

# DAY 1

## Tuesday, 12 March 2019

Consult the ccNSO Members Meeting agenda here: <https://buff.ly/2U8rKU7>

*The presentation slides will be published during or shortly after the meeting on <https://64.schedule.icann.org/> (go to the respective session) and later on <https://ccnso.icann.org/en/meetings/kobe64> (click "Presentations")*

## Introduction to the ccNSO Members Meeting

Opening and welcome by Katrina Sataki (.lv), chair of the ccNSO, followed by a welcome by Hirofumi Hotta (.jp), on behalf of the local ccTLD Manager. Alejandra Reynoso (.gt) will introduce the schedule of the ccNSO Members Meeting at ICANN64 and will welcome newcomers to the ccNSO.

## ccNSO Working Group Updates

### ***TLD-OPS Update***

TLD-OPS is the incident response community for and by ccTLDs and brings together folks who are responsible for the overall security and stability of their ccTLD. The goal of the [TLD-OPS](#) community is to enable ccTLD operators worldwide to collaboratively strengthen their incident response capabilities. The TLD-OPS held a Disaster Recovery Workshop at ICANN63, focused on the various aspects of Disaster Recovery that are specific to ccTLDs. The TLD-OPS update in Kobe will include a short status update on the ICANN63 workshop follow-up.

### ***Update by the Guidelines Review Committee ([GRC](#))***

Initially the purpose of the ccNSO Guidelines Review Committee (GRC) was to review the existing guidelines and to ascertain whether they reflect practices and working method and propose changes. Overtime the mandate of the GRC was expanded by also developing ccNSO internal processes and procedures to underpin the role of the ccNSO as Decisional Participant. At the ICANN63 the ccNSO Council requested the GRC to prepare the implementation by the ccNSO of the CCWG Accountability WS2 Recommendations with respect to Diversity and SO/AC Accountability, starting with the Accountability recommendations. In Kobe the GRC will inform the Council and broader community on progress to date in these areas.

### ***Update by the Strategic and Operational Planning ([SOPC](#)) Committee***

The purpose of the SOPC is to coordinate and organise participation of ccTLD managers in ICANN's Strategic and Operational planning processes. In Kobe, the committee will meet on Sunday 10 March. Relevant ICANN staff members will attend and take part in this meeting to discuss the recent SOPC submissions on ICANN's planning documents.

The ccNSO SOPC, recently provided comments on the first consultation by ICANN org to evaluate the potential benefit of implementing a 2-year planning process. (Read the SOPC comments [here](#).) Moreover, the SOPC submitted comments regarding

- ICANN's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2021 - 2025 (Read the SOPC comments [here](#).)
- [comments](#) to ICANN's Draft updated FY20 Operating Plan and Budget and Five-Year Operating Plan.

### ***Update by the cross-community working group New gTLD Auction Proceeds ([CCWG Auction Proceeds](#))***

The new gTLD Program established auctions as a mechanism of last resort to resolve string contention. Most string contentions have been resolved through other means before reaching an auction conducted by ICANN's authorized auction service provider. However, it was recognized from the outset that significant funds could accrue because of several auctions. As such, these auction proceeds have been reserved and earmarked until the Board authorizes a plan for the appropriate use of the funds. Board, staff, and community are expected to be working together in designing and participating in the next steps addressing the use of new gTLD auction proceeds. It should be recognized though that these proceeds are to be considered as an exceptional, one-time source of revenue.

The CCWG published its draft Initial Report for community comment shortly before ICANN63, presenting those fund distribution mechanisms that demonstrated most potential to meet CCWG expectations as well as conform with legal and fiduciary constraints. See further details about the work plan and approach [here](#) or read its most recent newsletter [here](#).

## **How to shape ccNSO Members Meetings during policy forums:**

### **Preparing for ICANN65**

Following the introduction of ICANN's new meeting Strategy, the ccNSO Council approved a recommendation by the ccNSO Meeting Programme Working Group in January 2016 to hold three (3) ccNSO Members Meetings a year. This recommendation was reviewed in 2018, as part of the review of the ccNSO meeting strategy. The review was conducted by the [ccNSO Meeting Strategy Working Group](#), according to the Terms of Reference as approved by the ccNSO Council, and based on a consultation with the broader ccTLD community.

