Summary of Public Comments on the
ccNSO Review – External Reviewers' Final Report

This document provides an overview of the 7 public comments[1] (plus two duplicates) received in response to the 'ccNSO Review – External Reviewers' Final Report' (including a separate Addendum) delivered by ITEMS International in June 2010 and featuring the reviewers' conclusions with 12 recommendations. The comments are summarized and grouped in table format per recommendation referenced, with comments not referencing any recommendation put under a relevant recommendation, if appropriate, or summarized under "Other comments" at the end of the table. The summary does in no way substitute for the original contributions, which should be consulted for complete information. These are hyperlinked below for easy direct access and available at: http://forum.icann.org/lists/items-ccnso-report/ .

Contributions provided by (in order of submission):

InternetNZ	.NZ
ccNSO Council	ccNSO
AFNIC	.FR
NOMINET	.UK
Olivier Guillard (duplicated submission)	OG
CIRA	.CA
CENTR (duplicated submission)	CENTR

---

[1] The public comment period ran from 15 June 2010 to 15 September 2010.

RECIOMMENDATIONS	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS
1. The ccNSO should consider the adoption of alternative, consensus-based, lighter and faster policy development mechanisms: a) A comments mechanism would allow the ccNSO to provide a prompt response to a request from ICANN's Board or another Supporting Organisation. b) A position paper mechanism would allow the ccNSO to elaborate common Statements on relevant ccTLD issues in a way that reflects the general position of the ccTLD community. The fast tracked comment mechanism as with the position paper mechanism would be non-binding to ccNSO members.	.NZ: We support the comments and position paper mechanisms but do not regard either of these as a policy development mechanism.
	ccNSO: There is confusion in the analysis and the recommendation between policy development and "comments" and "position paper" mechanisms. It is vital to distinguish between formal PDPs and mechanisms for interaction. A formal PDP requires consensus positions across the membership and has a particular significance compared to less formal modes of interaction. The need for input to other entities is fulfilled by the current range of mechanisms, which are tailored to the topic, timeframe and potential effects.
	.FR: This recommendation is misleading in its formulation. We support establishment of a lightweight comment mechanism, but this should not substitute the PDP. The scope of policy development is defined by the Bylaws, and the current PDP ensures that any policy developed fits the scope. The ccNSO also interacts with other entities, but these interactions are not policy by themselves. A comment mechanism to clarify the interaction with the members and ccTLD community would strengthen the value of such comments.
	.UK: Most ccTLD policy is set locally, which limits the work of the ccNSO. This is partly ignored in the report, like in the inappropriate comparison between ccNSO and GNSO PDP output. Output in terms of binding policy is not a good way of assessing the success of the ccNSO. The PDP was designed to address the concerns of the community and it may be appropriate to re-examine the procedure but any changes will need to reflect compromises. The IDN ccTLD fast track is held up as an alternative to the PDP, but these mechanisms have different purposes. The fast track concentrated on areas with consensus - further work is needed on controversial areas in a full PDP. Position papers and comments mechanisms are held up as alternatives to the PDP. The ccNSO has used both successfully, but the comparison misses the different nature of the issues. Lightweight processes are suitable for non-binding outputs, which, by definition are not policy decisions.
	.CA: We disagree with developing a new prescriptive process. The needs raised in the report are filled by the mechanisms currently in place, like direct letters, draft papers, discussions with the Board or staff, etc.
	CENTR: Lightweight mechanisms should only reflect the members' general position(s) and should explicitly mention that it is not binding. Such mechanisms can only be efficient when there is already general agreement on the issues. CENTR is not a policy developing organisation and therefore uses lightweight mechanisms.
2. Consider the translation into the main UN languages of key documents	.NZ: We do not support this recommendation and suggest further work in this area. Language is an issue for participants but there is no evidence that the five UN languages are the most important to support.

