

Summarized outcome World Café 13 June 2024

Why is only a little over a half of the membership involved in ccNSO voting?

Outcomes:

- What makes members vote, in your view?
 - Responsibility as a member. Sense of belonging. Personal values. Benefits. Related to interests. Accountability: feeling obliged to vote
 - Engagement and participation
 - Interest in the topic or the issue at hand
 - Being explicitly reminded, Encouragement
- Consistent involvement
 - How big is the intersection between those who vote and those who are engaged?
- Why not vote?
 - Information missing, not familiar with the topic
 - Other priorities
 - Lack of involvement, ccNSO is not part of their lives, Members who never attend the ICANN meeting, Lack of interest, lack of engagement.
 - Voter apathy
 - Conscious decision not to participate in a voting
 - Perceived technical issues: not finding a ballot, issues with the voting tool
 - Online voting
 - Issues regarding internal decision-making: approval needed regarding vote participation and choice

Transparency of voting: Should there be limits?

Outcomes:

- On publication of votes
 - Do make the votes public, but not how they voted.
 - Should the list of emissaries be uploaded? The list of ccNSO members is public. Allows checking contact details, should show who voted. Shows transparency.
 - If the voting is linked to a specific person (such as the chair of the ccnsso), the vote must not be published.
 - Names of the voters should be published, but not emails to avoid spam (publish name at domain)

The way we write emails are complicated. Too lengthy, very formal, too formal information about the process, before giving the information about the reason of the voting.

Does the ccNSO represent the ccTLDs globally?

Framed as: ccNSO provides ICANN its international legitimacy

Outcomes:

- Rules- As long as we meet quorum, it is legitimate: 50% lowering threshold 35? As long as requirement, Ethical/Morally as long as it is not breaking the rule. Moral: Predefined, transparent, communicated, buy-in to the rule. Strict interpretation.
- Legitimacy: Legal view (Rules) vs Political view, depends on the turn out. Legitimacy can be weaponized.
- ccNSO Functional platform - Governance for full ICANN: on behalf of the members. Claims to power/ those not Represented. Being the voice of the ccTLD is perception within ICANN context. Not worth the effort to change that perception
- Why are people not voting? Distinction between manager and the operator. Need to go the grass roots, the make the claim valid.

The process determines the legitimacy, well informed , had opportunity to learn and vote.

Are members aware of their role in the ccNSO?

Outcomes:

- Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs
 - Pyramid: essentials at the foundation, ICANN ccNSO at the top
 - If you have issues with electricity, internet, that is the higher priority.
 - But if there is a small window provided to what is happening at ccNSO, some could come in and start getting interested
- What is the most practical and sustainable way?
 - You have to explain who we are and build trust, not just say here: vote.
 - Maybe leverage those staff/members who have strong connections and communication channels (e.g. GSE)
- Some don't actively participate because don't have resources to come, then they fall further behind
- Senior members can mentor new members to help them understand their responsibilities and issues the ccNSO discusses. Need to inform new members about the role of the ccNSO
- Is lack of voting more due to choosing not to vote or because unaware of the vote?
 - Mix: Not reading the email, or the topic is not relevant, or can't understand the topic
 - ICANN discussion is often very difficult
- What is a practical way to make ccTLD managers understand it is important to be good participating members? We are the group who shapes policy. We should make members more aware of that

How many members should be voting?

Outcomes:

- People vote when they believe it is an important topic.
- Talking to neighboring countries helps. Encourage colleagues to vote.
- a 50% quorum is an ideal way to have a base of consensus. In reality, do we need to have a quorum or would a simple majority without quorum be better?

- It's hard to answer these questions without knowing why ccNSO members don't vote. Understanding these reasons would help and getting in contact with members face to face to have discussions may be helpful.
- May not vote since policy doesn't interest or impact ccTLD operator
- Language accessibility could also be a problem
- How many ccNSO members attend ICANN meetings? If ccTLD manager doesn't come to an ICANN meeting, they won't know about the policies being worked on (BB: note otes on Board members and PDP3 retirement during covid)
- ccTLD operators should help each other mediate and support each other
 - In some places, governments are involved and appoint ccTLD representatives. Manager should be respected.

It's hard to answer these questions without knowing why ccNSO members don't vote. Understanding these reasons would help and getting in contact with members face to face to have discussions may be helpful.

Is legitimacy of ccNSO decisions at stake?

Outcomes:

- Legitimacy - is legitimacy countable? There are other indicators for the legitimacy. Can we link the legitimacy directly to the votes?
- What is the source of legitimacy? Membership and the legal framework. We have both. We are abiding by the rules, that's why we are legitimate.
- Legality, participation are different. How do we ensure more volunteer participation, and how to keep them attending?
- We are above the minimum standards as the organization, but we need to make sure that people are voting voluntarily.

Legitimacy here is in 2 categories, legal and political. Legal is easier, political one is mostly perception.

From the WRAP-UP

Transparency of voting.

- Email lists to be updated frequently. Should be published
- Emails should be simpler and more attractive
- List of members that voted should be published. Also publish how they voted? Yes for ccTLDs. Perhaps only the ballot number
- There should always be a neutral option.
- 2 Columns with who voted and who did not vote

Are members aware of their role in the ccNSO?

- Privilege of responsibility to vote
- How can members take their role seriously?
- ICANN and ccNSO on top of daily matters. Might not be relevant to my ccTLD. Finding the right words and the right channel to deliver the message. Be a responsible member of the ccNSO. Take care of yourself and the entire group.
- Have video or audio fragments to explain the policy
- Reach out to RO's
- Have the right message delivered through the right channel. If we fail, it is our fault as communicators

ccNSO represents ccTLDs globally?

- As long as the procedure is in the bylaws, it is legitimate
- Moral issue: what if the quorum is not met.
- Discussion regarding participation percentage and voting percentage
- Legitimacy of the organisation
- We represent everybody, also non-members
- We develop policy for IANA, will most likely be used by IANA for non ccTLDs
- Enhance participation on voting for PDPs.

Legitimacy of the ccNSO

- As long as there are members and we follow the rules.
- Making people feel like they belong here.
- Newcomer session
- Translating or summarising the policies to allow people to vote
- Ccnso makes icann legitimate

How many members should vote?

- 50% quorum and 60% in favour . what happens if we would lower the 50% quorum, and what would that mean for the ccnsso legitimacy. Sending the wrong message?
- 50% was ok. But, lower the 60% threshold could be explored
- Second round without quorum as a possible approach

- Speak to your fellow ccTLDs.
- Explore issues in a safe environment, such as here

Why is that only half of the members vote

- Engagement
- Correspondence: is the email read?
- familiarity with the issue
- 2 ccTLD managers from same country
- Language barriers
- Strategy to manage africa and engage african ccTLDs
- Those who did not vote