ask the question, but it's a bit – but given that we don't yet…we haven't actually – I mean, the problem is, there's an average time that IANA – there is an average time that an IANA delegation takes. I don't know how long that is. Kim would probably be able to answer if he was here. But I don't…
	But again, it varies because it depends on whether the people are ready and so on and so forth. But if you're pushing and I understand why you would be doing this. If you're pushing to get a formal date or a document that says, "From the day that we put in our request for delegation, delegation will be three months." You won't get that, because it doesn't exist in the ASCII world.
	You put in your request for delegation and it goes through the IANA process and it comes out at the other end. And, that's it. So, there is currently no fixed timeline. So this certainly isn't going to be – it certainly won't be expected to provide a fixed timeline for this process.
	They can only deal with the applications as when they come in and they can only do so many of them…not that I'm suggesting they're going to be inundated because they won't be. So I think really the way to keep the pressure up is instead of thinking far forward to what might happen, is actually concentrate on what is happening. get that fixed, get it approved in Seoul and then start immediately getting – putting the pressure on then. Okay?
	Does that…does that make sense? Okay. Anyone else on the Fast Track? Almost Fast Track…
	We have a membership application to be approved from Albania, I guess. We have received the application. Kim has confirmed the usual IANA details are correct. So, may I ask André, to propose it? Thank you. Leslie to second and may we please formally vote on the resolution that Albania become the 94th member of the ccNSO?
	Patrick, are you in favor of that?
Patrick:	Yes, I am in favor.
Chris:	Thank you very much, Patrick. I think that's the only chance you're going to get to vote. No, no, there's a couple of more. There's a couple of more.
Patrick:	I lost my feed, my video feed so it's no fun.
Chris:	Oh, that's a shame for you because it must be fascinating watching me.
Byron:	It is…
Chris:	Thanks, Byron. I'm very jumpy. Have you noticed that? So, Gabby, could you do the usual putting them on the list, etc.? Thank you. It's time for Liaison Updates, Gina, so Liaison Update now? Thank you.

Gina: Thank you, Chris. There was a customary call at the joint lunch session that we had on Monday with the general council. There was a discussion on whether a joint working group to look into some of the issues of the common interest, certain issues related to IDN.

There's a common interest to both council to be set up. Certainly because it's IDN distribution and [30:25.4] management at root. So the general council has met this morning and they have agreed in principle to found the working group. So it's up now to this Council to decide whether or not to found this working group with the GNSO as well as to determine who are the working group members.

Chris: Thank you. So that just everyone's clear on it, some of you were at the Council, the GNSO Council lunch, joint Council lunch, rather. We talked about the fact that there is an overlap of stuff with IDNs and that's going to be ongoing so should we have this joint working group.

What I said was I asked Jan if she would go away and talk to Edmund and see if they could come together and work out how it would work, etc. so the GNSO is obviously very keen and that's great.

What we will do is that on our next call, Jan will have a discussion about how we'll do this. You can tell us what you think and how your discussions have been. And then we'll decide whether we want to set that up. Is that okay, or have you already done that?

Jan: Actually, I already talked to Edmund. We discussed about first thing is, what's a target? What's a goal? It's a goal of this working group because we want to make that very clear.

Chris: Okay.

Jan: So, basically, we're going to working on the issues of IDN like the lance issue, the lance of characters, the variance issue, the IDN protocols but we're going to limit the scope of ….this kind of issue.

Chris: So, you still have some more work to do with Edmund to actually come ot us with a proposal, is that right?

Jan: Yes, yes, yes.

Chris: Okay, fine.

Jan: Yes.

Chris: Okay. so if you can do that…if you have a chance to do that before our next call that would be fantastic, *n'est pas*?

Jan: Yes, but…

André: As soon as you concluded something with Edmund, if you would send Gabby and me a copy of what's done.

Jan: Sure.

André: So we can move that in and we may be adding something for Michael to avoid losing everything else we had.

Jan: Sure. But actually, one thing he mentioned is there's one more thing GNSO that I'd like to add on the target of that working group is they want to discuss off the timeline of the Fast Track.

Chris: No.

Jan: And IDN and the gTLD. So it's definitely "no"?

Chris: No.

Jan: That's going to be – that's not going to be – it's going to be other question. So this kind of brace will we're going to come back and there was a proposal…

Chris: Okay. Thanks. Thank you. Could somebody pass Ron the microphone so we could get the ALAC update, please? Ron's right here.

Ron: Yes, good afternoon. Can you hear me?

Chris: Yes.

Ron: Great. My last report to this body was just a couple of weeks ago so I'm not going to repeat all the stuff that went on there, particularly the history and progress of the ALAC. I'm assuming everybody heard it or read it or whatever. So this is an update from this particular session here in Sydney.