One of the recommendations by the ccNSO Meeting Strategy WG is to explore the need and possibility to organise a 1-day ccNSO Members Meeting during the Policy Forum (i.e. the second ICANN meeting of the year).

In Kobe, a consultation will take place.

- About the ccNSO Meeting Strategy Review Working Group:  
<https://ccnso.icann.org/en/workinggroups/mswg.htm>
- Final report by the ccNSO Meeting Strategy Review Working Group:  
<https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/ccnso-strategy-review-08may18-en.pdf>

## Joint meeting: ccNSO & ICANN Board

### *Questions from the Board to the ccNSO*

This time in particular, the Board would like to listen to your suggestions in order to make ICANN's big plans successful. What does it mean?

In 2018, besides GDPR, the Community, the Board and ICANN org have worked tirelessly on several key plans that are now or soon will be out for public comment:

- the draft Strategic Plan 2021-2025 was published a little before Christmas;
- the first consultation paper on a 2-Year budgeting process was also published before Christmas;
- and the draft FY21-25 Operating Plan & Financial Projections will be posted before this summer.

In addition, based on community feedback and discussions at ICANN 63, we will begin a consultation in Kobe on the status of ICANN's governance model, including whether and how it should evolve to continue to serve the global ICANN community.

In the aggregate, these plans are comprehensive and address the key challenges ICANN's faces in the future in the areas of security; governance; unique identifier systems; geopolitics; and financials.

Even great plans come with challenges, which we want to anticipate and address as a prelude to implementation. We pulled together once before, galvanized our resources effectively and achieved a successful transition. We need to do it again to address ICANN's future challenges. Are we ready? Do we, for example, collectively have the leadership, skills, resources, knowledge and commitment required to implement these plans successfully over the next five years? We need your help for this.

Specifically, as you prepare for Kobe, we would like your high-level input on:

1. What the Board, ICANN org, and the Community should be doing now to prepare for the successful implementation of these plans? Please make three suggestions as concrete as possible, providing one each for the Board, ICANN org, and the Community.
2. While the success of these plans lies primarily within ICANN, we all know that ICANN does not operate in a vacuum, and alliances and partnerships are important to our success. How can we increase the likelihood that important allies and partners in the space are on the same page and working together to achieve common/agreed upon goals? Please provide one suggestion of something that could be done externally to improve trust and collaboration.
3. We are looking forward to hearing your four suggestions during our face-to-face meetings in Kobe so that we could then work jointly towards a successful implementation of ICANN's future plans, that you have been involved in formulating.

## ***Questions from the ccNSO to the Board***

### 1. ICANN's mission

As the Board adopts ICANN's Strategic Plan, Operating Plans and related budgets, what criteria does the Board use to determine whether an activity is within ICANN's mission?

With ICANN's funding levelling or on the decline, do you consider all the activities as equally important or do you see some activities as of a higher priority for fulfilling ICANN's mission?

### 2. Confusing similarity

The joint ccNSO -SSAC working party has provided feedback and input to ICANN Org's proposed guideline to operationalize the amended Fast Track process (inclusion of Risk Mitigation to overcome the only pending case of confusing similarity). In addition and overstepping the original request, the working party suggests that ICANN takes a final decision on the one and only pending case. Once the current pending case under the IDN ccTLD Fast Track Process is resolved, we propose that all processes and procedures relating to the evaluation of confusing similarity be reviewed and evaluated, with a two-fold goal. Firstly, originally (in 2009) the process and procedures for evaluation of strings of the new gTLD round and the overall policy for IDN ccTLDs were supposed to be consistent. However, due to the incremental changes of the ccTLD Fast Track process since 2009, the discrepancy between these processes has increased. Secondly, since the introduction of sting similarity review in 2009, the methods to evaluate string similarity and underlying scientific insights in this area have evolved and, therefore, a review of the original approach is highly desirable.

