...agenda. And in fact, there are probably some items at the end that we’ll probably have to defer as a result. We have rearranged the agenda to ensure that we have the high priority subjects first. In terms of apologies, I have one that has been directly sent to me and that’s Lesley Cowley, who wanted to send her apologies and say that she wish she could be here, but for this meeting she could not, but would anticipate reengaging later in July.

Gaby, do we have any other apologies? Can you turn on Gaby’s mic please?

GABY: We also have apologies from Abibu Ntaghigiye and Maureen Hilyard.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Item number two on the agenda, minutes and actions. Everybody has had an opportunity to see the minutes, or to review the minutes. Are there any questions, or comments, or concerns on the minutes? Can we approve the minutes? All in favor? Please raise your hand. Any abstentions?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: As this is my first meeting, I should formally abstain on the minutes.
BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Duly noted. And since a table like this is always a challenge to see, anybody opposed? No? Okay. One abstention, everybody else in agreement. Thank you. Gaby could you speak to any actions? Kristina, Kristina.

GABY: Do you want me to read all of them?

BYRON HOLLAND: Are there any outstanding?

GABY: Outstanding. We have one that is deferred, and that is action 95 03, the secretariat to call for volunteers to participate in the working group to work on the issue of enhancing ICANN’s accountability.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Are there any objections to just leaving the action items of those outstanding? With that, okay. We’ll carry on to item number three, which is the Romania membership application. I would like to pass that topic to Nigel.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you Chair. I’m delighted to report to Council that we received an application for membership of the ccNSO from Romania dot RO. The application has been checked and found to be in compliance with all of the requirements for membership. So, with the Chair’s permission, I would like to read the proposed resolution.
BYRON HOLLAND: Please carry on.

NIGEL ROBERTS: If the Chair would ask Council if it’s of a mind to approve it. The ccNSO Council approves the application of dot RO Romania, and welcomes dot RO as a member #151.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Nigel. All in agreement please raise your hand. [Applause] Unanimous, thank you. That’s item number three. I fear our pace may be slowed as we move forward here. Item number four, they’re just getting feedback. Item number four is the appointment of, there is three sections to item number four.

So there are interim chair and permanent chair selections. As most of you know, or should know, Roelof is stepping down from his long time role as chair of the SOP. Before we move on, I would like to take the time to thank Roelof who has done a fantastic job there. And the work of Roelof, and the rest of the committee members, have become a fixture in the ICANN community.

And I’m sure a fixture the Board absolutely appreciates. And so does the rest of the committee, who uses our work frequently. So first, I would just like to say thank you to Roelof. [Applause] And then also not that one of the committee members, Giovanni, has agreed to act as the interim chair, which I think is a good selection, and I want to thank Giovanni for stepping up for that.
There is a draft resolution that, would you like to say something Roelof?
I’ll take the chair’s privilege, yes please say something.

ROELOF MEJER: I just wanted to say it was my pleasure, and of course, it wasn’t me alone. There was a whole committee, all those members are still there. And I think what a lot of people don’t realize is that there are some hidden forces behind the committee, and of course, it’s the two ladies in front, and especially Bart has been helping a lot with growing of most concepts, texts, etc.

So that’s the constant factor, so I don’t think we should be worried about anything changing for the worse.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Roelof. So there is a draft resolution in front of us, to appoint Giovanni as an interim chair. And the draft resolution is the ccNSO Council will appoint Giovanni Seppia as interim chair until the Los Angeles meeting. And the secretariat is requested to inform the working group accordingly.

Can I get a show of hands to approve that resolution? Yes. I’m moving and seconding it, yeah. [Laughter] Okay. We can absolutely go more formal on that one. Can I have somebody move that resolution? Keith, thank you very much. Second it? Katrina, quick out of the gate, lots of support. Is there any discussion at this point?

No? Okay. Thank you. Can I have a vote on that? All in favor? I think that’s, like I said, it’s very tough here, that looks like it’s unanimous. It
was down at that end. Thank you very much. Resolution passed. On to item 4.2, and that’s the appointment of Lise Fuhr as second co-chair to the cross community working group on use of names of countries and territories as TLDs.

We have a draft resolution in place. I’ll read the resolution out loud. The ccNSO Council appoints Lise Fuhr as ccNSO appointed co-chair of the ccWG of use of names of countries and territories as TLDs. The secretariat is requested to inform the GNSO, and the GNSO appointed co-chairs of this WG accordingly.


HIROFUMI HOTTA: Yes. I think it’s just a typo. The third line, the last character, co-chairs, it should be co-chair, I think.

BYRON HOLLAND: You’re probably right. I think that’s correct. Who is the grammarian here? Third line of the resolution, it’s says GNSO appointed co-chairs. No.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There are two co-chairs. There are two co-hairs from each constituency, so I think that’s correct.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It is correct. Hiro, it is correct because the two co-chairs on this working group are [Jing Chow] and Heather Forrest. So it’s plural.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Any other discussion on this resolution? No? Hearing none, we’ll vote. All in favor of draft, of the resolution for item 4.2? Show of hands please. I believe that looks unanimous. Could you just confirm that for me because it’s very tough to see here? Unanimous? Thank you. Congratulations Lise.

Item 4.3, the appointment of Becky Burr as co-chair of the cross community working group for the development of a framework of principles for cross community working groups. And I’m not even going to make a joke about [laughter]... Yes, no, it’s too easy, it’s too easy. We have a draft resolution in front of us that I will read.

