Chris  Hi all

Ramesh  Hi Chris Hi all

Ian  morning everyone

Peter  Afteroon from NZ. I have a little crisis in my email, just to coincide with a very very busy day.

Peter  I assume we are waiting for somethoing like a quorum of members? Is it worth getting started anyway?
Ian  Vincent has another meeting this morning.

joanna  Good morning! this is Joanna

Ramesh  Maybe we can start with a listing of issues while waiting for others?

Peter  Or do we just join the names Council and make our comment that 7 days is an unsuitable time for meaningful input. It seems that there is no driving need to comment now. The whole paper of the cc AG will be advertised in good time before any board meeting which considers it. This is piecemeal, and possibly not likely to result in productive comment. This needs to be considered in the light of the whole.

Dr. Lee  I'm in.

Dr. Lee  Are we waiting for more people to join?

Chris  Given that the ccTLDs in Shanghai accepted our working methodology and given that that methodology was based on the AG putting out prelim recommendations for comment on all 5 areas, it seems to me that the ccTLDs should make the effort to comment. On the timing - we are considering feedback at our meeting on Wednesday week (27th I
think) so any ccTLD who wishes to comment has until then. However, if you decide not to comment then that is fine and we will proceed to consider the feedback we do receive.

Ramesh 1. Issues Manager - who is she? Should she not be from the ccTLD constituency? 2. To what extent should General Counsel comment on item 2 sub-3 and sub-4? 3. Voting on initiation of PDP (item 3) by Council - doesn't the 100% of 2 regions appear to be a minority vote? 4. Voting on initiation of PDP (item 3) by Council - is majority vote (50%) too low? 5. Is the scope of the Task Force too narrow? Why do they only collect info whereas the Issues Manager (at the post-TF or Initial Report) can decide what info should or should not be included? 6. The process for rejection by Board of the Council's decision needs to be talked about. Shall we try to wade through these first?

Ramesh Please add as you wish

Ramesh Can we come up with general comments on these issues on behalf of APTLD?
Dr. Lee: This seems plenty to start with. Chris, can you give us a clarification on the concept of the "issue manager?"

Dr. Lee: I also definitely feel that APTLD should try to come up with general comments on these issues.

Peter: Chris, Please try and be accurate. The ccTLDs DID NOT agree to a 7 day response period, on this or any other suggestions. They agreed to a "timely" procedure. No one thinks this is timely. Nor is the ccTLD agreement all that is required. All of the other players in the DNSO< the ASO etc are involved in Reform. I know that the NC objects. However, I called this meeting to see if, even under very tight constraints, something could be achieved. I assume this is interim, and that there will be a "timely" point at which to make detailed comment. Lets look at Ramesh's list, and see where we can get to. I have about 45 minutes available.

Peter: The most important part of this is in clause 13. This allows the board to treat the council resolutions as "advice" and to do something else. This is all about who has the power to govern ccTLDs. This allows the
board to make a policy which will bind the ccTlds
through their contracts. Can we deal with this first?

Dr. Lee I would also like to add one more item

Dr. Lee 7. The concept of supermajority of Council vote needs clarification.

Chris Peter, I did not say that anyone had agreed to 7 days. I was responding to your other comments, specifically, "The whole paper of the cc AG will be advertised in good time before any board meeting which considers it. This is piecemeal, and possibly not likely to result in productive comment. This needs to be considered in the light of the whole."

Ramesh There is a need for someone who will manage the PDP process. To that extent, the Issue Manager is a good idea. But this person has to really understand ccTLD issues, i.e. should be someone appointed by ccTLDs. BTW, I don't think Chris should be defending the recommendations. He can provide us with clarification where necessary and give us some insight into the reasoning behind it.
Dr. Lee: Yes, Chris. I think we would all appreciate the reasoning behind the "issue manager" and 'supermajority vote'.

Chris: Give me a minute to finish up this phone call.

Dr. Lee: While Chris is taking his time, I think the APTLD statement should also make clear that the PDP process that will occur within the ICANN process will only apply to those limited areas defined in the 'scope'.

