

ccNSO Review - Table of Recommendations and ccNSO Actions

3 June 2021

Background

The Independent Examiner submitted its [Final Report: ccNSO Review Assessment & Recommendations](#) in August 2019. The Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) Review Working Party (RWP) submitted its [Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan \(FAIIP\)](#) to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee (OEC) in July 2020. This Plan provided an assessment of the issues and recommendations submitted by the Independent Examiner.

On 11 August 2020, an OEC meeting was held where the Independent Examiner presented its findings and recommendations listed in the [final report](#), and the ccNSO Review Working Party presented its [Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan](#).

On 9 December 2020, the OEC followed up with the ccNSO via [a letter](#) seeking further clarification, to which the ccNSO Council [replied](#) on 26 February 2021.

Purpose of this document

This document compiles input provided by the ccNSO in two separate documents, to provide the OEC, the Board and the community with a reference document for the status of recommendations:

- 1) the [ccNSO Review Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan](#) dated 7 July 2020 and,
- 2) the [Letter of Response from the ccNSO to OEC](#) dated 26 February 2021.

Summary of proposed actions by the ccNSO:

Of the 14 recommendations issued by the Independent Examiner, the ccNSO proposes:

- **No further action required** (either implemented or about to be fully implemented):
 - **11 recommendations** - numbers 1, 2 (a,b), 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13
- **Action required by ICANN org: 2 recommendations**, numbers 8, 11
- **Deferred/pertains to a future Review: 1 recommendation**, number 14

We note that since the Review was completed in August 2019 and the Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan was published in July 2020, the ccNSO RWP has made considerable progress on various recommendations, as summarized in the below table.

Recommendation	ccNSO Action (from Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan)	ccNSO Action (from response to OEC , and after)
<p>1. The ccNSO Council, with support from the Secretariat, should develop communications materials (including talking points) that clearly articulate the value of the ccNSO to potential new and current ccNSO members.</p>	<p>Creation of outreach and Engagement Framework /strategy, as soon as the Framework has been developed, the ccNSO will start with implementation - independent of the Board decision.</p>	<p>This recommendation has been fully implemented and no further action is required.</p> <p><i>Of note:</i> <i>The vision and goal of the ccNSO was updated during a ccNSO Council workshop in June 2020. The outcome is included in The material we use for on-boarding in the ccNSO (https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=66085237), and other related presentations and documentation, where we explain the purpose and value of the ccNSO to the broader community. The results of the Council workshop are documented in the ccNSO strategy (https://community.icann.org/display/ccNSOCWS/20+August+2020+18%3A00+UTC?preview=/143458575/144377383/Results%20Council%20Workshops%20ICANN66%20and%2068%20version%202.pdf).</i></p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>2. a) The ccNSO Council should amend Annex B of the Guideline: ccNSO Working Groups to indicate the Call for nominations, Selection Process, and Selection Criteria will employ a 1/3 quota system for individuals that have been involved in the ccNSO for less than three years. The Call for</p>	<p>Specific measures, such as the one proposed, are too limiting and do not recognize the realities of ccTLDs (limitations in staff/ time to spend on ICANN and ccNSO related work). Moreover, they do not take into account the dependency on the ccTLD Managers: individuals rely on their employer to be able to</p>	<p>In the context of implementation of this recommendation from the 2nd ccNSO Organizational Review no further action is required.</p> <p><i>Of note:</i> <i>It is our understanding that this recommendation seeks to expand the group of</i></p>