concerning and produced by the ccNSO (Bylaws, the Rules and Guidelines document, major Policy papers) of a brief summary of ccNSO position paper.	ccNSO: The ccNSO supports the translation of key documents, provided a cost effective methodology can be found. The ccNSO does not believe it is necessarily ICANN's responsibility to provide, or fund, such a service. .FR: Same as first and last part of CENTR comment, see below .CA: Translated documents increase transparency, accountability and participation, but for members to take on translations could be challenging. A thorough consideration of options and methodology is needed. CENTR: Translating key documents could help non-English language communities, but any translation budget should be measured against other ways to enhance participation. Discussions are in English and translations may discourage people with limited command to participate. It may be more effective just to encourage people to engage. Translation into UN languages would further disadvantage smaller countries. If adopted, we recommend an initial test, where user and download statistics are analysed before any continuation.
3. Due to the significant cost of translating documents on a regular basis we suggest that the task of translating all documents related to the ccNSO's activity could be carried by the ccNSO membership itself. This could be facilitated by the setting up of a multilingual wiki (as used by Wikipedia). In this way, the translation of documents would become the responsibility of the linguistic communities themselves, and there need be no limit to the number of languages that documents could be translated into. If such a mechanism were adopted we would also suggest the appointing by the Council of a "linguistic community manager" for each language who would have responsibility to check the accuracy of the translations	.NZ: We do not support this recommendation and suggest that, when the languages are identified, proper consideration is given to the best way to introduce those languages in a reliable and sustainable manner. ccNSO: This recommendation is unworkable and places an unreasonable burden upon members that contribute time and knowledge as volunteers in addition to daily responsibilities. Members cannot be expected to undertake translations and it is unreasonable to expect that members' skills cover translations, requiring editorial skills in both English and another language. .FR: Same as CENTR, see below. .CA: See .CA comment for rec 2 above. CENTR: While it seems a good idea to encourage ccNSO members to provide translations on a voluntary basis we doubt that even a minority of ccTLDs would have resources for such an initiative. A 'language wiki' might be useful and achievable if restricted to a basic repository to help the novice to understand the ccNSO.

4. The ccNSO staff should regularly engage in outreach activities to enlarge membership / better communication with non-members. ICANN should increase resources in order to propose attractive and value-added services for the ccTLD community. These value added services would require a dedicated "online community manager" whose responsibilities it would be to attract new members, especially from underrepresented regions.	.NZ: We agree with the sentence on outreach but not with the rest of the recommendation. "Value added services" are not defined and there is no indication of how they would tackle the obstacles to membership. ccNSO: Until the issue of financial contributions is resolved, ICANN should not incur additional costs for the ccNSO. ICANN does not have a major role in increasing ccNSO membership - it is the role of ccNSO members to engage their counterparts. Attempts to increase membership also carry opportunity costs. The most effective and efficient outreach mechanisms should be considered, to avoid undue burdens on ICANN and the ccNSO. .FR: Same as CENTR, see below. .UK: We note the growth in membership in recent years and increasing participation is important, especially in underrepresented regions. However, the "regulatory" nature of the ccNSO should not be increased to attract new members and we doubt that an ICANN-Ied initiative is the right way. "Attractive and value-added services" is unclear and better handled by regional ccTLD associations, already working closely with their members. .CA: The ccNSO is already recruiting new members. As interest and trust in ICANN improves, participation in ccNSO will increase. We advocate a mentorship program, e.g. where councillors be shadowed during meetings by new members. This could facilitate induction and increase participation. CENTR: It is inappropriate to increase ccNSO costs with "attractive and value-added services". The ccNSO should focus on its core mission. New services must be within scope and subject to membership approval.
5. The ccNSO should engage with the GAC and ALAC to determine a joint initiative to boost the membership levels of all the SOs and ACs within ICANN.	.NZ: We agree with this recommendation. ccNSO: In dialogue with other entities, membership levels do not appear as a priority cross-constituency issue, with one exception - discussion with GAC to recruit government-operated ccTLDs is important and worthwhile. .FR: Same as CENTR, see below. .UK: We strongly support this recommendation. The ccNSO has good experience to share in terms of improving participation and understanding the various barriers to enhancing participation. CENTR: ccNSO has more than 100 members, with only a minority active. The Participation WG has taken steps to increase membership but more could be done. An ICANN led bid for new members is flawed, as some in the target audience are hostile to ICANN. Boosting participation across all organizations in ICANN is a good idea.
6. When ccNSO develops a policy which could impact the activity of registrars and registrants, ccNSO should be able to collect their position.	.NZ: We do not agree with this recommendation. ccTLDs generally operate in a local market and have their own relationship with registrars and registrants - only few of those operate across ccTLDs. To include the global registrar and registrant communities represented in the GNSO would distort the balance of views. ccNSO: The existing mechanisms for consultation facilitate engagement of registrars and registrants. The PDP rules actively encourage consultation with other stakeholders. ccTLD managers also engage their local