Peter: Why don't we begin with the hardest one, as we are sure to run out of time. The rest we can do online.

Who has the authority to make policy? the ccTlds in council, or the Board? We have always said the ccTLDs. What is the reasoning behind allowing the Board to disagree with a council resolution? And to YE, this process applies to policy outside both the ICANN mandate and the SO scope.

Chris: Supermajority - this has been taken to mean 66%.

Chris: As for disagreeing with a council resolution - what would happen if the ccNSO agreed that a particular issue was within its scope and made a recommendation BUT the GNSO (also acting within
its scope on the same issue) made a different recommendation?

Peter  Why has the ccTLD definition of "majority" ie 2/3 from each region, been ignored?

Ramesh  Hmm.. I always thought a supermajority was 75%.

Especially since the recommendations actually state (in one instance - item 13(b)(3)) 66%.

Dr. Lee  Policy outside the ICANN mandate and the SO scope...? Why should this be determined by ICANN's ERC?

Peter  Chris, On what issue could the GNSO make a recommendation within its scope, that was different to one made within ours? They deal with such different areas, affecting different people, contracts, and registrants The fact of the scope difference implies a separation,. If you can identify an example of "overlap" it may lead to a solution -such as a joint group between the SO's, as suggested in the Liaison [paper, for example. But in the absence of an actual likelihood of overlap, we don't need a solution...?
Chris: I am not going to get into a discussion of why this was ignored or why that was ignored. The reality is that nothing has actually been ignored. If the apTLD or any of the individual members think that a 'supermajority' should be 2/3 of each region then I suggest that you provide that feedback...cont

Chris: And, if you think that the issues manager should be apptnd by the ccNSO then provide that as well

Chris: Can I suggest that we keep to one topic at a time otherwise this is going to get very confusing

Dr. Lee: Agreed.

Peter: YEL - No, not the ERC, but the Board. The ERC is recommending (if it accepted this suggestion) that the Board can resolve policies made outside the mandate, and outside the scope. This is normally prevented in an organisation by its rules, which first have to be changed, or, allowed only with very great caution

Chris: Ramesh, what would you like us to discuss first?

Ramesh: Agreed. Can we go back to point 1 - issues manager?

Chris: OK -

Chris: Let me see if I can clarify something
Chris  As far as the Ag is concerned

Chris  the concept of an Issues Manager

Chris  is a good one

Chris  The question is

Chris  whether that person should be

Chris  appointed by the ccNSO or

Chris  should be a designated ICANN staff member

Chris  Why is there a problem with it being an ICANN staff member?

Ramesh  My proposal: Clear statement that the IM should be

appointed by ccTLDs since we would know the

subject matter best and be able to appoint a person we

trust. We have to acknowledge that trust is an issue at

this stage..

Chris  OK - who pays for this person/provides office space etc?

Dr. Lee  The ccNSO Council can provide for this.

Ramesh  I presume it would be the ccTLD Secretariat's

budget?. Whatever the ccTLDs contribute to ICANN

that would go towards the IM will now go instead to

the ccTLD SEct.
joanna  can the IM be someone from the ccNSO secretariat?
surely ccNSO will need to have a secretariat, right?
Someone on the ccNSO structure is always better than
someone from ICANN, because it's ccTLD matters

Peter  I have no problem with a person being specifically "in
charge" of the Policy process. It's the role I suggested
for the VP. Works. The problem with it being a staff
member has been affected by the unsatisfactory
relationships many ccTLDs have had with the staff to
date, This may change in future. The RIRs prefer to
continue with their own staff - our Council can
employ its own policy development people - and
needs to. Agreed with Ramesh about financing...

Chris  This is all true BUT

Chris  the purposes are being confused i think

Chris  the IM is supposed to be the liaison between ICANN
the ccNSO and the other SOs on a particular issue

Chris  They are supposed to do the leg work and you will
recall

Chris  that it was an ICANN proposal that they budget

Chris  to pay staff who will work
Chris with each SO

Chris What is the problem with it being an ICANN staff member

Chris DO you think they have power or can influence things in some way?