<p>nominations should request the name and the number of years they, as an individual, have been involved in the ccNSO.</p>	<p>participate. The RWP interprets the recommendation of the reviewers as an incentive to increase the outreach and engagement efforts. Alternative instruments, such as introductory and informative webinars prior to public meetings, might lower barriers to participation in working groups and committees.</p>	<p><i>volunteers who want to participate in the work of the ccNSO. We concur with the Independent Reviewer on the need to engage more and new people. We also appreciate that a running roster may be helpful. At the same time, we foresee key issues in maintaining such a roster. Previous experiences with a comparable attempt have proven that such a roster might be out of date very quickly, as well as difficult to maintain (see: https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/expertise.htm)</i></p> <p><i>Since January 2020, the ccNSO has developed a targeted approach to seek members for working groups, committees, as well as other bodies. The targeted approach consists of announcements on the ccNSO website, email invitations and outreach events such as webinars. The webinars are recorded and together with their accompanying slides made publicly available (see: https://community.icann.org/display/ccnsowkspc/ccNSO+Webinars). Following any webinar, the call for volunteers includes a reference to the webinar and presentation slides, if any (see for example: https://ccnso.icann.org/en/announcements/announcement-20jan20-en.htm).</i></p> <p><i>It is our view and experience that as a result the threshold for participation has been considerably lowered. As a</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>matter of fact, thanks to this approach we have noticed additional volunteers and the engagement of people who have not participated before. We have also received confirmation that by providing the information before the call for volunteers, potential participants could make a more informed decision whether or not to participate in the working group or committee.</i></p> <p><i>As stated, since January 2020, it has become standard practice that prior to calls for volunteers the ccNSO uses every means available to inform the community about the engagement opportunity in a new or existing working group or committee. To date this approach has proven to be very successful in attracting newcomers and people with the right skill set and experience.</i></p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>2. b) The ccNSO Council should establish a running roster of individuals interested to volunteer—both those that attend ccNSO meetings and their colleagues that may not be able to attend meetings but could participate remotely in the ccNSO’s work. This list of individuals and their contact information can be drawn upon as opportunities arise.</p>	<p>The RWP supports the need to address the underlying issues of lack of participation to be addressed. However, it also believes that the proposed measure is not implementable over time. It relies ultimately on the efforts of ccTLD Managers to maintain the roster, and like other in other instances, over time maintenance may prove to weaken. The recommendation of the reviewers is viewed as an incentive to increase the outreach and engagement</p>	<p><i>Of Note: As said, we concur with the need to attract new participants, but we believe that lowering any threshold and emphasizing the value of participation works better than introducing artificial quota. The approach alluded to before with respect to Recommendation 2 A, has shown to work as well to attract newcomers.</i></p> <p><i>The issue as identified has been addressed. Monitoring and adjustment of the</i></p>

	<p>efforts. Alternative instruments, such as introductory and informative webinars prior to public meetings, might lower barriers to participation in working groups and committees.</p>	<p><i>involvement activities are at the core of the newly to be created ccNSO Outreach & Involvement Standing Committee (OISC is expected to be operational by April 2021).</i></p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>3. The ccNSO Council 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).</p>	<p>Given that chairs (and vice-chairs) of all ccNSO WGs are nominated by the WG membership, there is no need to address this. As stated, it is a perception issue.</p>	<p>Upon adoption of the procedures and publication of the amended relevant Guidelines, no further action is required.</p> <p><i>Of note: The ccNSO Guideline Review Committee has prepared draft procedures, which will detail the procedures for nomination and selection of the (Vice-) Chair of Working groups or Committees. This draft will be first reviewed by the ccNSO Council and afterwards reviewed by the ccNSO members. Afterwards, the procedures will be up for adoption by the ccNSO Council (expected at or around the 17 February 2021 Council meeting), and then will be annexed to the relevant Guidelines (Guideline ccNSO Working Groups and Guideline: ccNSO Collaboration Groups, see: https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/guidelines.htm).</i></p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>4. The ccNSO Council should request a change in the Bylaws requirement for the IANA Naming Function</p>	<p>The recommendation has already been fully implemented.</p>	<p>The recommendation has already been fully implemented.</p>

<p>Review Team, which requires two ccNSO members and one non-member. NOTE: This request was made to the ICANN Board¹ on 12 April 2019 and, as the IE, we concur. We recommend that the three seats on the IANA Naming Function Review Team be geographically diverse and membership-neutral.</p>		<p><i>Of note:</i> In November 2019, section 18.7 of the ICANN Bylaws was amended to change the composition of future IFRTs as was suggested by the independent reviewer and requested before by the ccNSO. As a result of this amendment, this recommendation has been fully implemented and no further action is required.</p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>5. The ccNSO should limit the number of consecutive terms a Councilor can serve. 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.</p>	<p>The RWP's alternative approach or recommendation is to create awareness of the issue, and develop an understanding of the underlying reasons and resolve the issues based on that analysis.</p>	<p>In the context of implementation of this recommendation from the 2nd Organizational Review no further action is required.</p> <p><i>Of note:</i> <i>To address the issue identified, the ccNSO Council took the following steps: in conjunction, but prior to the call for nominations for Councilors, the ccNSO conducted two specific and targeted webinars to inform the ccNSO membership about the role and expectation of Council membership, including a Q & A with current Councilors (see: https://community.icann.org/display/ccnsowkspc/ccNSO+Webinars). As a result, each of the regions selected new Councilors. They will start their mandate after the ICANN70 meeting. In one of the regions, elections were</i></p>