The ccNSO Council appoints Becky Burr as ccNSO appointed co-chair of the ccWG for the development of a framework of principles for ccWGs. The secretariat is requested to inform the GNSO and the GNSO appointed co-chairs, co-chair, of this WG accordingly. Could I have somebody make a motion on that?

Keith. Thank you. Seconder? Katrina. Thank you. Any discussion on the ccWG on ccWGs? Okay. With that, we’ll put it to a vote. All in favor of this resolution? Unanimous? Thank you. Becky abstained. Okay. Thank you.

Okay. On to item number five. The cross community working group on IANA oversight transition. There is a little bit of background contained within the agenda, but essentially, for those who haven’t heard me
mention it over the course of this week, the ccNSO worked in conjunction with the GNSO after discussions with other directly affected parties such as the root zone maintainer and the root operators, about the importance of having direct input into whatever the ICANN process ended up being.

And then at this point, it looks like a 27 person coordinating committee. But over the course of time, it was decided, or discussed and decided that a ccWG with the core focus around matters pertaining to directly affected parties would be an important input into that coordinating committee. In the fullness of time, we also had discussions around the opportunity to have other SO and ACs participate as invited guests in that.

And as such, made those invitations. In the interim, we have had ALAC and SSAC agree to participate. And some initial work has been done around potential scoping of draft charters, etc. So I continue to think this would be an important input, an important channel for the ccNSO community, to have input into the IANA oversight transition process that comes from a place of being directly affected party, or a direct customer of the IANA services.

So we have a draft resolution here, which I will read, and then we’ll have an opportunity for discussion. The ccNSO Council resolves to participate in the team to draft the charter for ccWG on the IANA stewardship transition process, and appoints Byron, and appoints its Chair, Byron Holland, as one of the co-chairs.

The ccNSO council agrees to discuss and make a decision on the adoption of the proposed charter through an email vote, once
submitted, and made available by the co-chairs of the drafting team. Can I get a motion for that? Keith? Thank you. Seconder? Dottie, thank you. Discussion on this item? Any comments, feedback?

Okay. Hearing none, we’ll put that to a vote. All in favor of the resolution? Thank you. Looks to be unanimous, thank you. There is an associated draft resolution, which I will read. The ccNSO secretariat is requested to send out a call for the four volunteers, as soon as possible after closure of this council meeting. And the secretariat is also requested to indicate to those who are interested, they may attend the informal meeting of the envisioned drafting team group here, during this London meeting.

The volunteers will be appointed by an email decision of the Council, as soon as possible, but no later than July 4th, 2014, midnight UTC. Can somebody make a motion for that?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Just wonder if there might be a friendly amendment to the motion to somehow ask the secretariat to use the regional organizations and any other means for outreach to try and ensure covering all ccTLDs along the way. And I don’t know that if, useful words. But there is an intent, okay.

Well, I think the sound people could probably turn the sound up. I don’t quite trust that one because it starts to hum if you speak closer to it and it gives feedback. I just wondered, as a friendly amendment, we could do something to amend the wording so that the ccNSO secretariat is requested to use all means at its disposal, including working with the
regional organizations to send out a call for, so that we can reach the [inaudible] of the ccTLDs that are not normally contactable within our community.

BYRON HOLLAND: I’m going to actually have [Bart] respond to that with some possible ways of doing that.

[BART]: As you will see under number seven, the secretariat is in the process of creating an email list that goes out to everybody, to all ccTLDs. But that will not be ready today. So, either... So that’s one option. We wait until that one is ready, but then we have, we do not have the opportunity.

The second option is, we use our normal channels, and it we forward it to the regional organizations, and if the regional organizations, if they’re able, once they’ve received the call for volunteers, pass it on to their communities at once, then we have at least ensured that we get them out to this evening, because the call for volunteers has been drafted already. So it could be sent rather quickly, and we will forward it to the general managers of the regional organizations. So that’s the second option.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I think the second option covers exactly what I wanted. So the normal processes to deal with the arrows as well, so that’s covered. Thank you.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And maybe, is it enough that we guarantee that we do it this way, so we do not have to amend the language of this one?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Absolutely.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: I was just going to discuss the addition of the cc community into the draft resolution, so that will call for the four volunteers, send out a call to the cc community.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. So we’re going to come back to that. First I just want to make clear that we are okay without any written amendment on the process side where, as part of this, we will send the message through the ROs. So that’s going to happen without any written amendment. In terms of your suggestion, friendly amendment, is it the ccNSO secretariat is requested to send out a call to all ccTLD...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: To the ccTLD...
BYRON HOLLAND: To the ccTLD community for the four volunteers. Okay. I think we can amend it accordingly. Margarita? You okay? So with that amendment, is there any other discussion? Okay. Could I get a motion for that resolution as amended? Becky? Thank you. Somebody to second that? Young Eum, thank you. Call for a vote on that.

All in favor of that amended resolution? Unanimous? Thank you. 5.1 and 5.2 done, thank you. Item number six, is the charter for the cross community working group on Internet governance. There is some background material in your agenda, but this is the cross community working group that started to take shape in Singapore, and started engaging in work before there was a charter.