Should we still strive to harmonize string similarity review under the two processes? If so, how could we all ensure this given both are developed under different PDPs?

### 3. Progress on IFR

During our Barcelona meeting we informed you that the ccNSO - despite all the efforts - has not been able to appoint to the IFRT a representative from a ccTLD manager that is not a member of the ccNSO. We suggested to appoint a representative from a ccNSO member ccTLD on an interim basis to ensure that ccTLD community which is one of the direct customer groups of PTI, is represented on the review by 3 members. Since then ICANN Org reached out to all the appointing entities to seek support for this solution. It is our understanding that one of the appointing entities objected, with reference to the Bylaws.

As this Review has been launched under auspices of the Board, could you provide an update on the current status? How will it be ensured that 3 members of the ccTLD community are included in the IFRT?

Looking to the future, the next IFR shall be convened in five years, measured from the date the previous was convened (September 2018). It is clear that with the growing number of ccNSO members, in five years it will be even more difficult to find a non-member ccTLD representative. To change this, a fundamental Bylaw change is required. What is the process to introduce the change in time for the next IANA Functions review?

## ccNSO policy session

### ***Update by the Empowered Community Administration (ECA)***

The Empowered Community Administration is the administrative body through which the Empowered Community acts. Each of the Decisional Participants of the Empowered Community designates one representative to the Empowered Community Administration. The Empowered Community (EC) includes the ccNSO (other Decisional Participants are ALAC, ASO, GAC, and GNSO). The ccTLD Community present will be briefed on the latest with respect to the ECA. Explore the public archive of the [Empowered Community Administration's mailing list](#). Learn more about the [Empowered Community](#) or go to the [Empowered Community Correspondence page](#).

### ***Update by the PDP retirement WG ([PDP-ret](#))***

The ccNSO Retirement Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group will provide a briefing to the ccTLD and broader communities during the [ccNSO Members Meeting](#) on Tuesday, 23 October to seek feed-back and input on its initial views, including on the proposed duration of the retirement process. The goal of this ccNSO PDP, the third initiated by the ccNSO Council, is to develop and recommend policies to the ICANN Board of Directors pertaining to:

- The retirement of country code Top-Level Domains (ccTLDs)
- Review mechanisms for decisions relating to the delegation, transfer, revocation, and retirement of ccTLDs

The ccNSO Retirement PDP Working Group will meet 15:15-18:30 on Saturday, 9 March as well. Consult the group's [charter](#), its work plan, and other relevant documents on its [website](#) and [workspace](#).

### ***New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP. Work Track (WT) 5: current state of affairs, and related topics from WT1 to WT4.***

Following the adoption of the [recommendations](#) of the Cross-community Working Group on the Use of Country and Territory Names as TLDs ([CCWG UCTN](#)) and hence closure of this CCWG, the ccNSO participates in Work Track 5 (WT5) under the GNSO New gTLD subsequent procedures policy development process ([PDP WG](#)). Work Track 5 focuses on developing proposed recommendations regarding the treatment of geographic names at the top-level. The group reached agreement on its Terms of Reference and began substantive deliberations in 2018. The latest edition of the New gTLD Subsequent Procedures PDP Working Group newsletter is now available: <http://go.icann.org/SubPro>. An archive of previous editions of the newsletter is available on the WG [wiki](#) and on the [GNSO website](#).

### ***Update regarding the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee ([IGLC](#))***

In November 2018 after an extensive discussion in Barcelona during ICANN63, the ccNSO Council decided not to support the CCEG Charter and to rescind from the CCWG IG / CCEG. However, the ccNSO Council decided to establish a IG Liaison Committee to coordinate, facilitate, and increase the participation of ccTLD managers in discussions and processes pertaining to Internet Governance. Consult there Terms of Reference [here](#). In particular, the IGLC has been established the liaison group to liaise

with the members of the CCWG IG / CCEG, ICANN staff and other active participants from the broader ICANN community.

