

Summary assessment by RWP of ccNSO Review recommendations

This overview is a summary of the FAIPP – the Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan (FAIPP), which is a document prepared by ICANN’s MSSl team to assist the Review Working Party and Council to review the recommendations of the independent reviewer. Ultimately the goal is to provide an assessment of provisional budget implications, anticipated resources and proposed implementation timeline.

If the Council adopts the assessment of the RWP, it will be submitted to the Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee. The OEC will invite the independent reviewer and members of the RWP to go over the various aspects of assessments.

Fully supported recommendation: Recommendations 1, 7, 8, 11

- **Recommendation #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.
- **Recommendation #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.
- **Recommendation #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.
- **Recommendation #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 It is one of the more (if not the most) outdated SO/AC websites yet it is a key tool that supports accountability, transparent communication, and efficient operations.

Already Implemented recommendations: Recommendations 4 and 12

- **Recommendation #4:** The ccNSO Council 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 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.
- **Recommendation #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.

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>

**Issue supported, recommendation Not supported, but alternative approach suggested:
Recommendations 2a, 2b, 5, 6, 9, 10**

- **Recommendation #2a: Introduce quota to attract new members to participate in WGs.** 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 nominations* should request the name and the number of years they, as an individual, have been involved in the ccNSO.

The issue that was identified is supported (lack of new wg members). However recent experience has already shown that the alternative approach does encourage people to participate who never have done before.

Alternative approach. 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.

- **Recommendation #2b: Create Running Roster potential volunteers.** 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.

The RWP supports the issue that was identified (need for new participants).

Alternative approach. Alternative instruments, such as introductory and informative webinars prior to public meetings, might lower barriers to participation in working groups and committees.

- **Recommendation #5: Limiting the term of Councilors.** 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. **NOTE:** a more restrictive version of this recommendation was made in the 2010 ccNSO Review that did not take into consideration diverse regional contexts which may prevent a region from cultivating new candidates. The recommendation was not adopted due to lack of feasibility across all regions.²

The RWP supports the issue as identified: Councillors should be replaced at a reasonable, regular interval.

Alternative approach: The RWP proposes that the ccNSO Council provides an overview to the ccNSO membership and discuss alternative approaches to resolve the issue identified, amongst other but not limited to:

- The bylaw change as suggested;

² Organizational Review of ICANN's Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO). Final Report. <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/items-ccnso-organisational-review-15jun10-en.pdf>

- Voluntary arrangement
- Call to action of members to nominate candidates.

The RWP's alternative approach or recommendation is to create awareness of the issue, understanding the underlying reasons and resolving the issue based on that analysis.

The initial conversation and discussion with the membership has to take place at a in person meeting. The RWP therefore suggests that no fixed time is set, but the result of the recommendation is considered in the next ccNSO review.

- **Recommendation #6: Increase variety of manners of interaction.** 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). **Suggestion R** (In the Final Report of the Independent Reviewer) includes several ideas for implementing this recommendation.

The RWP support the need to engage a diversity of voices through varied, interactive meeting formats to enable participation from people who are not as comfortable standing up with a microphone in front of the membership.

Alternative: The RWP agrees that interaction of attendees (whether in person or remotely) at ICANN meetings is important and should, where feasible, be optimized. The RWP appreciates the suggestions included in the report. The RWP is also of the view that the MPC is working on and experimenting on changing formats and has taken other steps to increase active interaction and participation at sessions. In addition, this is a continuing area of improvement, following a long-established practice of post- ICANN meeting surveys.

- **Recommendation #10: Consolidate resources for newcomers.** 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
- **Alternative:** The RWP suggests that this recommendation is integrated in the re-design of the ccNSO website, whenever scheduled.

Issue not supported, no alternative suggestion: Recommendations 3 and 13

- **Recommendation #3: WG Chair nomination and appointment.** 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).

RWP View: Given that chairs (and vice-chairs) of all ccNSO WGs are nominated by the WG membership, there is no need to address this. The way the issue is stated, it is a perception problem.

- **Recommendation #13: Timely Publication of the Council agenda.** 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.

RWP View: The RWP supports the general sentiment. The RWP is aware that in the past the agenda was not always posted at least one week in advance of the meeting or was difficult

to find. However the RWP noticed the practice and Guideline are now aligned. At the same time the RWP is also aware that the Guideline allows the chair of the Council to divert from this general practice when needed, for example at ICANN public meetings when the agenda depends on outcome of members sessions and / or WG meetings.

In addition - and again with an eye to members' interest in continued transparency and accountability - the RWP notes that since ICANN67 all Council meetings (whether in person or through conferencing tools) are open and the details are made publicly available well ahead of the meeting.