From: ccnso-members-bounces@icann.org
To: Dr Eberhard W Lisse
Cc: ccTLDcommunity@cctld-managers.org; cctldworld@icann.org; directors@omadhina.co.na; ccnso-members@icann.org; cctldcommunity-bounces@cctld-managers.org
Subject: Re: [ccnso-members] [ccTLDcommunity] GRC and ccNSO Council: public comments on Guideline on Approval Actions
Date: Wednesday, May 24, 2017 1:13:47 AM

+1

best

Jörg

_____
Dr. Jörg Schweiger
CEO

DENIC eG
Kaiserstraße 75 - 77
60329 Frankfurt

E-Mail: schweiger@denic.de
Tel: + 49 69 27 235 - 455
Fax: + 49 69 27 235 - 457

PGP-Key-ID: EE3D7DBB
Fingerprint: FB27 B134 78F1 0E0E EE43 B321 7CE8 0967 EE3D 7D

Sitz: Frankfurt am Main
Eingetragen unter Nr. 770 im Genossenschaftsregister beim Amtsgericht Frankfurt am Main
Vorstand: Helga Krüger, Martin Küchenthal, Andreas Musielak, Dr. Jörg Schweiger
Vorsitzender des Aufsichtsrates: Thomas Keller

cctldcommunity-bounces@cctld-managers.org wrote on 23.05.2017 16:40:51:

> Von: Dr Eberhard W Lisse <el@lisse.na>
> An: ccnso-members@icann.org
> Kopie: "ccTLDcommunity@cctld-managers.org" <ccTLDcommunity@cctld-managers.org>, directors@omadhina.co.na, "cctldworld@icann.org" <cctldworld@icann.org>
> Datum: 23.05.2017 16:41
> Betreff: Re: [ccTLDcommunity] [ccnso-members] GRC and ccNSO Council: public comments on Guideline on Approval Actions
> Gesendet von: cctldcommunity-bounces@cctld-managers.org
>
> I find myself in full agreement with Roelof, with the clarification that the "10%"" issue is a "short deadline" issue. In other
> words I do not like our procedures dictating the content of our decisions.
>
> As the issue at hand (what committee deals with the workload) is marginally relevant, and I don't care either way, we can use it
> to develop our processes properly.
>
> el
>
> --
> Sent from Dr Lisse's iPad mini 4
>
> On 23 May 2017, at 14:53, Roelof Meijer <Roelof.Meijer@sidn.nl> wrote:

> Dear Katrina, all,
>
> In my opinion, sacrificing the "internal accountability" of the ccNSO in decision making on potentially very serious issues would
> be a very bad choice, as the overall accountability of the process will suffer from it. It is not a sacrifice "for the sake of"
> but "at the cost of" overall accountability of the empowered community.
>
> So alternative 1 is a no-go as far as I am concerned.
> I suggest we combine alternative 2 with a review of of our procedures, specifically to find a solution for the potential "10% paralysis"
>
> Best regards,
>
> Roelof Meijer
> CEO
>
> <7C00E58A-7C44-42F2-AC9E-ED336334E086[2].png>
>
> SIDN | Meander 501 | 6825 MD | P.O box 5022 | 6802 EA | ARNHEM | The Netherlands
> T +31 (0)26 352 55 00 | M +31 (0)6 1139 5775
> Roelof.meijer@sidn.nl | www.sidn.nl
>
>
> From: <ccnso-members-bounces@icann.org> on behalf of Katrina Sataki <katrina@nic.lv>
> Date: vrijdag 19 mei 2017 17:02
> To: "ccnso-members@icann.org" <ccnso-members@icann.org>, "cctldworld@icann.org" <cctldworld@icann.org>, "cctldcommunity@cctld-managers.org
> " <cctldcommunity@cctld-managers.org>
> Cc: "ccnso-council@icann.org" <ccnso-council@icann.org>
> Subject: [ccnso-members] GRC and ccNSO Council: public comments on Guideline on Approval Actions
>
> Dear Colleagues,
>
> As you know, the ccNSO is a Decisional Participant and as such a part of the Empowered Community. As Decisional Participant we as
> ccNSO have the power to support or object to a so called Approval Actions or, if so determined, abstain from the matter. Further,
> to be considered approved by the Empowered Community an Approval Action needs to be supported by at least three (3) Decisional
> Participants, and not objected to by more than one.
>
> Recently we already informed you that the ICANN Board proposed changes to the Fundamental Bylaws. This has triggered the Approval
> Action process and as part of the process there will be a Community Forum during the Johannesburg meeting. During this Community
> Forum everybody can ask their questions. In addition, directly after the Community Forum, at the end of ICANN59, a 21-day period
> will start during which the ccNSO Council has to decide whether to support, object or abstain from the Approval Action.
>
> To be ready as ccNSO to take such a decision, we as community need to have a guideline in place, at least need to know how we as
> ccNSO (members and Council) will structure our decision-making process. Therefore, the ccNSO Council intends to approve a ccNSO
> Approval Action guideline in Johannesburg at the latest.
> The Guidelines Review Committee (GRC) has developed a draft guideline (Draft Guideline Approval Actions v6.docx). The core of the
> guideline is about the ccNSO decision making process. In developing this guideline the GRC has identified a major issue: the way
> we normally take major decisions can not be aligned with the timelines of the ICANN Bylaws Approval Action procedure. According to
> the Rules of the ccNSO from 2004, 10% of ccNSO members (currently 17 ccNSO members) may ask for a ccNSO members vote to ratify a
> ccNSO Council decision within 7 days after the ccNSO Council decision has been published, and only after 7 days after members had
> the opportunity to call for a ratification a ccNSO Council decision becomes effective. It is quite clear that we cannot squeeze
> our process, including the members vote, in the 21-day period we have for an Approval Action decision according to the Bylaws.
>
> If the ccNSO does not meet this 21-day deadline it is deemed to have abstained from the matter, so neither support, nor object.
>
> Moving forward, the GRC proposes two alternative solutions and the ccNSO Council would like to know your opinion.
>
> Alternative 1: Rules of the ccNSO do NOT apply to this decision!
>
> The process:
> - after Community Forum the ccNSO Council has to seek opinion from the ccTLD community (mandatory)
> - the ccNSO Council takes a decision (within 21 days, including the consultation period with the community)
> - the ccNSO Council informs the Empowered Community Administration about the decision.
>
> Pros:
> - longer consultation period which means that the ccNSO Council may be better informed.
> - 10% of ccNSO members cannot hold the entire ccNSO from expressing its position, lower possibility that the ccNSO abstains.
>
> Cons
> - The internal accountability rules of the ccNSO are sacrificed for the