           The ALAC is a – it's an organization that has a very, very broad base and a very difficult mandate. They have fourteen scheduled meetings during these six days. Many of them I might tell you starting at 7:00 o'clock in the morning. I will list a lot of the topics that have been discussed and that I've witnessed.

           The ALAC regional leadership working session was an excellent session, bringing together the leaders from the various RELOs and all five regions. The items discussed – and I'm not going to do what I did last time and get tied up in a bundle of acronyms. But the issues that were discussed to a large extent are the same issues that have been discussed in this particular community as well.

           So, there's a lot of crossover there. I will talk about a couple of things that were really interesting and I think you'll be interested in. they discussed the real world effects of users that have lost domains. So they talk about real people and real happenings and not theoretical and it's – the impact is enormous, I have to tel you.

           They – whoops…One of the issues I think was really interesting is that the ALAC have undergone the outside review, which is something that ccTLD NSO is about to

involve. Quite a long way along they're at the point where the working group report has been put together and is being presented to – at this point being reviewed by the Board for adoption.

The resulting report – as a result of this outside review includes – and these are just some of the items includes – that ALAC should continue their work. If you remember today's introduction to that overview – that outside review process, that's one of the issues. Should they stay? Should they go? And same thing applies to ccNSO.

That ALAC should have two seats on the Board, the ICANN Board. That the ALAC RELO ALS pipeline for information, distribution of information and gathering of data should continue.

That the public comment periods on ICANN issues should be thirty days with an optional fifteen days in addition. Mainly because dealing with that particular community, there's a lot of translation and interpretation and that's taking time through the ICANN staff process. To get that information back, often takes much longer than the period available.

Their goal, their current goal is now to have one ALS in every country. At the moment, there are more than 100 at-large structures, more than one in some countries so there's certainly a lot of countries left without them. But that is their current goal. By the end of this week, I think we will know whether the reviewed report has been adopted.

Another issue that came up that is of particular interest is the relationship of ALAC to the ccNSO. I was questioned on ccNSO policies and I advised the ALAC assembly that I tend to like council teleconferences and the face to face meetings as an observer, and that I don't speak for ccNSO or for any of the ccTLDs.

I did, however, say that I bring their concerns to this body. Some of the questions that were asked are, one, is the ccNSO considering a global policy of implementing DNS SEC amongst our members? So, the same question regarding IDN.

Three, many European governments are considering the implementation of filters and blocking technology for domain names to prohibit access to harmful content sites and to prevent illegal transactions. What are ccNSO guidelines to our members on that issue? Obviously, I can't answer these but I did say I would bring them to the ccNSO.

Four, they expressed a mutual interest in involving individual users in our respective "houses". The local Internet community should be important to ccTLDs. At-large structures are the organizations of individual users that are the building blocks of the at-large. ALAC will welcome any help from the ccNSO and any individual ccTLD managers in connection to any relevant user organizations to bring them to their attention. ALAC will be pleased to infuse ALSs to any ccTLD managers.

Five, they questioned the possibility of mutual assistance in outreach programs. There are ccNSO member ccTLDs in countries where there are no ALSs. There are ALSs in countries where the ccTLD is not a member of the ccNSO. Is there anything that we can do together maybe to help each other increase our memberships?

These exchanges have led to a meeting scheduled for tomorrow between Chris, Cheryl Angrenaul, the ALAC Chair, myself and my ALAC counterpart Rudy Elsnick beside me to discuss this relationship or these relationship between the two constituencies and the role of the liaison should play in that.

Chris: thank you, Ron. Can I ask you to…may I ask you, please, if you would be kind enough to send us that, those notes and preferably typed, if that's okay. Just because I think that would be very useful to be able to – I mean, we will be discussing stuff irrespective of my meeting with you and Cheryl.

Oscar had a question…

Oscar: Yes. Thank you very much for this group work. I have several questions but at least two but at least two [inaudible 41:29.8] questions. One is do they have an actual plan of how to have this at-large structure in every country? Or do they just want to have them?

Ron: I think that perhaps we can ask my counterpart. Tell me about the plan.

Chris: Briefly though.

Rudy Elsnick: Very short as we're trying to get as much ALS as possible in each country. We do this through regional organizations that we have in ALAC, five regional organizations. We call that RILOS and RILO has the responsibility to look for more participation in the region.

So that's the - actually we have ongoing already. Bringing together the ALSs and the ccTLDs as a new plan which we just brought up during this ICANN meeting and it's a plan we want to work on very soon.

Chris: Thank you, Rudy.

Rudy: Thank you.

Chris: Did you want…?

André: Yes, well, I was wondering if we could have access to that plan.