And as a result, entered a little bit of choppy water and has subsequently worked through developing a charter. We have a draft resolution in front of us. We also have members on that, sorry. Let me back up. We do have members on that cross community working group right now.

And there is a charter that has come forward. We have a related draft resolution, which is the ccNSO Council adopts the charter for the cross community working group on Internet governance. And the secretariat is requested to inform the conveners of the informal working group as soon as possible, as well as the chairs of the other SOs and ACs.

We have had just, or I had very late notice that the GNSO is not going to support this right now because of wording within the charter. So at this point, I would, in spite of the fact that it’s in here, that decision is hot off
the press, and I’m going to suggest that we defer this item to a future meeting, until such time we can understand that all of the SOs and ACs are going to be in support of the charter.

So, unless there is any objection to that, I will defer this item. Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Just some explanation about the controversy. Is that there has been included, a voting mechanism. And I think the word voting kind of was not accepted by, even the members themselves. Not all of the members themselves.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you for that explanation. So we will defer items 6.1 and the related 6.2. Thank you. Item number seven, ccNSO selection process, ccNSO selection process members for the coordination group IANA stewardship transition process. That’s a mouthful. I think we might want to clean up that sentence.

The ccNSO selection process for the coordination group of the IANA stewardship transition process. Sorry, a little typo. Based on what we’ve heard in terms of the Council preparatory meeting on Sunday, ongoing conversations going through the week, and certainly what we heard over the course of the last hour and a half session, we have attempted to put forward a resolution that actually reflects the temperature of the room, and a conversation that we had.
And so over the last past couple of hours as well as the preparatory council meeting, and the meeting of the IGRG. We do have a draft resolution that attempts to capture that, and I think it's fairly reflective of it. If there are any comments, Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. Thank you Byron. I think that there is an amendment that we could put to this that would more properly reflect the mood of the last couple of hours. Would you like me to suggest one?

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. Is it a friendly amendment?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah.

BYRON HOLLAND: Absolutely, please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Okay. Well I propose to delete the second sentence, the one that starts at least four, and replace it by, the members of the selection committee shall be drawn from the ccNSO and the ccTLD community as a whole. At least one member of the selection committee shall be from a non-ccNSO member ccTLD.

BYRON HOLLAND: Could you repeat that please?
NIGEL HICKSON: Would you like me to have sent it to you by email? I can do that, if that helps. The members of the selection committee shall be drawn from the ccNSO and the ccTLD community as a whole. At least one member of the selection committee shall be from a non-ccNSO member ccTLD.

BYRON HOLLAND: But you’re excluding any potential to have a non-cc, that third party member.

NIGEL HICKSON: I don’t understand. What do you mean a non-cc third party?

BYRON HOLLAND: The outside member, the Yannis or the independent.

NIGEL HICKSON: I think that was the mood of the meeting also. Was it not?

BYRON HOLLAND: It was my... So for the selection committee, it was my sense of the room that with five members that an outside member could be accepted.

NIGEL HICKSON: I won’t die in a ditch. So, if you want to add more to make that clear.
BYRON HOLLAND: Maybe... So I’m going to ask Young Eum to make a comment or intervention, but given that we have the chair of the session with us, I will perhaps ask for him to make comment or provide color, unless there is any objection from the Council itself. No, Roloff perhaps you can add some color to this?

ROLOFF: What I presented to the room was the rough consensus of this point was that the committee would could five members, four of which would be members of the ccNSO, one of which should be a ccTLD registry representative, but not a member of the ccNSO. So there was a slight majority in favor of ccTLD only members in the selection committee, and as specifically asked those who were in favor of an outsider, if they thought that would be recommendable or if they would be against a ccTLD only composition.

And nobody indicated that they would be against, strongly against a ccTLD only composition on the selection committee. Am I making myself clear? Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: I believe so, but let me just recap for the Council. The understanding that there was a slim majority in favor of having the selection committee be only ccTLD managers, of which one at least would be, or one would not be a ccNSO member. And of those who were interested in having a third party, was not an issue that they felt strongly enough about to make demands on it.

I think that recaps what Roloff has said.
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And I think what I wrote captures that precisely.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any further comment or debate on that? Okay. I’m open to the friendly amendment. Thank you. Bart, did you capture it? And maybe Nigel, you can just send it. Oh, you’ve done it? Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: This is more refining what is currently in the draft resolution. But I think it captures what Nigel wanted to say as well, is so the resolution... So I’ve got in front of me as it now reads, the ccNSO Council resolves to establish a five member selection panel to select the four members of the IANA stewardship transition processes coordination committee.

At least of the members of the selection committee, shall be, and would change should with shall... Shall be from the ccTLD community. The selection committee will include at least two members of the ccNSO Council, including its chair, one member of a Board or a regional TLD organization, and one non-ccNSO member. And then it starts... That captures, I think, at least for these four, how it should be composed.

And then you have room, if necessary, it can be five, it can be four, out of the cc, but at least these criteria need to be met for the selection, the four of the selection of the panel, or the five.

BYRON HOLLAND: Does that capture the spirit?
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's compatible to everything I said, I think.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Just an additional friendly amendment suggestion of the title of this item. ccNSO selection process committee members. No. ccNSO selection committee members of the coordination group. So right. Replace committee with, I mean, replace process with committee.