¹ Correspondence: Composition of the IANA Functions Review Team: proposed ICANN Bylaws change. (2019, April) Retrieved from <https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/sataki-to-chalaby-12apr19-en.pdf>

		<p>necessary to appoint the Councilor (see 2021 Council Elections Report: https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/election-report-02dec20-en.pdf). In addition, and to ensure future replacement, the issue of limiting Council terms and how to warrant this, was discussed with the ccNSO Membership at the ICANN69 session on Governance of the ccNSO. Following this discussion, the ccNSO Guidelines Review Committee is looking into alternative ways to express the expectation of limited terms (for example, inclusion in Guidelines or Internal Rules of expected term limits). During ICANN70 there will be a follow-up session, which will include a discussion of the internal rules of the ccNSO.</p> <p>It is our view that ultimately the membership itself is responsible for good governance of the ccNSO and the mechanisms to limit terms should reinforce that responsibility of the membership. The expectation is that by ICANN72 the necessary changes of the Guidelines and Rules will have been adopted and published. In addition, the next call for nominations for Councilors, which is expected in August/September 2021 time frame, will again be preceded by similar alerts and webinars as the 2020 call for nominations.</p>
--	--	---

		Outcome: No further action required.
<p>6. The ccNSO Meetings Programme Committee should develop and adopt meeting formats to allow more varied interaction between participants at ICANN meetings (e.g., small regional group discussions followed by small group topical discussions).</p>	<p>Creation of outreach and Engagement Framework /Strategy. The Recommendation itself is considered to be implemented.</p>	<p>This recommendation has been fully implemented and no further action is required.</p> <p><i>Of note:</i> <i>Since its creation, the Meetings Programme Committee (MPC) has been continuously adopting and adjusting the meeting formats to increase participation. The latest examples are the ccNSO sessions during ICANN68 and 69 (links broken). These improvements are based on post-meeting surveys of the ccTLD community to seek their suggestions for improvements and input for future meetings. The MPC has developed the practice to respond to the community on the results and discuss them extensively. See various announcements on the ccNSO website (https://ccnso.icann.org/en/news/announcements) and the recent ccTLD consultation regarding ICANN70 meeting strategy (https://community.icann.org/display/ccnsowkspc/ccNSO+Webinars).</i></p> <p><i>Further, since ICANN70, the ccNSO Outreach and Involvement Standing Committee has become active (see: https://ccnso.icann.org/en/workinggroups/oisc.htm). The goal of this group is to ensure: A continued and ongoing coordinated approach regarding the</i></p>

		<p><i>existing and potential outreach and involvement efforts by and targeted at the ccNSO and ccTLD community, and ensure ccTLDs awareness of and involvement in the aforementioned efforts.</i></p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>7. ICANN should provide real-time scribing of ccNSO Members Day meetings. As the Independent Examiner, we recognize that addressing this finding is outside of the ccNSO alone to remedy.</p>	<p>The RWP suggests that the ccNSO Council sends a letter to the Board in support of the recommendation.</p>	<p><i>Of note: In our opinion, providing this service is fully and completely within ICANN’s remit. Hence, we believe that this recommendation is not directed at the ccNSO, but at ICANN.</i></p> <p><i>However, since ICANN70, Real Time Transcription (RTT) is provided generally for all sessions, including ccNSO sessions. Assuming this will continue going forwards the recommendation is fully implemented.</i></p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>8. The ccNSO Council should request to ICANN that the written ccNSO course on the ICANN Learn portal should be translated into all ICANN languages.</p>	<p>Should be driven by ICANN org.</p>	<p><i>Of note: The ccNSO Council has sent a letter to ICANN org in May 2021 (https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/reynoso-to-cohen-04may21-en.pdf) . ICANN org has responded that once the update of the course is completed, it will be translated. This is anticipated to be completed by August 2021.</i></p> <p>Outcome: Implementation has started, awaits action required by ICANN org to</p>