Chris: Well, we'll talk to – and yes, I'll talk to Cheryl tomorrow and we'll work out what's actually going on because this is the first I've heard of it. Anyone else…want to say anything?

Well, thank you, Ronnie, and if you wouldn't mind, if you have a chance just to sort of sending that to us as a note. That would be really helpful.

Ron: Yes, I will do that.

Chris:	Thank you. And thank you, Rudy. Okay. That's Liaison Updates. Thank you very much. We now have two resolutions to pass and then any other business. The two resolutions are - we haven't formally passed our thank you to Demi. We did it - we talked about doing it then we said we would do it as this meeting and we would so show an expression of our appreciation which we did last night at the ccNSO dinner.
	But there still needs to be a formal resolution. In fact, the resolution says, "The Council resolves to express its deep appreciation to Demi Getschaux for his service to the community as a ccNSO elected representative to the ICANN Board, from 2005 to May 2009. Demi's depth of knowledge and quiet wisdom from DNS matters and the issues facing ccTLD managers have been invaluable."
	Anybody have – Oscar? No, no, you…Anyone got any comments to make before I put the resolution? Anyone want to propose at all? Proposed? Who would like to second it? Jero. Thank you. I propose that we pass the resolution acclamation.
	The second one is the Council resolved that it is delighted of [44:23.8]. It is delighted that Michael Silber has been appointed to the ICANN Board as a ccNSO elected representative and wishes him well in his role. So we can formally do that. Becky, thank you. André, thank you. And - thank you very much.
	Yes, Peter…Yes, Peter…
Peter:	Can I as observer, maybe as somewhat unpopular comment after this resolution –
Chris:	Yes, I've got –
Peter:	There's not the first time that Mike fails to show up during sessions that we planned specifically to have an exchange of views with him as our Board representative. So, from my perspective I'd really appreciate if we'd see more of him.
Chris:	Okay. Yes, Leslie…
Leslie:	I'd just like to build on that comment by suggesting that maybe we need to think about how we can maximize those opportunities for the benefit of the ccNSO maybe by thinking about questions beforehand, etc., and issues that we want to cover.
Chris:	Thank you, for reminding me but it's down here under any other business. Okay, well, let's take that one then since that one is actually - the possibility and again, this will be something for a call - the possibility of a Board liaison group working - I hasten to yet another working group but a Board liaison working group that is actually charged with much the same way that the program working group is responsibility for actually making the Agenda and the program.
	That actually the Board liaison working group's job is to think about what stuff we're going to talk to the Board about, what the issues are, synthesize them, summarize, make papers about them and then bring them to the meeting.

So, if I can just plant that as a possibility for us to think about at our next meeting…I have one more item before I get to that. Does anyone else have any other business or anything that they'd like to say? Yes, André.

Peter: Sorry. Not being ccNSO liaison, just again for the joint working group to look into the IDN issues that common among the two, that among CCNG. I wonder if the Council can decide whether or not to go head first with the working group and the charter and this come in later as Jane and Edmund. So they can start to work on the issues?

Chris: Well, no, we need to get clear first that we're comfortable. We're not at the stage yet that you're at so, that the Gs are at so I'm sure it won't be a problem but I think we just need to get clear first that we're comfortable.

Jan: Yes, oh, great. Great. But the thing is, let's say if I get back, let's see. Probably I will get back to you probably in a couple of days actually -

Chris: Sure.

Jan: Are we going to wait until next Council meeting to discuss it? Because this I actually emphasized this to Ann and we don't want this process to delay our Fast Track, definitely. So any report, any resolution will come up, that working group should be before the Seoul meeting.

Chris: Okay.

Jan: So, if we're going to wait until a month later to discuss if the -

Chris: No, I think we can do it on the list.

Jan: Okay…

Chris: So - but it depends on what you come back and say but I think we can do it on the list.

Jan: Yes. Okay.

Chris: Okay? Okay. I have a proposal to make for Seoul. We're certainly with a goal. The goal would be try and do this in Seoul. I think we would be…the ccNSO could hold a youth forum in Seoul. The idea would be that what you do is each of the regional organizations would find two or three fifteen to twenty year old Internet-savvy people where we'd put them together online for a month before the meeting and ask them to come up with an Agenda for their forum.

We would pay for them to come to the meeting and let's not worry about how we do that for the moment because I actually don't think that's even a tiny problem. We would pay for them to come to the meeting. And on Wednesday afternoon, assuming it starts on a Monday, on a Wednesday afternoon for two hours or three hours we would have them tell us what they think the Internet is going to be like in ten years' time and what they think is important for us to be thinking about.

This would be a ccNSO-driven thing and I think it's something that we could probably do by the time we get to Seoul provided we start working on it reasonably quickly.

