Joint meeting: ccNSO & ICANN Board

Tue, 5 November | 11:00-12:00 | 516C

Discussion topic chosen by the Board

Community, Board and ICANN org readiness to implement the following three critical plans that will shape ICANN's future: (1) Strategic Plan FY 21-25, (2) Operating & Financial Plan FY 21-25, and (3) Work Plan to improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model.

Background:

The [Strategic Plan](#) has been adopted by the Board last June at ICANN65 in Marrakech. The two other plans will be completed and posted for public comment in December 2019. At ICANN 64 in Kobe, the Board asked each constituency to provide three suggestions, one for the Board, one for ICANN org and one for the Community of things/aspects that should be done/improved in order to implement these plans successfully, starting 1 July 2020, as mandated by our Bylaws. In addition, the Board asked for one suggestion of something that could be done externally to improve trust and with our partners and alliances (eg. IETF) so that they collaborate effectively with ICANN on some of our strategic objectives (eg. DNS security).

Based on the input received in Kobe, we are compiling a list of suggested actions for the community, Board and ICANN org which we would like to share and discuss with you in Montreal. We will send you that list in advance of our meeting in Montreal on or before 11 October 2019.

Questions from the ccNSO to the Board

- Question 1

The ccNSO and GNSO Councils are working together to define a procedure for launching a Specific IANA Function Review (SIFR) after the Customer Standing Committee (CSC) has determined that a persistent and systemic PTI performance Issue exists and all three escalation steps - including the escalation to the ICANN Board - have failed to correct the issue (for more information see CSC Remedial Actions Procedures or RAP). When looking at the overall processes from RAP to SFIR to Separation process, the ccNSO Council notices that the timelines to deal with the unlikely - but highly impactful - situations are prohibitive and affecting the stability of the DNS negatively. What is the Board's procedure to deal with issues raised by the CSC in a timely and efficient manner?

All together we have created procedural monsters which, due to their timelines, unknown and/or non-transparent processes do not allow for quick resolution of serious and potentially damaging issues. An IANA Naming Function service performance issue as described above is a very good example. What activities does the Board plan to make its own processes more efficient? What would the Board suggest to the Community to make sure that we can resolve issues efficiently?

- Question 2

We have read with interest the recent blog post from ICANN CEO on the President & CEO's FY20 priorities. Could the Board clarify how the priorities highlighted in the blog fit into the ICANN approved and published Strategic Plan?

- Question 3

What, in the Board's view, is ICANN's role regarding DNS Abuse? How could the ccNSO support ICANN in the fight against DNS abuse given that ccTLDs' policy development is outside ICANN's remit?

- Question 4 (optional)

If we receive a response to our letter regarding ccNSO PDP 2 by Montreal, then it will be irrelevant but, if not, we would like to ask a quick question: When can the ccNSO expect a response on its 4

September 2019 proposal to end the evolution of the Fast Track Process and mutually agree to close ccNSO PDP 2 (the overall IDN ccTLD policy proposals)?

Once a response / indication of the response is received, the ccNSO Council intends to take further steps: preferably launching ccPDP 4 and requesting a change to Article 10 of the Bylaws to allow IDN ccTLD to become members of the ccNSO.