Dr. Lee ICANN can have their own staff to work with each SOs. That's all fine. However, the issue manager that deals with ccTLD issues SHOULD come from the ccTLD community.

Ramesh Trust is an issue that we must acknowledge. The problem with getting contact details etc changed in the IANA database is one example.

Chris Maybe the answer is to designate 2 people - one an ICANN Issues manager and 1 a ccNSO issued manager to work together - would that work

Ramesh May not be cost effective to have 2 people. Do we expect them to have that much work?

Dr. Lee Also, I think the final decision about issues important enough to be included in the PDP process should stay within the ccTLD community.
Ramesh: At this point, may I suggest that we adopt the GAC method of drafting comments. Different positions can be noted separately.

Chris: But the final decision IS with the ccNSO - the IM simply provides help with the leg work.

Chris: It seems there is a clear opinion that the IM should not be an ICANN staff member - if so then I suggest the apTLD provide that as feedback and we now move on to the next topic.

Dr. Lee: Agreed.

Ramesh: Agreed. Item 2: To what extent should General Counsel comment on item 2 sub-3 and sub-4?

Peter: This person could have a lot of influence - and they ought to if they are doing their job properly. A person appointed by some else will possibly suffer, as other staff members have done. Even there should not be a lot of global policies to consider, it would be better a person appointed by the cctlds.

Chris: Peter, good point - and as Ramesh has said several times - it's all about trust.
Peter  General Counsel opinion on an Issues Request: A good idea, but their influence must be limited to legal, not policy matters. (they can always be asked to stray into that ) I'd be happy with an opinion on items 1, 2 and 5 only.

Chris  Surely, since the comments of the GC are only opinion and are there for guidance rather than being binding, it makes sense to request the GC to provide an opinion on the big picture

Ramesh  I agree with both Peter and Chris. The GC in coming to a conclusion about the opinion on whether the issue is within scope of ICANN should only look at items 1,2 and 5. But his views on the other 2 items would be helpful. But they should not be tied to his opinion of whether it is within ICANN/SO's scope.

Dr. Lee  How about changing the wording?

Chris  OK - so you would recommend that in coming to his opinion he examines 1, 2 and 5 but may also comment on 3 and 4?

Dr. Lee  General Counsel shall examine whether the issue: 1. is within the scope of ICANN's mission statement; 2. is
within the scope of the ccNSO pursuant to the ccNSOs Scope Matrix; 3. is likely to have lasting value or applicability, albeit with the need for occasional updates; 4. will establish a guide or framework for future decision-making; or General Counsel shall examine whether the issue: 1. is within the scope of ICANN's mission statement; 2. is within the scope of the ccNSO pursuant to the ccNSOs Scope Matrix; 3. is likely to have lasting value or applicability, albeit with the need for occasional updates; 4. will establish a guide or framework for future decision-making; or "General Counsel shall examine whether the issue:" would include 1, 2, and 5 only.

Dr. Lee  oops...

Peter  I am sure you don't really believe that. Opinions from the staff have to be kept to the minimum necessary to allow the policy makers to make good policy, unaffected by staff opinions. One of the constant criticisms and failings of ICANN has been staff capture. This is one of the ways to ensure the staff do not have to defend themselves against that sort of complaint, at least on our "patch" The staff are always
available to assist when required. What you must avoid is undue influence in the critical formative stages, when an idea is just getting off the ground, people are unsure and thinking out loud. An influential opinion at that stage is powerful beyond what proper.

1, 2 and 5 - with the ability to request anything more we want

Chris From a personal point of view, I’m happy with PDT's proposal

Dr. Lee I agree. Let's move on.

Dr. Lee 3. Voting on initiation of PDP (item 3) by Council - doesn't the 100% of 2 regions appear to be a minority vote? 4. Voting on initiation of PDP (item 3) by Council - is majority vote (50%) too low?