BYRON HOLLAND: ccNSO selection committee members, I think we also need to say for the coordination group of the IANA stewardship transition process. Okay? With those amendments. Can I ask for a motion on this? Margarita and Dottie, thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There are two open questions in this one, which haven’t been discussed. That’s the date by which this selection committee has to forward its decision, or has to make its list of candidates for the coordination committee. So that’s a matter of further debate. My suggestion would be, leave it as it is. That the chair of the Council and I will get back to you by tomorrow on this one, around noon, with the list, proposed list, and dates.

So we get this going. Because the dates need to be determined.
BYRON HOLLAND: Margarita?

MARGARITA VALDES: I have a question. In this sentence that said, including its chair, one member of the Board of original TLD organization, it’s mandatory that this person have to belong to the Board of the original organizations? Or regional organizations could present their candidate?

In the case of a small organization, it could be an issue. It’s also, yeah. One member of the board of regional organizations. So the older the regional organization have to agree in one person?

BYRON HOLLAND: That’s correct. So the understanding is that between the four regional organizations, there will be able to surface a candidate, very shortly. And they have committed to me that they can do that.

MARGARITA VALDES: All right, okay. But the other question is, this person is agreed by the regional organization, and also have to belong to the board of these organizations?

BYRON HOLLAND: That’s correct. From the pool of candidates of the four boards of the four regional organizations. Somebody from that pool.
MARGARITA VALDES: Okay. Thank you.

BYRON HOLLAND: So I think it’s correct as it stands. Any other comments or interventions on this one? As amended, can we put this to a vote? All in support of...? Yeah. Let’s put it to... Yes, call for a motion. Young Eum and Becky, thank you. Put it to a vote. All in favor as amended?

I think we’re unanimous on that? One abstention. Capture that? Thank you. We are on to item 7.3, which is... Becky go ahead.

BECKY BURR: Sorry. I thought that we’re doing these separately. I think that the sentence, the chair and the vice chairs of the ccNSO are requested seat members and nominate the members of the selection committee as soon as possible, is, begs the question of who is going to actually select them? In the interests of time, I would certainly be fine with having the chair and vice chairs of the ccNSO make the selection or otherwise we should just decide that the Council is going to vote quickly on it.

BYRON HOLLAND: So I think it would be best if the Council could vote on it. And I would suggest we use the same mechanism as, as 7.3, sorry 7.4, which is on the back of the next page, and it’s...

Essentially what it’s saying is that by noon UTC on June 26th, that we will put forward an email recommendation for the Council.
NIKOL HICKSON: Mr. Chair, could I just, for the sake of making life easy, formally suggest we cut and paste the wording of 7.4 into...

BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Thank you Nigel. Dotty? Could you put your mic on?

DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: Does this mean that only the vice chairs and chair can submit nominations?

BYRON HOLLAND: No, it’s the call and to put forward the list. So the call will go out, and the chair and vice chair will put forward recommended slate effectively for the Council to vote on. Yeah. So just so there is total clarity since there have been a number of changes, I’m going to ask Bart to read the updated and comprehensive resolution. But before Bart does that, Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Because it would be possible for the vice chairs to either nominate themselves, or be nominated, I would think it would be better to change the wording to take out the vice chairs, so the chair of the ccNSO is requested to seek members. And that would be in line with your suggestion of the Council taking a vote, rather than the chair and the vice chair being the, I mean... Being responsible for the selection committee.
BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Young Eum. Becky?

BECKY BURR: I believe Nigel’s suggestion which was just to cut that sentence, the chair and vice chairs, and substitute the language in 7.4, which directs the chair to finalize the call for nominations.

BYRON HOLLAND: So I think Bart has captured the essence of what Nigel and Young Eum were articulating. Are you going to give it a try?

BART: Yup.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

BART: The full resolution now reads: ccNSO selection committee member for the coordination group of the IANA stewardship transition process. The ccNSO Council resolves to establish a five member selection panel to select the four members on the IANA stewardship transition process coordination committee. At least four of the members of the selection panel, this should read, shall be from the ccTLD community.

The selection committee will include at least two members of the ccNSO Council, including its chair, one member of the board of the regional TLD organizations, and one non-ccNSO member. It’s task is to review
the applications and select the four ccTLD members of the coordination committee to the ccNSO Council by, date to be filled in, prior to a special meeting of the ccNSO Council on, date.

In its review and selection, the committee will take into account and be guided by the criteria for selection included in the call for nominations. Now the second friendly amendment, the Chair of the ccNSO is requested, is requested to seek members and nominate the members of the selection committee as soon as possible, and send it to the Council for final approval by 26th of June, noon UTC.

Interviews of the candidates may be conducted. Members of the selection committee are not eligible as candidates for the coordination committee. That’s the full resolution as it reads now.

BYRON HOLLAND: There were a significant number of changes there. Perhaps we’ll make sure everybody has had time to digest that. Any further comments or questions? Young Eum?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Question about the members of the selection committee. Being from the ccTLD community, I thought that what Roloff had said was that the mood of the room was a bit more in favor of all of the members being from the ccTLD community. So should we include that? Or should we leave it open for one outside member to be included? But maybe not necessarily an outside member, but so this is something that I think we should be clear about.
BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. It’s at least ccNSO community.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: From the ccNSO...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If you have at least four from the ccNSO community, then, and you have also the requirement of one, at least, from say non-ccNSO member, then that’s the, then you have the full slate.

