

Highlights ICANN56, Helsinki (FI)

ccNSO Members Meeting

28 – 29 June 2016

Membership ccNSO

The ccNSO Council approved during its face-to-face meeting the application of the ccTLD manager of .dk and welcomes Dansk Internet Forum (DIFO), the ccTLD manager for .dk (Denmark), as the **160st member of the ccNSO**. <http://ccnso.icann.org/announcements/announcement-2-30jun16-en.htm>

ccNSO Council Meeting (30 June 2016)

- **The mandate of the ccNSO GRC**, the Guideline Review Committee, was further extended. The ccNSO GRC is now in a position to do what is necessary including, but not limited to, reaching out and coordinating with other SO/ACs and ICANN staff to develop all processes and procedures the ccNSO should implement according and flowing from the ICANN Bylaws as adopted by the ICANN Board on 27 May 2016. The GRC is requested to present these rules and procedures to the ccTLD community and for adoption by the ccNSO Council.
- **The ccNSO agrees with the process to request additional budget for WS 2 items**
The co-chairs of the CCWG-Accountability send a letter to the CCWG's chartering organisations, including the ccNSO, and requested to validate the FY17 Budget for the CCWG-Accountability and agree with the following formal process to deal with additional expense requests post-budget approval, approved:
 - The CCWG, with the support of the PCST, prepares a request for the Chartering SO/ACs.
 - The Chartering SO/ACs review the CCWG request. If the Chartering Organizations validate the request, it is submitted to the Board for approval. If not, it will be returned to the CCWG with a detailed explanation.
- **Appointed members to CCWG-Accountability**
In accordance with its charter, the ccNSO Council has appointed 5 members on the CCWG-Accountability. The members on the CCWG-Accountability have been actively and intensively involved in Work Stream 1 since the creation of the CCWG in December 2014. The ccNSO Council chair will ask the ccNSO appointed members on the CCWG to indicate whether they want to remain on the CCWG-Accountability as member. If one or more members indicate they want to end their membership, the secretariat is requested to launch a call for membership on the CCWG. Council will use the same selection process as for the original appointments
(<https://community.icann.org/display/CSPFCWGOIA/ccNSO+Selection+Process+for+Cross-Community+Working+Group+on+ICANN+Accountability>).
- **CSC membership selection**
In accordance with the ccNSO Guideline "ccNSO Actions Respecting the Customer Standing Committee" (<http://ccnso.icann.org/about/guidelines.htm>), a **call for Expression of Interest**

for membership of the CSC was launched (<http://ccnso.icann.org/node/48077>). The call for Expression of Interest was open until **Friday 15 July 2016, 17.00 UTC**. By 22 July 2016, the ccTLD representatives on the CSC will be selected by all Councillors who have not volunteered. A sub-group of the Council, the CSC Selection Committee (5 ccNSO members appointed Councillors, one from every ICANN region and 1 NomCom appointed Councillor) will then approve the full slate of CSC members and liaisons.

The following Councillors are appointed as CSC selection committee:

- Katrina Sataki (.lv, Europe)
 - Ching Chao (NomCom appointee)
 - Margarita Valdes (.cl, LAC)
 - Stephen Deerhake (.as, NA)
 - Hiro Hotta (.jp, AP)
 - Abibu Ntahigiye (.tz, AF)
- The ccNSO Council has launched a **ccNSO Policy Development Process regarding the retirement of ccTLDs and the development of a review mechanism for the decisions on delegation, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs and retirement of ccTLDs**. An Issue Report is currently being drafted and will be discussed at ICANN57 taking place in November in Hyderabad. The report addresses the following topics:
 - a. Whether or not the ccNSO should initiate the ccNSO Policy Development Process on the retirement of ccTLDs and review mechanism for decision pertaining to the delegation, transfer, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs.
 - b. Whether or not to initiate a ccPDP to develop a policy on Review Mechanism first and defer the decision on the Retirement to a later stage, and if so, when the decision should be taken; and
 - c. Whether or not to convene a Taskforce or use other method to address these issues.

In addition, if the conclusion of the Issue Report is to initiate a ccNSO Policy Development Process, the report will include a proposed time line for conducting each of the stages of PDP outlined herein.

A Council sub-committee will act as a steering group for the PDP, and to liaise with and assist the Issue Manager on behalf of the Council, up and until the Council decides whether or not to initiate a ccPDP on review mechanism and retirement of ccTLDs (foreseen to take place at the Hyderabad face-to face meeting). The sub-committee will have 6 members consisting of one (1) Councillor from each of ICANN geographic regions, including the vice-chair overseeing the policy and policy related activities, and one (1) NomCom appointed Councilor. The initial members of the PDP Oversight Committee are:

- a. Debbie Monahan (.nz, AP Region)
 - b. Demi Getschko (.br, LAC Region) chair
 - c. Peter Vergote (.be, EU Region)
 - d. Becky Burr (.us, NA Region)
 - e. Souleymane Oumtanaga (.ci, AF Region)
 - f. Ching Chao (NomCom appointed Councillor)
- The ccNSO Council chair provided an update on the survey on **the ccNSO Council's accountability and transparency**. In order to improve its transparency and accountability, also in light of the broader discussions on the accountability of the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council sought the ccTLD community's input and feed-back via a **Survey**, which was open between 10

and 24 June 2016. The survey results are published here, <http://ccnso.icann.org/surveys> and will be further analysed, to ensure an adequate follow-up.

- **Thank you and congratulations**

The ccNSO Council expresses its warm thanks to Juhani Juselius and his team at FICORA (.fi) the local host for their hospitality and assistance during this wonderful event in Helsinki, and in particular for organizing as sole sponsor the very successful ccNSO Cocktail.