Chris Re 3 - yes it does but bear in mind this vote is only to initiate the PDP

Chris it is not a vote on policy itself - I will explain

Chris The AG's view is that if 2 regions believe that an Issues Paper should be prepared on something then it would be unfair for that to be blocked by the other regions
Dr. Lee Also, we need to define "supermajority" vote

Chris Bear in mind this is only a vote about the PDP should be initiated

Dr. Lee I can understand this.

Dr. Lee Can we move to the most important topic that Peter suggested? 6. The process for rejection by Board of the Council's decision needs to be talked about.

Ramesh I think we're doing pretty well.

Dr. Lee I believe this can only be accepted if the scope of the PDP process stays within the ICANN mandate and the scope of the SO.

Peter Starting the PDP process Sorry -slow typing!

Personally, I would like the SO to be a forum where there's a ready development of ideas. What this is about really, though, is the special case of a binding policy. Then, we need to be sure that everyone is on board, and will implement a decision if one does eventually emerge. ie there's no point starting the process if its clear some large chunk of ccTLDs will not implement the outcome. Why should any group be able to impose its will on any others? Clearly, only
when something fundamental is at stake.... I am not sure that the SO members from say, Africa and North America, who are largely to account for a very small minority of actual ccTLDs, and a tiny fraction of registrants, should have the ability to start a process, which, as we shall see, permits the board to do something entirely of its own making. This process should be started with great care, and for compelling reasons.

Chris Starting the PDP process - I have explained how we got to our opinion. I still hold that view but the AG will be happy to receive contrary feedback.

Dr. Lee True, Peter. But I can also see where Chris is coming from. Other regions have the chance to participate in the PDP process through the Task Force.

Ramesh My objection is to the fact that 100% of 2 regions is actually a minority. Can we just keep it at simple majority (50% +1) of the Councillors?

Dr. Lee Agree with Ramesh.

joanna TW also agrees

Dr. Lee Let's move on to item 13. Board Vote.
Ramesh  Yes. Let's move on.

Peter  As I said above: The most important part of this is in clause 13. This allows the board to treat the council resolutions as "advice" and to do something else. This is all about who has the power to govern ccTLDs. This allows the board to make a policy which will bind the ccTLDs through their contracts. Can we deal with this first?

Ramesh  Currently only 66% of Board is needed to reject a Supermajority Council decision. At least an equivalent level (i.e. supermajority) in the Board should be required. This of course is assuming that a supermajority is 75%.

Chris  Hold on a minute

Chris  The PDP does not allow the board to make policy that binds the ccTLDs - why do you think that it does

Peter?

Chris  For the purposes of this discussion, assume that supermajority for Board and Council is set at the same level be that 66 or 75
The individual ccTLD-ICANN contracts, (including yours, Chris contracts say (see: http://www.icann.org/cctlds/model-tscsa-31jan02.htm) Establishment of Specifications and Policies 5.1 Procedure for Establishment. The specifications and policies set forth in Attachment G shall apply to the operation of the Delegated ccTLD under Section 4.5.1 beginning at the commencement of the Term of this Agreement. During the Term of this Agreement, new or revised ICANN specifications and policies applicable to the Sponsoring Organization shall be established according to procedures that comply with ICANN's bylaws and articles of incorporation. In addition, new or revised ICANN specifications and policies established during the Term of this Agreement that are required by this Agreement to be established in the manner specified in this Section 5 shall be developed according to procedures that provide the Sponsoring Organization with input into the decision making process, including where feasible (a) prior notice (by web posting, by e-mail, or according to Section 6.8) to the Sponsoring
Organization explaining what specification or policy is being considered for adoption and why; (b) reasonable opportunities for the Sponsoring Organization to comment, in writing and at a public forum, before the specification or policy is established, and (c) a written statement of the specification or policy that is established and the reason(s) for its establishment. This means that a policy made via this SO policy will become binding on ccTLDs.

Chris

Yes Peter but it is the CONTRACT that says that NOT the PDP. And there are only a handful of contracts and unless a ccTLD has one it is irrelevant. If the PDP was drafted another way that made it clear that the board cannot bind the ccTLDs, any contracts would STILL take precedent.