But the feeling in the room, as Roloff recorded, is there was a slight majority in favor of having all five, all five from the ccTLD community. And this is captured with the wording of at least...

BYRON HOLLAND: So just to be clear here. Is what is on the screen the revised one? So, can we please put it up so that we can have clarity on the exact wording?

So the intent, as we get to the wording, is to ensure that all members are from the broad ccTLD community, and there are some carve outs for ccNSO and RO. So that’s the intent, we all agree on that. We’re going to work on the wording to ensure that that is the case. Young Eum.

YOUNG EUM LEE: If we state in the first sentence that members from the ccTLD community, and then not discuss for but include the two members of
the ccNSO Council including the chair, and at least one member from the non-ccNSO community, and I think that would also work. And so we would not have to mention four members being from the ccNSO community.

If we say that all members should be from the ccTLD at the beginning.

BYRON HOLLAND: Do we have it on the screen yet? So while that is happening, can I suggest that we defer that for a moment and move on to 7.3 while we get it up on the screen? Unless there is any objection to that? We will come back to it. First we’ll go to 7.3, which is to create a ccTLD world email list to engage and involve all ccTLDs specifically for the IANA stewardship process.

We do have a draft resolution, which I think is fairly straightforward, and I would say we’re already familiar with 7.4 and a call for nominations. The draft resolution for 7.3 is, the secretariat is required to setup an email list, including email contacts, to all ccTLDs, and solely for the purpose to inform and engage the community in the IANA stewardship transition process.

Can I have somebody make a motion for that? Keith? A seconder? Young Eum? Thank you. Discussion? Is that Jordi?

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: Yeah, just a question to try to find... Is that maybe it’s just to send one mail to tell them that we’re going to engage on that conversation? Or is
that kind of following so people can exchange? Cannot get the goal, the real goal for that.

BYRON HOLLAND: Certainly my understanding was that it wasn’t just one email, but it was to be used to inform and engage over the process. It’s more than just one single email, but it’s not a spam list, it’s restricted to the single topic.

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: So we just inform about that to all of the community, but not engage the discussion that list?

BYRON HOLLAND: That’s correct.

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: Thanks.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any other discussion? Thank you. Seeing none, I’ll call... Go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I mentioned something about the numbers, the five members. Wouldn’t it be easier, the way it is put here, to say, two members will be from the Council, on the Chair and one to be selected? One member will be from the regional board, regional organization board, and the other two from the ccTLD community. And then you have the five.
BYRON HOLLAND: Before we go back to that, can we just...? We’re just going to vote on the resolution on the mail list. Hold on to your numbers, we’re coming back. But first, 7.3, we’re going to actually have the vote. So, seeing there is no more discussion, vote on the draft resolution as it stands for 7.3. All in favor? Any abstentions? Was that unanimous? Yes?

It’s really hard for me to see, I’ve got to rely on you. So okay. Unanimous on 7.3. I’m sure you’ll tell me, but yes I would like to just do it right the first time. Okay. We’re going to go back to item number 7.2, and the amended, amended draft resolution. Can you put in the maximum font that can get it all on one page?

I didn’t bring my glasses up here. Okay, so I’m going to read this revised version. 7.2, draft resolution. ccNSO Council resolves to establish a five member selection panel, to select the four members of the IANA stewardship transition process coordination committee. At least four of the members of the selection committee shall be from the ccTLD community.

Yes. So instead of, at least four of the, that should be deleted and replaced with all. Can you do that? We can’t do that on the fly. While we are revisiting that, please give us your suggestion Victor.

VICTOR ABOUD: My suggestion is that we are talking about at least, but there is already one selected that is a [inaudible] of the ccNSO Council. There is already another one selected that is another ccNSO Council. So we shorten to three. Out of the three, there is one left that is the one from the
regional organization’s Board. So the only ones that you have to select, that we have to select, out of the Council is two ccTLD community members.

Yes, that’s what we said.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: If I do the math, what I’m, apologies because I’m not very good at it. So you’ve got the Chair, you’ve got one member of the Council, you’ve got one member of the Board, and then I think because of this, you have two members from community, and at least one of those members, or say, and two members of the community.

Whoever is going to be elected, say we need to ensure that one of the five is a non-ccNSO member. Is that the correct capture of...? Yes? Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND: So, to reflect this. The composition will include the Chair of the ccNSO, a ccNSO Council member, a member of one of the regional organization’s boards, and of the two remaining seats, one will be a non-ccNSO member.

Which likely, but not by definition, leads to the fact that the other, the final seat will probably be a ccNSO member. But anyway, we don’t need to make it that prescriptive. So what we have done is ensure we have what we need, but there is some flexibility. So just to repeat it.

ccNSO chair, and another ccNSO Council member, plus a board member from one of the RO boards, and a non-ccNSO member. Those are the
prescriptive candidates for the selection committee, leaving some flexibility for another one, a fifth one. There will be a ccTLD member, without a prescribed or stripe or tribe affiliation.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Because one of the ccNSO Council, could not be a cc member, because we have councils that are not cc members...

BYRON HOLLAND: Correct. But without going into that, that is the spirit of what we are trying to achieve here. Young Eum, did you have...?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Just one additional clarification. The remaining member could be a ccNSO member, ccNSO Council, or a regional organization order, so that, we leave that open.

BYRON HOLLAND: That’s correct. We are not going to be prescriptive on that final spot, other than to say it’s a ccTLD community member. Jordi.

JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: Yeah, that ccTLD community member means someone that is knowledgeable about that community, because I’m also confused about what does it mean, being a member of that community? Managing or being part of a board of a ccTLD? Or as you mentioned, [inaudible] for instance, is knowledgeable...
BYRON HOLLAND: No, that it would be, the ccTLD manager or their designate, which would… I mean, depending on how far we want to drill into this, the assumption is their designate is employee or part of the organization, not an outsider. So for further clarity…

For further clarity, when we talk about ccTLD community members, we are agreeing that it is the ccTLD manager, or their designate from within their organization. We’re good?

Have we been able to revise the resolution? I think that it’s important that we see this one before we pass it.

So, since we are in flight with this, I’m going to ask your indulgence again that we move on to the next item, which is 7.4, the call for nominations, allow staff to make the required adjustments and we’ll come back. Hiro?

HIROFUMI HOTTAAAAAAAAAAAAAA: First line of 7.2 resolution has selection panel, so panel means a committee here, right?

HIROFUMI HOTTA: I wanted to make a comment on 7.2.

BYRON HOLLAND: Hiro, can you speak more directly into the mic? Just the volume is tough.

HIROFUMI HOTTAAAAAAAAAAAAAA: First line of 7.2 resolution has selection panel, so panel means a committee here, right?
BYRON HOLLAND: We’re going with consistency of language to ensure there is no confusion, and you’re correct, it should be selection committee. That is the vernacular that we’re using, and we’ll make sure we scrub the resolution to have consistent language. Thank you Hiro, good catch.

That said, we move on to 7.4, we’ll defer to 7.2 for the moment. We’ll move on to 7.4, call for nominations. There is a draft resolution there, which I will read. The Chair of the Council is requested to finalize the call for nominations, including the criteria for selection of the four ccTLD members on the coordination committee, and send it to the Council for final approval by June 26th noon UTC.

The secretariat is request to send out the approved call for self-nominations and refer the nominations received to the selection committee upon receiving the nomination. I’d like somebody to make a motion, and then I’m sure there are going to be some discussion, perhaps, for the amendment on that, given some of the feedback that came out of the panel session this afternoon.

That said, can I get a motion? Hiro, thank you. A seconder? Jordi, thank you. Discussion on this resolution, on 7.4? Just remind everybody that we did have a discussion about the transparency component of this, and that all submissions, the name of the applicant, would be made public. Presumably on the ccNSO website.

So Bart, could I task you with adding a sentence that indicates such?
UNKNOWN SPEAKER: What I’ve added to the resolution, so to reflect this afternoon’s discussion is, the names of the nominees shall be published on the ccNSO website.

BYRON HOLLAND: So the resolution will be updated accordingly. It will be exactly as you see it in print, except for that one additional sentence, which has just been read. Any discussion? Any further discussion? With that, could I put that resolution to a vote? All in favor of the amended resolution? Hands up please.

Any abstaining? Opposed? I see none, carried unanimously, 7.4 as amended. Thank you. How are we doing on 7.2?

Okay. So it’s somewhere along the information highway then, okay. Okay. Until that happens, we are going to keep moving on the agenda. We will, of course, be coming back to 7.2, but before we get there, we’ll go to agenda item number eight, which is ICANN’s IANA oversight transition process and enhancing accountability.

Now we know there are essentially two separate processes that are going to be happening here. And the accountability process is much discussed, but not particularly well shaped yet. We do have a draft resolution in front of you, which I am going to read.

The secretariat is requested to draft a charter for the coordination committee on the IANA stewardship transition and accountability. The purpose of this group is to coordinate the ccNSO and broader ccTLD efforts to participate in the IANA stewardship process, and enhancing ICANN’s accountability process, and coordinate the efforts of the ccNSO...
with other efforts aimed at including the broader ccTLD community in the process and finally coordinate the interrelation between processes from a ccNSO and broader ccTLD perspective.

Further, the membership of this group should at least compromise, comprise the following. The chair of the ccNSO, and the chairs of the ccNSO meeting program working group. So correct that typo. The chair of the SOP, the members selected on the coordination committee, and the members to be appointed on the future ccWG on IANA.

And the members of the working groups related to the enhancing ICANN accountability process. Effectively what we’re doing here is trying to create a working group essentially that will facilitate the flow of information between all of these various streams, to make sure that we don’t lose sight of any of them, and that the flow of information coming back in will also be widely and effectively disseminated.

I’d like to, can somebody make a motion on that before discussion? Nigel, thank you. Seconder? Demi, thank you. I know people’s arms are probably getting tired here, but thank you. Discussion on this item. Any discussion? Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I’m sorry. I have a short question. Can I raise it? Is it an informational group, basically? I mean, information sharing, a platform as I understand it. Yes.
BYRON HOLLAND: Yes. Yeah. It’s not a decision making body. It’s meant to have a flow of information between all the various streams so that nothing gets dropped, and there is an understanding of what’s happening in all of the processes.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Excuse me. That’s why it’s still in drafting mode. This one will replace the coordination committee of the Council, which comprised of Byron, Keith, and Becky. And in time, as the Internet governance probably loses its priority for the moment, because NetMundial has just been closed, this is a way, and maybe at some time they will be included as well, is just this is the central point for everybody dealing with these different processes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Yeah. If you recall, when Becky, and Keith, and I agreed to, it will be a very informal clearing house of this information, it was meant to be informal, ad hoc, and short lived. And of course, more things have piled up on top of what we initially thought was going to happen. So it’s important to expand that and make sure the flow of information from all of these work streams, is being effectively disseminated and communicated.