The ccNSO Council wholeheartedly congratulates Keith Davidson that he received the ICANN Ethos Award. The ccNSO Council and ccTLD community was fortunate to benefit from Keith's leadership, wisdom and humor in his role as ccNSO Council member, vice-chair, chair of the Delegation, Redlegation Working group and chair of the Framework of Interpretation working group.

ccNSO Tech Day (27 June 2016)

Tech Day (<http://sched.co/7NCl>) is a workshop open for all community members, with an interest in technical topics related to registry work, security etc.

A copy of the agenda and the presentation slides can be found here: <http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/helsinki56/workshop.htm> All presentations are available and audio and transcript are available under "Audio & Transcripts" <http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/helsinki56>

ccNSO Members' Meeting Days (28-29 June 2016)

On Tuesday 28/06 and Wednesday 29/06, we welcomed participants at the **ccNSO Member Days** (<http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/helsinki56/agenda.htm>), where the ccTLD community presented a number of issues affecting a cross-section of the world's country codes, with updates from ICANN/IANA, ccNSO Working Groups, and updates on developments and best practice from various ccTLD managers during the Legal session, the ccTLD news session and the Marketing session. The ccNSO Member Days are open to all with an interest in ccTLD related topics.

Other relevant sessions:

The ccNSO is launching an important **Policy Development Process regarding the retirement of ccTLDs and the development of a review mechanism for the decisions on delegation, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs and retirement of ccTLDs**. An update on the implications and details associated with this was provided by Bart Boswinkel (ccNSO Secretariat) and Becky Burr (.us)

At its meeting on 10 December 2015, the ccNSO Council discussed the issue of launching formal Policy development processes to address the lack of policy with respect to retirement of ccTLDs and Appeals Mechanism on issues of delegation, revocation and retirement of ccTLDs. More specifically, it was raised that part of the IANA stewardship transition process has demanded that the process or processes need to be commenced, to fill the void of lack of relevant policy. Two separate but clearly interrelated topics will be presented: Whether or not to combine the topics of retirement and Review Mechanism for decision regarding delegation, revocation, transfer and retirement of ccTLDs into one single formal policy decision process (section 2: One or two ccPDPs?) Secondly, Phasing of a formal ccNSO Policy Development Process as defined in Annex C of the ICANN Bylaws (section 3: Structure of ccNSO PDP and tentative minimum timeline PDP). Based on experience to date, the scope of a policy development process or policy related process (DRD WG/FOIWG) and underlying issues that need to be addressed, determine in large the intensiveness and duration of these processes.

During the session dedicated to the **implementation of the CWG-Stewardship proposals**, the community present was informed on the progress implementation work by ICANN and CWG-Stewardship and how it affects interaction of a ccTLD with ICANN/ PTI / CSC and other committees, including the next steps. Moreover, the progress implementation of the proposals by the ccNSO was discussed, including the selection and appointment of ccTLD representatives on CSC and RZERC.

The session that focused on the **Implementation of the CCWG WS1 & progress to date WS2, including ccNSO accountability, provided the community present with an overview of the CCWG work to date, and an overview of the new ICANN bylaws with a focus on the relevant aspect for ccTLDs and ccNSO**. The ccNSO Council chair provided an update on the survey on **the ccNSO Council's accountability and transparency**. In order to improve its transparency and accountability, also in light of the broader discussions on the accountability of the ccNSO, the ccNSO Council sought the ccTLD community's input and feed-back via a **Survey**, which was open between 10 and 24 June 2016. The survey results are published here, <http://ccnso.icann.org/surveys> and will be further analysed, to ensure an adequate follow-up.

Cross-community sessions (28-29 June 2016)

In the joint meeting (<http://sched.co/7Mdl>) of the **ccNSO with the GAC**, the Governmental Advisory Committee, where we welcomed an exchange on the Policy Development Processes relevant to the ccTLD community, and the survey recently conducted by the GAC WG on under-served regions on government relations with ccTLD managers.

Different stakeholders particularly welcomed the cross-community session focusing on the **operational side of ICANN's Operational Plan and Budget** (slides are available on <http://sched.co/7NWP>). This session launched and embedded a cross- community dialogue on ICANN's operations in ICANN's planning cycle, in particular on high level operational goals, Key Performance Indicators (KPI's) and related metrics regarding for instance HR related matters and ICANN's hub strategy. A potential follow-up session for ICANN57 is being considered.

In the **Country & other Geographic Names Forum**, a cross-community session hosted under the auspices of the ccNSO, the focus was on the eternal debate, namely country, territory and geographic names in the Domain Name System.

The purpose of this sessions was to solicit views of the community on the different issues and views related to the use of country and other geographic names and feasibility of a harmonized framework that could inform and enhance the policy efforts around the use of these names as TLDs.

The cross-community working group is currently focusing on the use of 3-letter country codes as TLDs. The WG noted diverging interest and opinions, across all communities. The CCWG is also aware of other discussions relating to geographic names. With this in mind the CCWG looks at an opportunity to have a broader discussion on topics relating to the use of country and other geographic names and understand whether a harmonized framework would be feasible, however the conclusion from the discussion seems to point in the direction of the fact that a harmonized framework is unlikely.

Presentations, Recordings and Transcripts, Survey Results

- All **presentations** from the ccNSO meeting can be found at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/helsinki56/presentations.htm>
- **Recordings and transcripts** of some of the meeting are available at: <http://ccnso.icann.org/meetings/helsinki56>
- **Members Meeting Satisfaction Survey** results: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-2GS3VNHT/>