Chris

I do not believe you can fairly link one with the other.

Ramesh

Hmmm.. the PDP item that we are discussing is with regards REJECTION of policies, not adoption. Right?

Chris

Yes
Chris: It is about the ccNSO making a recommendation and having the Board NOT adopt it.

Ramesh: Whereas the Contract talks about policies being imposed after going through a process (e.g. the PDP). Correct?

Chris: It makes provision for compromise but ultimately it allows the board to not adopt a ccNSO recommendation.

Chris: The contract says that .au will abide by ICANN policies.

Chris: So if a policy recommendation of the ccNSO were accepted by the Board, .au would be bound by it but .nz would not.

Dr. Lee: I agree with Ramesh's proposal (of 75% supermajority to REJECT) the Recommendation, PROVIDED that we make clear that these policies stay within the scope of ICANN's defined in the 'scope' document.

Chris: OK, let's see if we can get clear.

Chris: Firstly, the scope matrix needs to be in place and as the PDP says, it is up to the ccNSO to use the matrix to decide if it is within scope.
Secondly, at present a supermajority is defined as 66% because that is the same as the Board, GNSO and so on.

If you believe that should be 75% then provide that to the AG as feedback - personally I have some sympathy with 75%.

Chris - Binding nature of Policy If you are seriously suggesting that the staff and surveying members of the board are going to give up on a nearly 4 year effort to introduce a term in the contract which binds ccTLDs to policies made by ICANN (in this case, now by the SO, you might have a point. I assume we are dealing with a total programme. I assume you are aware of the previous requirements imposed by the MoU/ If those are now to go, I would rather they be removed from the so-called ccTLD resources" part of the ICANN web site, and confirmation from ccTLDs in negotiation right now that this is not part of the plan. Until then, let's agree we are talking about contractually binding policy.
Chris: No we are not. Contract have not been mentioned in the context of ccTLDs for months. Everyone accepts that ccTLDs will enter into contracts at their own pace on their own terms and some will never enter. Stuart has said as much and the Board has acknowledged it also. We are talking here about a process for operating an SO. It has nothing whatever to do with the question of contracts.

Chris: It is unfair to refer to the contracts in this context. If the ccNSO is formed and the PDP adopted then CLEARLY the way the PDP works will have an effect on the contract negotiations for a ccTLD. IN other words

Chris: if the PDP remains as and says the Board can ignore a ccNSO recommendation in certain circumstances the you will negotiate the terms of any contract bearing that in mind

Peter: The conditions, if any, that the board can not approve an SO recommendation need to go further than simply the number of board members who think its a good idea to reject a properly carried out SO procedure and
recommendation. They need to include safeguards, like Counsel's opinion that the recommendation of the SO is prejudicial to the safety or security of the net, etc NOT just that another SO, or some faction, might disagree. It needs input from the GAC, and possibly other advisory groups. It should be a rare and hard to invoke procedure, with the onus on the board to make out its case, not on the SO - which is the body charged with cctld policy - with defending its view.

Chris Excellent - I agree that some safeguards need to be put into place. You believe that the supermajority, plus the subsequent compromise discussions etc are not enough (these were based on the GAC ones by the way) then please let the AG have your feedback on what safeguards you would like to see.

Peter Chris Contracts I am going to see if I can get Stuart or the Board to confirm your view, as its a crucial assumption you are making.

Ramesh At the first rejection, the Board must give reasons for rejection. And a second opportunity exists to again push the Council's recommendation. This is a
safeguard. But it would be good if we had more. Any ideas Peter?

Chris  It's an interesting discussion. There is a belief that the ccNSO should be able to bind the Board but the Board shouldn't be able to bind the ccNSO. Isn't that position untenable? Surely the correct position is neither binds the other. The Board can bind a ccTLD pursuant to a contract NOT pursuant to a policy made and the ccNSO as a supporting organisation cannot possible be in a position to bind the officers of a company who take the legal obligations of everything they do. The ccNSO or it's members ultimate sanction is to pick up their tent and walk to Willie Black's plan B.