And then it won’t just be Becky, and Keith, and I. So that’s the goal. Okay, with that clarification, can we vote on this please? All in favor of the draft resolution? Thank you. I believe it’s unanimous. Thank you. Number eight.

Okay. Third time is the charm on 7.2. Can you put it up in front of us please? I broke his computer. Can you get it back on the screen? Oh,
those Apple products, you should get a Mac, or a PC, they are much tougher. One moment please.

Bear with me.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair? I think we’ve duplicated those a bit there. There is another Council member appeared.

I don’t want to put it this way, but I think there are too many Council members.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: ...if you delete the sentence, or the fraction, ccNSO Council members...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right.

BYRON HOLLAND: Can we change this to reflect it? It has the potential to be more, so here, let me just... It has the potential to be more because that fifth and final seat is not prescribed. So it’s at least, it could be more.

Alan, could you bring me my glasses please? Sorry guys.

Maybe redundant now. Thank you sir, I appreciate that.
All right, I owe you a beer for that. Okay. I’m going to read it again. Draft resolution. The ccNSO Council resolves to establish a five member selection committee, to select the four members of the IANA stewardship process coordinating committee. All members of the selection committee shall be from the ccTLD community.

The selection committee will include at least two members of a ccNSO Council, including its chair. One member of a board of the regional TLD organizations, and one non-ccNSO member. Its task is to review the applications and select the four ccTLD members of the coordination committee to the ccNSO Council by a date to be determined, prior to a special meeting of the ccNSO Council on a date to be determined.

And in its review and selection, the committee will take into account and be guided by the criteria for selection included in the call for nominations.

So I believe that the math works. Okay. Just one moment. So, we are in the, still in discussion on this. So first, I have Keith and then Jordi.

KEITH DAVISON: Thanks Byron. The date to be determined is a bit concerning I think. I don’t think we can have a resolution with a date to be determined, so perhaps the first date to be determined could be resolved by adding the words, by or a certain after the second of July. But I’m not sure what to do about the second date to be determined.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Keith. Take that into consideration. Jordi?
JORDI IPARRAGUIRRE: Yeah, thank you. I don’t know if it’s me or maybe it’s that something that confuses everyone. Is that, these are my viewpoint, including its chair. I mean, what does it mean? At least two members of the ccNSO Council, so the chair and another one? Or just members of the, because if it’s the chair and another one, it’s for me, it would be easier.

The chair of the ccNSO Council and another member of the Council. But if the chair is not included, then it’s just members of the Council. So I think it eases the writing of that on my viewpoint.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you Jordi. I don’t think this is grammatically wrong. Perhaps you make a, I take your suggestion, though I don’t think this is grammatically incorrect. Margarita?

MARGARITA VALDES: I think that’s a [inaudible], is because we are currently talking about things. One thing is the election committee, and one thing is our members to the coordination committee. Do you follow me?

So we were talking about these five members that are from our community, and they will elect to the, our representatives to the coordination committee. The coordination committee are four, right? Yeah. The election committee are five. That’s the, perhaps that’s the reason why the number doesn’t fit. Okay, sorry.
BYRON HOLLAND:

It’s not, although I do agree that it can lead to confusion, but that’s not the issue. The essence of this resolution, is that all members will come from the ccTLD community. The selection committee would include at least two members of the Council, including its chair, that is correct.

One member of a board from a regional TLD organization, and one non-ccNSO member. Those are all correct. What it doesn’t do is be prescriptive of the nature of the fifth member, which we have already agreed is what we’re looking for. So it is silent on that topic specifically.

So I think we’re okay with the language there. I want to go back to Keith’s date comment, and [Carolina], do you have a question of clarification?

[CAROLINA]:

I’m very sorry, I know I’m observer status, but I just think if you’re saying two members of the ccNSO Council, one of which is the chair, and then you repeat again, ccNSO Council member. Okay.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Okay, which is, don’t be sorry. So I should also say what I’m reading, there is a slight delta, that’s why I’m reading it out. Nothing like drafting on the fly when you’re not actually connected. So the math and the requirements are correct.

Now we do need to speak to the date. So, are you suggesting, Keith, a friendly amendment or that we should just change this, and it would be the sentence beginning with, about half way down, its task is to review the applications and select the four ccTLD members of the coordination
committee to the ccNSO Council by, I would say, by July 2\textsuperscript{nd} or as soon after that date as possible.

Would that address your concern and clarify for us?

KEITH DAVISON: It would address my concerns. But I’m now also concerned that it says, the four ccTLD members of the coordination committee to the ccNSO Council. And in effect, I thought they were in pairing the selection committee to make the selections. So I don’t know why it would be referring to the ccNSO Council.

BYRON HOLLAND: So, they are empowered to make the selection, but ICANN as a process has asked the ccNSO to actually... That committee cannot just walk into ICANN and say, “Here are our four candidates.” My interpretation is, ICANN very specifically asked us to put those names forward.

