

ccNSO Review

Presentation and Discussion of Draft Recommendations

10 June 2019

Briefing Objectives

On the 10 June RWP call, we aim to:

- Share draft recommendations with the RWP, including the process for developing them
- Provide examples of the suggestions and rationale for inclusion
- Solicit questions, comments, and feedback on the draft recommendations and suggestions
- Discuss any potential edits before draft report is released for public comment and presented @ ICANN65



Overview and Methods

- Majority of ideas came from ccNSO community through interviews and the electronic survey.
- We considered and prioritized the range of ideas to sort them into two categories:
 - Recommendations: High-priority. Specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, or time-limited (SMART).
 - Suggestions: Additional opportunities for continuous improvement related to the findings, as proposed by respondents. Do not necessarily meet the SMART criteria.
- It is worth nothing that we did not include ideas that we deemed inappropriate, irrelevant, and/or counterproductive in the ccNSO context.



DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS



Continuing Purpose

[1] To address the findings regarding the ccNSO's ongoing continuing purpose, the ccNSO will need to involve next generation ccTLD managers and ensure that ccNSO work and meetings remain relevant. We recommend developing communications materials (including talking points) that clearly articulate the value of the ccNSO to potential new and current ccNSO members.



Structure & Operations: Working Groups and Committees

- [2] To better evaluate the merit of potential working group candidates in the event of more applicants than available spaces, the ccNSO Council should amend the "Information received from nominees" section of Annex B of the Guideline: ccNSO Working Groups to request that all applicants submit a short biography. The following section, "Initial selection of candidates" should be amended to indicate that the biographies are then anonymized by the ccNSO Secretariat and shared with the Councillors before they provide a confidential ranking of candidates to the ccNSO Secretariat, Chair, and Vice-Chairs.
- [3] To address the perceived lack of transparency and standardization around the selection process for Working Group members and Chairs, the ccNSO should update Section 3.5 of the Guideline: ccNSO Working Groups to clearly articulate and standardize the process for nominating and appointing Working Group Chair(s).
- [4] To accommodate the growing number of ccNSO members (and dwindling number of non-members), the ccNSO should request a change in the Bylaws requirement for the IANA Naming Function Review Team, which requires two ccNSO members and one non-member. NOTE: This request was made to the ICANN Board on 12 April 2019 and, as the IE, we concur. We recommend that in the case that the ccNSO is unable to identify a non-member within the period allotted for submissions of expressions of interest, it could then allow the appointment of three geographically diverse ccTLD representatives without prescribing membership status.



Structure & Operations: ccNSO Council

[5] In order to increase the number and diversity of people involved in the Council, the ccNSO should limit the number of consecutive terms a Councillor can serve. (Note that this was also a recommendation from the 2010 ccNSO Review). In regions with fewer members to draw upon and/or in the case of no willing volunteers seeking election, this requirement could be waived for that term.



Structure & Operations: Barriers to Participation

[6] To help engage a diversity of voices that would otherwise not feel comfortable standing up with a microphone in front of the membership, the ccNSO Members Programming Committee should develop and adopt meeting formats to allow more interaction between participants at ICANN meetings. This could include time for ccNSO members to meet and discuss key topics within their regional groups to foster greater participation, followed by small group discussions organized along topic-areas (rather than regionally). Suggestions R includes several potential ideas for implementing this recommendation.

[7] To enable better remote participation and non-native English speakers to better track discussion in real-time, ICANN should provide transcription of ccNSO Members Day meetings, recognizing this is outside of the ccNSO alone to remedy.



Structure & Operations: Orientation and Onboarding

- [8] Considering many respondents indicated that more could be done to enhance the orientation and onboarding of new and newer (< 2 years) ccNSO members as well as newly-elected leaders, we recommend translating the written ccNSO course on the ICANN | Learn portal into all of the ICANN languages.
- [9] We recommend that the COP facilitate the connection between mentors and mentees through a simple sign-up sheet with short biographies from potential mentors and mentees. Recognizing the need for mentors may be greater than the availability of them, we concur that the official relationship should only last one year, as it stipulated in the Terms of Reference, to allow new mentees to engage with mentors.
- [10] Resources for newcomers (including ICANN | Learn portal materials) should be assembled into one location that is prominently featured and easily accessible on the ccNSO website.



Accountability: Accessibility and Transparency of Information

[11] Based upon the many findings related to accessibility and transparency of information, which also presents barriers to participation, and in light of the IE's experience trying to locate documents on the website for fact-checking, we concur that the accessibility and transparency of existing information could be significantly improved. We recommend the ccNSO website should be redone as soon as possible, as it is one of the more (if not the most) outdated SO/AC websites yet is a key tool that supports accountability, transparent communication, and efficient operations.



Accountability: Accountability of the ccNSO Council

[12] It appears that the challenge in the recent ccNSO Vice-Chair election process stemmed from a lack of consistent file-naming, storage, and sharing. Standardizing information through templates, tagging, and automation could help improve the efficiency and transparency of ccNSO information sharing. The Guidelines Review Committee should review the process for naming, filing, and uploading documents to the website to ensure a clear, transparent, and efficient process going forward.

[13] The ccNSO Council should adhere to the ccNSO Council Practices Guideline. If the guidelines for Council agendas are too restrictive or impractical to follow, then the Guideline should be updated to reflect practices that are sustainable, keeping in mind members' interest in continued transparency and accountability.



Accountability: Independent Reviews

[14] Considering the number of respondent statements that discussed the level of transparency of information being shared on various mailing lists, it would have been helpful to be able to independently verify this information in order to make more informed recommendations. We recommend that for future ccNSO reviews, the IE have access to archived mailing lists for the period in review and/or be able to join as an observer to the mailing lists for the period of the review. Note to Reader: the Process Proposal for Streamlining Organizational Reviews is currently out for public comment through 15 July 2019. This is an opportunity for the ccNSO to provide input to inform the organizational review process.



DRAFT SUGGESTIONS

SELECTED HIGHLIGHTS



Continuing Purpose: Community of Practice & Knowledge Exchange

[F] The ccNSO could coordinate a more systematic way of capturing, retaining, and sharing institutional and experiential knowledge. This could include, for example:

- Documenting interviews with past leaders and founding members.
- Fostering more dialogue between ccNSO and other SO/ACs and constituency groups within ICANN—many of whom expressed interest in learning from ccNSO members' experience.



Structure & Operations: Working Groups and Committees

[J] While there is no way to control Councillors' vote on working group nominations, we encourage the ccNSO Council and members to consider placing more attention on cultivating new, next generation leaders in the nomination and appointment processes for working group members and Chairs.



Accountability: Accessibility and Transparency of Information

[Z] Considering the ccNSO website is scheduled for a redesign along with other SO/ACs, when the time comes, the ccNSO may want to consider convening a Working Group to develop priorities for the new website. Some suggestions included for the new website included: designing for offline/low-bandwidth access and considering accessibility from different devices and browsers. Since web design decisions usually entail trade-offs and budget implications, it may be helpful for the ccNSO to initiate discussion on its top priorities for the new site once the redesign schedule is made clear.



Discussion Questions

- 1. Please share any clarifying questions that would help inform your review of the draft recommendations and suggestions.
- 2. How might the draft recommendations be further refined or strengthened?
- 3. What edits, if any, should we consider making before the draft report is released for public comment?
- 4. Any advice on how to best present the report in Marrakech?



Timeline | Next Steps

- Final revisions of Assessment & Draft
 Recommendations report with any feedback received
- Launch of 40-day public comment period, overlapping with ICANN65
 - Presentation and community consultation on draft recommendations in Marrakesh





Thank You