Ramesh  Can we resolve this? My proposal: In item 13, remove the words "66%" and replace with "Supermajority" and define "supermajority" earlier in the document to mean 75%. And to include further safeguards (to be finalised after online discussion).

Dr. Lee  Agreed.

Chris  Fine by me
Peter  Board's power to reject SO The current ccTLD view is that the Board cannot reject a SO recommendation.

Ramesh - please poll the group to see if anyone now believes there may be conditions, yet to be developed, under which the board might reject an SO recommendation and follow its own view. I have captured this in discussions as saying the Board must "Ratify or remand, Not Remake SO policy". I strongly believe ALL policy making must be done in the SO's - that the Board MUST be kept from making policy

Dr. Lee  I like the wording, Board must "Ratify or remand, Not Remake SO policy".

Chris  Yes but this is a different topic. At the moment we are talking about whether the Board accepts or does not accept a recommendation of the ccNSO - that is not the same as the Board having the power to make policy and even if they do have the power to make some policy why is that relevant if that policy is NOT binding on the ccTLDs?

Peter  Binding Politics Chris said: 's an interesting discussion. There is a belief that the ccNSO should be
able to bind the Board but the Board shouldn't be able
to bind the ccNSO. Isn't that position untenable?
Surely the correct position is neither binds the other
Not at all - we are designing a political institution - ie a
place which make policies. Who has the power is at
the heart of all politics. I want it to reside in an elected
and representative SO - not the Board, which I am
afraid, is likely not to fit that description.

Chris   Ah - i understand. Would it be fair to say then that
your opinions re the ccNSO are coloured by your
believes about what you think the Board will turn out
to be?

Ramesh   Can we then have a clear statement in the Bylaws that
prohibit any policy making that may affect or impact
ccTLDs unless it first goes through the agreed PDP?

Chris   It's worth a try

Peter   If it's not binding, as I am sure its intended to be, via
the contracts, why should the Board want It? In that
case, they should be quite willing to adhere to an SO
recommendation. After all, if Chris is right, and each
ccTLD contract will be uniquely designed, and not
requiring adherence to policy made in ICANN, then Board policy making is quite irrelevant. As you can guess, nothing is further from the reality. The contracts are intended to be relatively simple. They will bind ccTLDs to adhere to policies made in the SO.

Chris Peter - that may well be so BUT if the PDP etc is designed in the way the AG has recommended then you won’t be entering into a contract will you? And neither will a whole heap of other ccTLDs will they? So why is your point relevant.

Dr. Lee Can we try to wrap this up?

Peter Chris asked" Would it be fair to say then that your opinions re the ccNSO are coloured by your believes about what you think the Board will turn out to be? " Answer -no -but what a board ought to do -it should not make policy. That is the job of the SO -its job is to ensure that the place is resourced, and does its job properly. If you give it a role in policy making, you weaken the SO's, put improper pressures on the board, and board elections. I'd be equally opposed to the board doing anything outside its proper mandate, and
would defend the CEO, for eg, if they started meddling in employment relations with the staff.

Again Chris, the indications are that signing contracts will be required, perhaps for membership of the SOI - again, if its made explicit that ccTLDs don't need to sign contracts to join the SO, or, can have contracts without having to follow SO policy, the problem goes away.

Your assistance in publishing ERC or staff [positions on these issues would much clarify these important issues

Chris  Peter, I can assure you that the AG WILL NOT be recommending the contracts have ANYTHING to do with membership and can say (publically if you wish) that were that to be the case, .au would strenuously object

Chris  Also, I can assure you that in our discussions to date the ERC seem to have accepted that membership should be limited to ccTLDs only (GAC liaison excepted)

Peter  Chris Thanks for that. If you could get ERC and staff positions on this, it would help a lot. It needs to be
more than what the AG will or won't do, as its mandate is limited.

