

Follow-up ccNSO Council Accountability

Based on discussion on-line following the call for nominations for ICANN Board seat 11, discussion on the Guideline review committee with respect to agenda setting and the discussion following the presentation of the ccNSO Council Accountability Survey, the secretariat has compiled an overview of issues identified, and where feasible included suggestions to remit the issue.

A¶ Transparency ccNSO Council decisions

I. A ccNSO member pointed out that it is difficult to see when a particular topic was addressed and decided upon by the council

Suggestions how to address this:

- The draft agenda of the ccNSO Council meeting is shared with the councilors one week ahead of the meeting. The same draft agenda could be shared with the community as well prior to the council meeting, together with all the related background documents.

via publication on the Wiki space for instance and on <https://ccnso.icann.org/about/council/minutes.htm>

- Inform the community, once the minutes of a council meeting are approved.
- Include more details in the monthly activity report, such as listing the then current decisions. Current content:

ccNSO Council preparation material and output can be found here: <http://ccnso.icann.org/about/council/minutes.htm>
ccNSO Council Decisions and Resolutions: <http://ccnso.icann.org/about/council/decisions-resolutions.htm>
[ccNSO Council Wiki space](#)

II. Inclusion of Agenda items on the ccNSO Council: cut of date to include topics or decision making.

- To date draft agenda's are send out one week in advance of the Council meeting and include indication on topics on which Council is expected to take a decision. Formally this is a draft agenda, hence opens the opportunity to add topics for decision very close to the meeting. This practice may become an issue in the context of increased need and requirement for transparency (see above)
- This issue was brought up during discussion of the GRC. As this affects the procedures of the ccNSO Council directly, it is raised now, and if Council in manner in which to address it, it will be included in the Guideline.

- Suggestion to address this, to include in the ccNSO Council Guideline a section that an item will need to be on the draft agenda, one week before the meeting with indication for decision, to allow Council decision. If not, then it may be discussed at the Council meeting but the decision is deferred to email decision making (intersessionally) or next call/f-2-f meeting.

-

III. What process is there for consultation with ccNSO members on the guidelines?

Suggestions how to address this:

- Include more details in the monthly activity report sent to the community via email, such as listing the then current decisions.
- Publish the monthly activity reports on the ccNSO website
- Should we consider weekly updates to the ccNSO community, just like we do internally to the policy team?
- Promote the work of the GRC.
- Strive for adoption of the Guidelines after a f-2-f meeting after the ccNSO membership had an opportunity to discuss the (merits of the) guideline.

B¶ Volunteers

I. TIME FOR RECRUITING VOLUNTEERS

Give every potential volunteer time to consider whether to apply, and to encourage all of us to motivate candidates

Suggestions by ccNSO Members how to address this:

- several months of recruitment before nominations are even accepted. Adopt a timeline similar to ICANN's Nominating Committee? You can view their annual timeline here: [https://www.icann.org/nomcom2016/#timeline\[icann.org\]](https://www.icann.org/nomcom2016/#timeline[icann.org]).
- a process that held nominations open over a meeting, and then allowed presentation and campaigning at another, would be ideal.

II. LIMITED NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS

interacting with the candidates during a F2F meeting would be seriously undermined if we have only one candidate.

III. VARIATION/DIVERSITY IN VOLUNTEERS

- Glass ceiling: an unacknowledged barrier to advancement in a profession, especially affecting women and members of minorities.
- Old boy network: An informal and exclusive system of mutual assistance and friendship through which men belonging to a particular group, exchange favors and connections
- Term limits

C¶ Affiliation

- I. Is being nominated/seconded by a ccTLD is a strong enough connection to a ccTLD, to take the position of ccNSO councilor, ccNSO chair, ccNSO rep to the ICANN Board, working group member and various other groups?

This goes back to a very fundamental choice that was made at the time the ccNSO was created: should ccNSO appointed Councilors or Board members be from - or need to be directly associated with - a ccTLD, or are they elected in their personal capacity? At the time and to date the choice is that they are (s)elected in their personal capacity.

The Bylaws¹ specify the following about ccNSO Council members:

¹ Link to current Bylaws: <https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance/bylaws-en>
Link to the 27 May 2016 Bylaws: <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/adopted-bylaws-27may16-en.pdf>

Article IX section 4:

“Any ccNSO member may nominate an individual to serve as a ccNSO Council member representing the ccNSO member's Geographic Region. Nominations must be seconded by another ccNSO member from the same Geographic Region.”

With respect to the Board Selection/nomination the Bylaws are silent. In 2007/2008 the guideline² documented that the principle applicable to Council elections is also applicable to Board Selection/nominations.³

II. What if there is a change in affiliation of an appointed member, during its term?

This is currently not being addressed, neither by the bylaws nor the guidelines. To date people have reacted differently. Goes back to fundamental question is person nominated/selected in personal capacity or representing her or his organisation

ccNSO council accountability survey

In order to improve its transparency and accountability, also in light of the upcoming broader discussions on the accountability of the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council sought input and feed-back from the ccTLD community. The **ccNSO Council Accountability Survey** ran from 16 to 24 June 2016. 46 responses have been received.

- Survey results: <http://ccnso.icann.org/surveys>
- Presentation on this survey by Katrina Sataki at ICANN56 in Helsinki: <http://ccnso.icann.org/surveys>
- Transcript of the discussion in Helsinki during the ccNSO Members days: <https://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/transcript-ccnso-members-part-1-29jun16-en.pdf>

Suggestions for improvement, raised in the ccNSO Members Days at ICANN56:

1. Discuss council accountability during the next ccNSO Members Days in Hyderabad, ICANN57

The topic is on the agenda in the morning of day 2, on Monday 7 November 2016.

2. Important decisions to be voted upon by members

From the transcript: *“members vote when they select their representatives on the Council, members vote when they select our representatives on ICANN Board, for example. So, there is a set of decisions that is taken by vote of members. Do we need more? More or other types of decisions? This is, again, something that we could discuss in more detail. “*

Preliminary response:

3. Removal of Councillors/ Board Members:

From the transcript: *“how can we remove a Council member if we do not try a particular*

² 25 June 2008 Guidelines on the election of council members:

<https://ccnso.icann.org/about/guidelines-ccnso-council-election-procedure-08may08en.pdf>

³ Guideline: ccNSO nomination process ICANN Board seat 11 and 12 process:

<https://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/ccnso-nominations-icann-board-guideline-01sep16-en.pdf>

counselor? This is not such an easy thing because we have this regional representation. So, normally region selects three counselors. So should we give other regions the power to remove a counselor from a particular region? "

4. Councillors should engage more with the community

Take certain steps to ensure that you, in your regions during your meetings, your regional organizations meetings, provide updates on the ccNSO's activities.

5. More transparency on travel funding

Addressed via <https://ccnso.icann.org/about/funded-travel>

In addition the travel funding guidelines will be updated. It is on the GRC priority list

6. Language issues

Cannot easily be solved, no funding available, i.e. has major funding implications also in context of expected financial contributions by the ccTLD community.

Issues identified, regarding the survey:

- Not clear whether councillors answered as well, and if this biased the results
- There is an engagement problem, and this should be the focus of the activities that come out of this survey. From the transcript: *"If we want to be accountable to the whole community, then they need to be consulted. They need to, we need to be able to lessen to their expectations. And if we cannot establish a two-way communication channel, then certainly we have an issue."*