KEITH DAVISON: Thank you for the clarification. In that case, yes the words you just used, by or soon after the 2\textsuperscript{nd} of July was perfect was the first date of be determined.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. So we are going to go with, by July 2\textsuperscript{nd}, or as soon after as possible. Bart is going to make that change and we’re going to try again. In the meantime, Dotty?
DOTTY SPARKS DE BLANC: I was just going to suggest, why don’t we say with a target date of July 2\textsuperscript{nd}?

BYRON HOLLAND: So I think we want to put that date as, it’s the date in the sand, but recognize that the committee needs to do the job right. I’m comfortable with going by July 2\textsuperscript{nd} or as soon after as possible. Does the Council wish to see this in print again?

Okay. Keith?

KEITH DAVIDSON: Can I suggest with the second date to be determined, maybe we delete the second date to be determined and have prior to an urgent special meeting of the ccNSO Council.

BYRON HOLLAND: Any objections to Keith’s suggestion? Okay. Can we include that? Just for clarity sake, Keith, could you repeat that for all of us?

KEITH DAVIDSON: That the, from the word prior, prior to an urgent special meeting of the ccNSO Council stop.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you. Bart is going to read it for us.
BART: Its task to review the applications and select the four ccTLD members of the coordination committee, to the ccNSO Council by 2nd of July or as soon after, thereafter. As soon as possible thereafter. Thereafter.

Prior to an urgent special meeting of the ccNSO Council. In its review and selection, the committee, and then it continues, no changes.

BYRON HOLLAND: Okay. We now have dates. Are we comfortable with the resolution as modified? Any final discussion points? Going, going, gone. Thank you. Can we put that to a vote? All in favor of the resolution as amended? Any abstaining? Unanimous? Okay. Thank you very much for your endurance, but I think that was actually very constructive and significantly improved from the original, and significantly clarified.

Recognizing that we are 40 minutes past our scheduled endpoint, I think we are going to have to defer some of the items to our next meeting. I’m going to suggest that we attend to agenda item number nine, and then defer the rest of the items to our next Council meeting.

Unless I hear any objections to that, out of respect to people’s time and other commitments. Okay. Item number nine. We will do number nine, and then we will defer the rest to a further Council meeting.

Item number nine is a contract report repository implementation working group, the final report and recommendations. This has been an item that has been on the agenda a number of times. I don’t think a lot of background is required, though there is some background material in your agenda.
There is a draft resolution in front of this on this topic, which I will read. The ccNSO Council adopts the final report, and according to its charter, the working group is closed. The ccNSO Council thanks the Chair of the working group and its members for their work, and the ccNSO adopts the recommendations to initiate the implementation of a secure mail list, in coordination with other initiatives.

Can I get a motion for that? Young Eum, thank you. Seconder? Katrina, thank you. Any discussion on that? No? Can we take a vote on that resolution? All in favor? Looks unanimous. Any abstentions? Did we lose a member? Please note that Souleymane left the meeting prior to agenda item number nine. I would just ask my counsellor colleagues, should you leave a meeting, mid-meeting, that you please let us know.

Ideally in advance. [Laughter] Okay. Sorry I got sidetracked there, thank you very much to that working group and the Chair. Item number 9.2, the appointment of Cristian Hesselman from dot NL as interim chair of the working group to implement the secure mailing list.

We have a draft resolution in front of us. ccNSO Council request Cristian, please [laughter]. Okay. I’ll take that as a typo, which we will correct. Cristian Hesselman from dot NL to seek volunteers to initiate the steps of the process and draft a charter for the implementation working group, in close cooperation with the secretariat and present it to the Council as soon as is feasible.

Can I have a motion for that please? Katrina, seconded by Nigel. Thank you. Let the record show that Souleymane has returned. And thank you. And any discussion on 9.2? Seeing none, can I put it to a vote? All in favor? Unanimous? Thank you. Approved.
We will just conduct a very small administrative component of this meeting, so we will defer all items, items 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 to a further Council meeting. Move to item number 16, just to acknowledge the next meeting dates: August 21st, September 25th, October 15th. They’re just regularly scheduled meetings.

Becky.

BECKY BURR: In light of the fact that we are not meeting in July, could we authorize the chair and the vice chair, or some other people, to prepare and circulate for a vote any, the selection, if any that comes up for the accountability process so that we’re not pushed all the way into August on that? If that comes up?

BYRON HOLLAND: It seems reasonable to me and I’m sure we can do that online, especially given all of the work that we have done on selection committee methodology. I don’t think we need a resolution on that, if we have general agreement on that. Are we okay? Does anybody want to object or speak against that?

You won’t hurt my feelings if you do. Okay. Thank you for that suggestion Becky. And we’ll make sure to keep the Council informed online. In terms of thanks, I have already thanked the chair of the SOP, but I would like to make sure that goes on record even though he has departed, and also to our local hosts.
Who I notice at least one of them in here, Martin. We as a Council would like to thank the local hosts for putting on this meeting. Thank you very much [applause].

With that, I will strike off items 16, 17, go to number 18. Any other business? Would anybody else like to raise anything? I figured that would be a fast agenda item, agenda item 18 close. I would like to call this meeting to a close. I guess I need a motion for that. Keith [laughter]. Second? Here I’ve got a whole range of them. I’ll go with Margarita. Thank you very much and I appreciate your patience and tolerance, that was an important discussion and it will have significant impact as we go forward.

So I thank you for taking the time on that and spending the effort. Thank you very much, meeting adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]