### ***IDN ccTLD Recommended Policy Review Roadmap***

In September 2013, the ccNSO concluded its work on the overall policy for selection of IDN ccTLD strings and inclusion of IDN ccTLDs in the ccNSO. This recommended policy was developed to replace the Fast Track process. As issues emerged with the selection of IDN ccTLD strings, the ICANN Board vote was deferred to gain experience with the changing methods to address those issues under the Fast Track. As a result, the original policy recommendations need to be reviewed. This briefing and discussion is intended to inform the ccTLD community and other interested parties on the areas that need to be reviewed and a possible roadmap for the review.

## **IANA Naming Function Session**

### ***PTI, to present on the IANA Services to the ccNSO***

The "Post-Transition IANA" organization, filed under the name Public Technical Identifiers ([PTI](#)), is performing the IANA functions pursuant to an IANA Naming Functions Contract with ICANN and subcontracts with ICANN for the performance of the numbering and protocol parameter services. This session includes an update by PTI on the IANA services to the ccNSO, and a short update by Lise Fuhr and Wei Wang, PTI Board members.

### ***IANA Function Review Team (IFRT)***

The ICANN Bylaws requires a review of PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function SOW to be carried out by an IANA Function Review Team ("IFRT"). The Bylaws further specify that the first IFRT review was convened no later than 1 October 2018. Although the IFR has been convened, the IFRT has not been established to date. During this session, the community will receive an update on its current status. The IFR is a new accountability mechanism created as part of the IANA stewardship transition to ensure that PTI meets the needs and expectations of its naming customers, which includes all ccTLD managers. To that end, its intent is to review PTI's performance of the IANA naming function against the contractual requirements set forth in the IANA Naming Function Contract and the IANA Naming Function Statement of Work. An important distinction is that the IFR is not an organizational or specific review, and it is not a replacement for the work of the Customer Standing Committee (CSC).

### ***Customer Standing Committee (CSC)***

The CSC provides operational oversight on the IANA naming function as performed by Public Technical Identifiers (PTI) since the transition of the IANA Stewardship. Background on the committee, along with transcripts of its meetings and the monthly reports on the PTI performance can be found [here](#). Byron Holland, chair of the CSC, will provide an update on its recent activities.

### ***CSC Effectiveness Review***

Per its charter and the ICANN Bylaws, the effectiveness of the [Customer Standing Committee \(CSC\)](#) needs to be reviewed two years after its first meeting and then every three years. The first meeting of took place in 2016. The first CSC review kicked off at ICANN63.

To that end, the Generic Names Supporting Organization (GNSO) and Country Code Names Supporting Organisation (ccNSO) Councils recently adopted a method for a lightweight and brief CSC Effectiveness Review. The review builds on the outcome and findings of the CSC Charter Review. The results, as adopted by both the GNSO and ccNSO Councils, will feed into the IANA Naming Function Review (IFR). Due to the coinciding timing of the reviews and the potential overlap in scope, a ccNSO and GNSO coordination team has been working on proposal of what the CSC Effectiveness Review is expected to cover so it could be considered for incorporation into the IFR.

### ***Root Zone Evaluation Review Committee (RZERC)***

ICANN has established a [Root Zone Evaluation Review Committee](#) to review and provide input regarding proposed architectural and operational changes to the root zone and as determined necessary by the RZERC, propose architectural and operational changes to the root zone for consideration by the ICANN Board. The RZERC will consider issues raised to the RZERC to identify any potential security, stability or resiliency risks to the architecture and operation of the root zone.

## **Update by the Study Group on the use of emoji as second level domains ([emoji SG](#))**

The study group was established by the ccNSO Council to provide to ccTLD community and the Council a comprehensive overview of the issues associated with the use of Emoji as second level domains, and the need for - and current practice by - ccTLD managers to allow emoji's as second level domains. If considered appropriate by the study group, the study group may advise on a course of further actions, if any. The Group intends to deliver its final report by ICANN64.

