

March 26, 2015

Dear Lise, Jonathan, Leon, Mathieu, and Thomas,

At its meeting on 19 March 2015, the ccNSO Council requested us to inform you about the intended process for decision making and to share Council's potential concerns about the timing and logistics of the proposals coming out of the CWG-Stewardship and CCWG-Accountability work streams.

As you know the ccNSO is one of the chartering organizations of both the CWG-Stewardship and CCWG-Accountability. As such, and in accordance with the respective charters, the ccNSO at one point will need to express whether it will adopt the recommendations contained in the Final Transition Proposal of the CWG-Stewardship and the recommendations contained in the Draft Proposal of the CCWG-Accountability. Since its meetings in Singapore the ccNSO Council has been discussing how the ccNSO should arrive at such a decision on these important, strategic matters.

To date, when dealing with decisions on strategic issues, the ccNSO has followed a process whereby a working group would first present its consensus proposal, then the ccTLD community at-large (i.e. members and non-members of the ccNSO) would discuss and seek consensus on the proposal, through at least one in-person meeting of all ccTLDs present at a meeting of the ccNSO. Only after the ccTLDs present expressed their consensus support for the proposal, the ccNSO Council would take a decision. Finally, and in accordance with the internal rules of the ccNSO, the members of the ccNSO could call the ccNSO Council decision to a vote, however to date this has not happened. Recent examples of such decision-making processes are the adoption of the Framework of Interpretation and the ccNSO Guideline on the voluntary financial contributions of ccTLDs to ICANN.

At its meeting on 19 March 2015, the ccNSO Council expressed intention to follow this decision-making process with regard to the proposals of the CWG-Stewardship and CCWG-Accountability. Therefore, taking into account the timelines of the CWG and CCWG are currently working against to submit their proposals, the ccNSO will be in a position to take a decision by the Buenos Aires meeting at its earliest. Further, as the standard decision-making timeline is under pressure, it is an essential pre-condition that the proposals coming out of the CWG and CCWG are robust and broadly supported by their membership, and in particular, by all of the ccTLD representatives.

On behalf of the ccNSO Council,

Byron Holland
Chair

Katrina Sasaki
Vice-chair

Keith Davidson
Vice-chair