sake of the overall accountability rules, no mechanism to
> ratify the ccNSO Council decision.
>
>
> Alternative 2: Rules of the ccNSO DO apply
>
> The process:
> - during or directly after the Community Forum period the ccNSO Council
seeks the opinion from the ccTLD community
> - the ccNSO Council takes a decision (within 14 days after closure of
the Community Forum Period, including consultation of the community)
> - the ccNSO Council decision is only effective 7 days after it has been
taken. If the decision is not challenged, the ccNSO
> Council informs the Empowered Community Administration about the
decision.
>
> Pros:
> - there is a mechanism to block ccNSO Council decision
>
> Cons
> - shorter consultation period
> - if 10% of ccNSO members (17 ccNSO members) call for a ratification,
the ccNSO abstains from the matter as it will not be able to
> take an effective decision within the deadline of 21 days.
>
> To summarize, in both cases the ccNSO Council shall consider:
> - the feed-back, views and input received from the ccNSO community;
> - the results of the Community Forum;
> - the importance of the matter for the ccTLD community;
> - other factors deemed relevant by the ccNSO Council.
>
> Finally, in the past we have been able to live up to our standard of
decision-making and deliver decisions in time.
>
> What is your opinion? Which alternative do you support?
>
> To make it easier for you to understand the Approval Actions process we
have prepared the following documents (see attachment):
> - A high level graphical overview of the process – AA process.pdf
> - A full timeline (overview) – Overview Approval Action Process.pdf
(GANTT chart)
> - A full timeline (detailed) – Detailed chart Overview Approval Action
Process.pdf (GANTT chart)
>
> If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to ask.
> We are a looking forward to your feed-back and input by 8 June. Please
also note that we have scheduled a session to discuss this
> guideline in more details in Johannesburg on Tuesday, 27 June at 14:15.
>
> Kind Regards,
>
> }{atrina
>
>
> _____
> Ccnso-members mailing list
> Ccnso-members@icann.org
>
https://mm.icann.org/mailman/listinfo/ccnso-members

> ccTLDcommunity mailing list
> ccTLDcommunity@cctld-managers.org
> https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.lists.cctld-
2Dmanagers.org_mailman_listinfo_cctldcommunity&d=DwIGaQ&c=FmY1u3PJp6wrcrwll3mSVzgfkbPSS6sJms7xcl4I5cM&r=GKmFfRII4Fu5R2rvaGzd2eqNVicqdIuGnamKqfKpp0hrH9ye_zt36pZ_ZIAuB8NR&m=DtLP4ejTA80dLw6fd7ux40Sh2xASbMTlVH2IZ9s1Ael&s=Nr25DX6yG3L0gFI8EFtQlO33cNWFUlYU66MOS6m02Io&e=

>
> To unsubscribe please send a blank email to
ccTLDcommunity-unsubscribe@lists.cctld-managers.org
_____
Ccnso-members mailing list
Ccnso-members@icann.org
https://mm.icann.org/mailman/listinfo/ccnso-members