## **Update on the 2nd ccNSO organisational review**

According to ICANN Bylaws section 4.4 (a) Section 4.4(a), calls for a periodic review “of the performance and operation of each Supporting Organization, each Supporting Organization Council, ...by an entity or entities independent of the organization under review.” As per the Bylaws, the goal of these reviews shall be “to determine:

- (i) whether that organization, council or committee has a continuing purpose in the ICANN structure,
- (ii) (if so, whether any change in structure or operations is desirable to improve its effectiveness and
- (iii) whether that organization, council or committee is accountable to its constituencies, stakeholder groups, organizations and other stakeholders”.

These Organizational Reviews “shall be conducted no less frequently than every five years, based on feasibility as determined by the Board. Each five-year cycle will be computed from the moment of the reception by the Board of the final report of the relevant review Working Group.”

The Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the Board (OEC), previously known as the Structural Improvements Committee (SIC), is engaged in the process from the Board side. [Meridian Institute \[merid.org\]](https://www.merid.org) has been appointed to conduct the second ccNSO review.

Based on information collected via an online survey and interviews at ICANN63, the independent examiner prepared its draft findings report. The report will be presented to the community on Tuesday, 12 March (17:00-18:00), followed by an opportunity to provide feedback.

For further information see: <https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/org> or the RWP wiki: <https://community.icann.org/display/ccnsowkspc/ccNSO+Review+Workspace>

For Information on the 1<sup>st</sup> ccNSO review see: <https://www.icann.org/resources/reviews/org/ccnso>

## DAY 2

Wednesday, 13 March 2019

### Legal session

- What are the legal issues African ccTLDs are facing? *Barrack Otiemo (AFTLD), Abdalla Omari*
- Notice & action procedure for .be domain names. *Peter Vergote (.be)*
- Dealing with illegal content within .no. *Ann-Cathrin Marcussen (.no)*

### Joint meeting: ccNSO and GAC

The ccNSO is meeting for 45 min with the Governmental Advisory Committee (GAC) on Wednesday, 13 March. (10:30-11:15).

Agenda:

- status report ccNSO Retirement Policy Development Process (PDP) Working Group
- DNS over https
- Discussion on the future scheduling of the joint meetings between the ccNSO and GAC: The GAC meets with other SO/ACs on Sunday in Kobe and proposed to have future joint meetings between ccNSO & GAC earlier during the ICANN-meetings week, when they meet with other SO/ACs. This means the joint meeting between ccNSO & GAC would no longer be part of the ccNSO Members Meeting days. The GAC and ccNSO will discuss this proposal in Kobe.



## Financial contribution session

After a long and intensive process of community consultation, the ccNSO agreed in 2013 on a [guideline pertaining to the voluntary contribution of ccTLDs to ICANN](#). At previous meetings (ICANN61 and ICANN63) the level of contributions by the ccTLD community was discussed. At ICANN64 the Financial contribution session focuses on the administrative issues the ccTLD community and ICANN are facing with respect to the invoicing of voluntary contributions. The goal is to make the contribution process predictable for all, both for ccTLDs and for ICANN going forward.

## ccTLD news session

- The customer service as a value proposition. *Ivy Contreras (.gt)*
- Introduction to the .af registry. *Nadia Hashimi (.af)*
- Promotional activities for .id. *Andi Budimansyah (.id)*
- Promotional activities for .tw. *Ai-chin Lu (.tw)*

## Regional ccTLD Organisation update

- AFTLD. *Barrack Otieno*
- APTLD. *Leonid Todorov*
- CENTR. *Peter van Roste*
- LACTLD. *Miguel Ignacio Estrada*

## Session with ccNSO appointed Board members

The ICANN Board of Directors consists of sixteen voting directors, including two directors nominated by the ccNSO. These seats on the Board are referred to in the ICANN Bylaws as Seat 11 and Seat 12 and are respectively occupied by Chris Disspain and Nigel Roberts. The following ccTLD-related ICANN Board members are invited to this session as well: *Becky Burr, Danko Jevtovic, Lito Ibarra*.

## ccNSO Council meeting

The next ccNSO Council meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, 13 March | 17:00-18:30 | Room Sapphire. Consult the agenda and relevant background material for the ccNSO Council meeting on the [ccNSO Council workspace](#).