So, comments, thoughts…Sorry to throw it on you like that. Yes…

Peter: Other than coming personally to the meeting in Seoul, what remote participation as well? ccNSO at the same time they increase the amount of remote participation

Chris: I think we can remote participation. Yes, of course, we can do remote participation as well. I want the – it is powerful having the people here but of course you can have remote participation.

Anybody else want to say something? Dottie? You're breathing in as if to speak.

Dottie: Well, it has been the practice not to allow children to come to the ICANN meetings.

Chris: It has?

Dottie: Yes, it has.

Chris: It's news to me.

Dottie: Oh, in New Zealand, no children were allowed to even the games, to even go bowling during the activities. It said "no kids". So, there aren't too many children. You don't see many children coming here and I think that, that since that's been the practice -

Chris: Except for the ccTLD managers, of course. They behave like…sorry.

Dottie: So, it's just - so it's - I think you need to think about that because once it's opened up to young people they're going to inundate us and outnumber us.

Chris: Fantastic. Brilliant. They've got more energy, more stamina, more understanding and far better ideas. Brilliant. Leslie.

Leslie: I have a child who'd love to come here, I'm sure. I was just going to make a point that I think that the strategy discussion the other day, several people made the point that the next generations is kind of younger than we all are. And may be able to contribute to that discussion would be issues from their perspective and I think that would be tremendously informative, I would hope.

I would also add that I'm aware there's an initiative because the nominate trust is funding part of it to have a youth IGF. That's being led by a charity from the UK. I see this as being quite similar and actually hopefully engaging the next generations would be beneficial to all.

Chris: Thank you. I don't want - we're not going to make a decision today because obviously we need to do some research beforehand. We may have to adjust the age because of legal restrictions or whatever it may be. But nonetheless, if everyone's reasonably comfortable at least we should find out more about it.

What we'll do is in time for the next Council meeting put together a paper that suggests this is how it could be run. This is roughly what it's going to cost. This is how we think we could fund it; all of that stuff. And then work from there, is that okay with everybody?

Bart: Yes.

Chris: Excellent. Good. Youngham, yes, sure. There you go. Okay, that's fine.

Youngham: I was just wondering since ICANN has held several sessions on IDN and sessions related with IDN and cost, I mean, how are we going to – I mean, are we going to deal with that at all, is my general question? And if yes, how?

With regard to one of the things that were mentioned in terms of a cost recovery mechanism for the processing which – no, not the processing - the IDNs, the processing of IDNs which was…mentioned as 123 percent. And Chris, you actually mentioned that the leaders of the IDN Fast Track process had suggested it and we're okay with it –

Chris: some of them.

Youngham: Yes, and I just wanted to formally state that I didn't know that KR was excluded in the leadership group because iCare has never agreed or mentioned or anything…

Chris: No, you have it quite right. But we have to -

Youngham: With the registration -

Chris: We've had discussions about it and your view is different.

Youngham: Right.

Chris: I was – I was delivering the information that the majority of people that we spoke to –

Youngham: Okay, okay. It was just my intent -

Chris: That certainly wasn't suggested -

Youngham: That the KR did not mention -

Chris: I certainly wasn't - it was unanimous.

Youngham: A percentage of revenue.

Chris: No, no. Absolutely not. I agree. I'm not sure I actually got – excuse me. I'm not sure I actually got your first question…are we going to do something about what? About money?

Youngham: The fact that the ICANN's budget specifically mentions ccTLD questions and there is a clear expectation by the ICANN that the cc community would do something about it.

Chris: Yes, well, that's right and if you recall the discussions yesterday with Kim and what we agreed was what the room kind of agreed was that he was going to go away and come back with a more – with additional items of information that we asked him for. And then once we got that, then we would work out what the next steps were.

Because right now with all the information we've been sent is very useful and very interesting, we're still waiting for a bit more. So once we've got that, then we can decide how we're going to move forward with that.

My sense of it is that some – that the SOP committee would at least be involved on the basis that we're talking about money and budget from the operating panel. Stop looking like that. I saw that. That's why you need more members. Lauren?

Lauren: Yes, and also it…the budgeting side is actually not in our mandate and they appear to be trying to coop to the committee -

Chris: Is that right…

Lauren: To be the catalyst for that discussion and it is not in fact in our mandate.

Chris: Okay.

Lauren: Though we have had some general discussions about it.

Chris: Well, we may want to yet another working group.

Lauren: I think that that's probably the way to go because the strategy committee has got a fair amount of work –

Chris: No, if I – I acknowledge that. I mean, that's an ongoing – oh, that'll be my phone. Okay. I'll call you back. Turn it back on again. I'll turn it back off again.

Okay. Is that…are we done? Any other business? Last call…okay; in that case, I will formally close the Sydney Council Meeting. Thank you all very much for coming.