

Re: Clarification of letter of March 26, 2015

May 8th, 2015

Dear Lise, Jonathan, Leon, Mathieu and Thomas,

This is a follow up to our letter dated March 26, 2015. Subsequent conversations with the ccNSO appointed co-chairs on the CWG- Stewardship and CCWG Accountability on April 15, 2015, and an informal Council call on April 17, 2015 suggest that the initial content of the letter from the ccNSO Council may have raised questions and caused some confusion.

Specifically, we understand that clarity is required around the following statement: “...that the proposals coming out of the CWG and CCWG are... broadly supported by their membership, and, in particular, by all of the ccTLD representatives”. It was asked whether this implied that the final proposal of the CWG or CCWG required unanimity or full consensus of the ccNSO appointed members, members and representatives.

This question was discussed at the ccNSO Council meeting on April 23, 2015. In the view of the Council, *broad support* by the ccTLD representatives does NOT imply unanimity or full consensus, either by the ccNSO members or by the non-ccNSO ccTLD members and representatives of the group. Unanimity would mean the ccNSO Council impose a higher level of consensus on the internal decision-making process of the CWG or CCWG than what is defined in the charter adopted by the ccNSO. It would also reach above requirements set by NTIA, according to its announcement on consensus support.

Although unanimity is not required, we do expect the proposal of the CWG or CCWG, when submitted, to reflect significant consensus. We also expect that all the ccTLD members and representatives of these groups will apply reasonable efforts to take into account all views and concerns.

Assuming this clarifies our position, on behalf of the ccNSO Council

Kind regards,

Byron