Dr. Lee Again, Ramesh's proposal: In item 13, remove the words "66%" and replace with "Supermajority" and define "supermajority" earlier in the document to mean 75%. And to include further safeguards such as a clear statement in the Bylaws that prohibit any policy making that may affect or impact ccTLDs unless it first goes through the agreed PDP?

Chris Peter, as you very well know, neither the ERC nor the staff will be prepared at this stage to give any opinions. I am merely expressing mine and providing you with some 'inside the AG' information which might be helpful. I am certainly not prepared to hold myself out as some form of ERC/ccTLD liaison at this stage of the process. I reiterate that once we have feedback on ALL 5 of the identified issues (of which this is the second) we will then publish recommendation as a whole for comment. At that stage everyone will be able to see how the whole thing hangs together and make comments on it.
Ramesh Young-Eum, I would now add to that the need to include a safeguard in the Bylaws to ensure that no policy can touch the ccTLDs unless it first goes through the PDP.

Ramesh Can we move on?

joanna TW agree

Ramesh I think that may take care of some concerns. One more issue I would like to raise is with regards item 13(c):

"In any case in which the Council is not able to reach Supermajority, but is able to reach a Majority then the Board shall adopt the policy according to the Council Majority Vote recommendation unless by a vote of more than fifty (50%) percent the Board determines that such policy is not in the best interests of the ICANN community or ICANN." I'm uncomfortable with a situation where a policy that did not get Supermajority in Council (but more than 50%) can still be adopted by the Board with a 50% +1 majority. I would think that this should be deleted - if 49% of the ccNSO does not agree with the policy, it should not go through.
Peter  On Ratify Remand Not Remake How about we continue with our current position, acknowledge that this is a critical issue. Accept that there may be times when a "log-jam" needs to be broken. Suggest that this will come from closer working between ICANN constituents DURING the PDP process, not confrontation at the end of it. Agree to the current suggestion (plus today's other modifications) being implemented ONLY After 24 months have elapsed, during which there is a good faith effort to develop a mutually satisfactory answer?

Chris  May I ask what will happen if there are differing views amongst the members of the apTLD? Will individual countries be making their own feedback to the AG?

Ramesh  As I mentioned earlier, why don't we adopt the GAC method and have a consensus as far as possible while recording differing positions?

Peter  On ccTLD policy going through the PDP Agreed that it must go through here, but the issue really is - only policy which is within the Mandate, and within the
scope of the SO. Any other policy (and we should provide for the future) would then require an agreement to change the mandate, or to change the scope. Otherwise it can't go through.

Chris I am coming to the point where I will need to leave the discussion - how will we move this forward.

Ramesh To reply to Chris' second question: I think it would be good if everyone could make their own comments. However, having a consolidated position on the areas that we can agree with shows that, as a region, there are something we can agree with but are willing to discuss the others.

Chris Ramesh - that makes sense to me

Ramesh I propose that the agreements herein be recorded and distributed to all Board members for final comment and then be sent to AG as feedback. Each ccTLD is also encouraged to speak out on the areas that they feel strongly about. Obviously, if the views are different, these views will not be recorded as a consolidated APTLD response.

Ramesh We will provide the first draft by Wednesday.
Dr. Lee  Agreed.

joanna  Agree

Chris  agreed

Peter  Looks good -there are still lots of issues, particularly the time frames which all seem too short for global discussions...

Chris  Are we done?

Dr. Lee  I also propose that we send the minutes of this meeting to other members so that they get a better idea of the reasons behind the proposals.

Ramesh  Thanks all for attending. I think we're done for now

Chris  Happy to have this chat sent out to those who could not attend

Ian  the secretariat will send the minutes to every member

Chris  Bye for now!

Dr. Lee  Thanks, everyone.

Ramesh  Goodbye all. Can the Secretariat send out a copy of the discussion to the members?

Ian  yes

Ian  the secretariat will do so
Peter Night -and thanks to all -this is a complex set of issues!

joanna bye bye all

Ian bye

Meeting called to close at 12:12 Malaysia time (GMT+8)

Rapporteur:

Ian Chiang