		<p>be completed, but is in the pipeline No further action required by the ccNSO</p>
<p>9. We recommend streamlining the mentorship program to more efficiently connect mentors and mentees. Recognizing the need for mentors may be greater than the availability of them, there may be efficiencies gained through group mentoring and/or dedicating face-to-face time at ICANN meetings for mentors and mentees to connect.</p>	<p>Going forward, the RWP suggests that first a proper framework needs to be developed and instrumentalization of such a framework needs to be in place, before focusing on specific actions like the one recommended.</p>	<p>This recommendation has been fully implemented and no further action is required.</p> <p><i>Of note:</i> <i>The ccNSO Council established a mentor/mentee program in December 2018, during the time the review was conducted (see: https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/cop-selection). The work of this group has been recently reviewed, and the ccNSO Council decided, based on the results of the review, to include the activities of this group in the Outreach and Involvement Standing Committee (OISC), which is being established at present. Until this new Committee is effectively taking over the activities of the Community Onboarding Programme selection committee (COP), the COP will remain in place. We note, however, that the activities of COP and mentor/mentee were envisioned for an in-person environment.</i></p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>10. Resources for newcomers (including multi-lingual ICANN Learn ccNSO portal materials) should be assembled into one location that is prominently featured and easily accessible on the ccNSO website.</p>	<p>The RWP suggests that this recommendation is integrated in the re-design of the ccNSO website, whenever scheduled (see Recommendation 11).</p>	<p>This recommendation has been fully implemented and no further action is required.</p> <p><i>Of note:</i> <i>On the ccNSO website a special area has been created where newcomers can find all relevant material.</i></p>

		<p>The material itself can be found at: https://community.icann.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=66085237 .</p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>11. We recommend the ccNSO website should be redone as soon as possible. It is one of the more (if not the most) outdated SO/AC websites yet it is a key tool that supports accountability, transparent communication, and efficient operations.</p>	<p>The ccNSO Council will send a letter to the Board stressing the urgency and importance of this recommendation and underlying findings.</p>	<p><i>Of note:</i> As the ccNSO has no role to date in the project management, nor has been informed about the details of the specific project, we are neither able nor in a position to provide any further detail or budgetary and resource implications.</p> <p>The ccNSO was advised by ICANN org that the first steps for updating the ccNSO Website would be taken in May 2021.</p> <p>Outcome: Implementation has started, further action required by ICANN org.</p>
<p>12. The ccNSO Secretariat, in collaboration with the ccNSO Council, should review the process for naming, filing, and uploading documents to the website to ensure a clear, transparent, and efficient process going forward. Standardizing information through templates, tagging, and automation could help improve the efficiency and transparency of information and accessibility.</p>	<p>The RWP is aware that the Council and secretariat have developed a practice to adequately publish correspondence, guidelines and decisions, and does not see the need to undertake any further action. The recommendation has already been implemented.</p>	<p>This recommendation will be implemented and no further action required at the time the revamped ccNSO website is published.</p> <p><i>Of note:</i> Since the isolated incident noted by the reviewers, the naming of Guidelines and other documents adopted by the Council has been updated and implemented. Posting is ensured too (see, for example, the Guideline webpage on the ccNSO Webpage: https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/guidelines.htm) and the Council wikispace:</p>

		<p>https://community.icann.org/x/Y4EmCQ).</p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The RWP does not agree with the wording used in the Report. To date experience has shown that the agenda and decision list are published in time.</p>	<p>This recommendation has been fully implemented and no further action is required.</p> <p><i>Of note:</i> <i>We note that in the past the agenda may not have been published in time or was not retrievable as such. However, since 2018, the draft has been circulated to the Council in time and published on the ccNSO webpage in a timely manner (see https://ccnso.icann.org/en/news/announcements?year=2021).</i></p> <p>Outcome: No further action required.</p>
<p>14. We recommend that for future ccNSO reviews, the Independent Examiner 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.</p>	<p>Dependent on use made of the information shared on the list: This should only be for verification purposes.</p>	<p><i>Of note:</i> <i>According to the recommendation, future reviewers should be subscribed to relevant email lists, to allow those future reviewers to access communications with and among the membership. As stated in the FAIP, the ccNSO in principle accepted the recommendation; however, implementation will depend upon 1.) the use that will be made of access to the list and 2.) Appointment of the future independent reviewer, if any. With respect to the first point, we note that, for example, the purpose of the ccTLD world email list may not allow such a use</i></p>

		<p>https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/file/field-file-attach/2016-12/cctld-world-list-procedural-doc-08nov16-en.pdf).</p> <p>With respect to the second point, we note this recommendation pertains to the future, 3rd, organizational review of the ccNSO. In our view this recommendation preempts on how the future reviewer intends to conduct its business.</p> <p>Outcome: Deferred. Revisit recommendation by the 3rd organizational review of the ccNSO.</p>
--	--	--