	communities on policy developments that may affect them and channel this feedback into ccNSO processes.
	.FR: Same as the first part of the CENTR comment, see below.
	.UK: An assessment of how to improve the liaison function is missing. "Global registrar/registrant" engagement is welcome, but the ccNSO should not spend effort on related issues as these are national matters. ICANN-accredited registrars could also get an "inside track", with undue advantage over nationally important registrars. The silo approach needs addressing - and recent work shows how this can be done. More meetings with other communities would be useful, but communities have little time for non-core work.
	.CA: ccTLD policies are subject to national processes, and consultation with the global registrar and registrant groups represented in the GNSO does not make sense in these processes. For ccNSO policy development, existing consultation mechanisms with the GNSO sufficiently facilitate the engagement.
	CENTR: We accept Registrar engagement, but ccTLD registrars and registrants are subject to local processes and the ccNSO should not spend time on national issues. ICANN accredited registrars should not get an undue inside track over national registrars. Recent work shows how to handle the silo approach and ccNSO participation in other discussions would also be useful, for example with law enforcement representatives.
7. Beyond the ongoing improvement of the website, we recommend the implementation of a collaborative networking tool allowing ccNSO to create subgroups based on thematic, regional, linguistic grounds. Such a tool could include wiki, agenda, project management functions and allow members to update their own contact details within the register of all ccNSO participants. Articulation of this collaborative tool with existing mailing lists has to be studied. Such a tool would be helpful for the animation of the ccNSO community as well for attracting new members. Animation of such a tool requires "community management" capabilities.	.NZ: We support the recommendation of a more collaborative web presence but caution against developing the existing web site for this when a number of commercial web sites offer such functionality. ccNSO: We welcome the recommendation and we always investigate and adopt new tools for collaboration and participation. E.g., the ccNSO was the first SO to try and adopt Adobe Connect - an effective tool. .CA: The website should be the core online meeting place and provide information coordination. Ongoing discussion could be advanced on this. We advocate using existing tools and social networking tools, while not committing to any more spending until the ccTLD Contributions issues have been sorted out.

8. ICANN should provide ccNSO with appropriate "management community" capabilities in order to make the best usage of the collaborative tool.	.NZ: We do not support this recommendation. The issue of resources for the ccNSO has not been adequately assessed and there is nothing other than anecdotal evidence indicating that more resources are necessary.
	ccNSO: The ccNSO is well served and needs no further capabilities and resources from ICANN.
	.FR: Same as CENTR (without the last CENTR sentence), see below.
	CENTR: The ccNSO secretariat is doing an excellent outreach job. The current website and YouTube channel are good instruments, and website improvements are announced. In the light of the budget discussions it is not appropriate to consider additional staff. The ccTLDcommunity@cctld-managers.org mailing list is an existing tool, not mentioned in the review.
9. Introduce a limit to the number of terms that can be served by ccNSO Council members (item tabled for discussion at ccNSO meeting in Brussels).	.NZ: We support the general principles of this recommendation, in line with established best practice for good governance, but further consultation is needed with ccNSO members.
	ccNSO: Term limits are an important mechanism for ensuring good corporate governance. However, ccNSO members are volunteers and Councillors do not receive compensation. To attract potential councillors is already challenging and term limits could erode the strength and talent of the Council. The Council has a coordination and facilitation role, while the decision power lies with the membership. Term limits are typically used for entities with both decision power and compensation. The ICANN Board has term limits but the pool of expertise is considerably larger. In addition, the Board introduced remuneration for the Chair - incentives that are unavailable and inappropriate for the ccNSO. A process to clarify councillors' roles is under way and the concept of term limits can only be considered when members have agreed a shared set of expectations.
	.FR: Same as CENTR, see below.
	OG: Having served as a ccNSO councillor over 6 years, I consider that two terms were enough. But for a community that counts at most 200 ccs, I question the need to regulate the number of mandate periods.
	CENTR: The report doesn't investigate reasons for the (perceived) low number of Council candidates, but concludes that a term limit will improve participation. Analysis is needed before taking any step in that direction. Attracting qualified and motivated individuals for a non-remunerated role is challenging and term limits may imply loss of significant expertise and knowledge. The issue might be addressed by a "mentor" approach - encouraging acting Council members to look for successor candidates.
10. ccNSO should consider clarifying of the respective roles of the Council and the Chair in the ccNSO Rules and guidelines.	.NZ: We support this recommendation.
	ccNSO: The ccNSO Council has already commenced a process of clarifying the roles of council members, the Chair and Vice Chairs and intends to discuss this with members in Cartagena.
	.UK: Clarification of the roles of council and chair could be useful, but the remit should not be defined tightly.

	The Council is accountable to the members and needs to be responsive to their interests. It is more important to encourage member participation in ccNSO work, to spread workload and to improve involvement.
	.CA: The respective roles of the councillors and chair should be clarified. This may also assist in recruiting new councillors and address the report's concerns about lack of candidates.
11. The ICANN Expenditure Analysis by Stakeholder Interest Area represents a major progress in term of understanding the allocation of ICANN budget towards ccTLD and ccNSO operations. In the interests of the members of the ccNSO and the broader ccTLD community, we recommend the institution of a permanent Finance Liaison (a designated member of the Council) whose responsibility will be to act as a gobetween with ICANN's Finance Department and to ensure complete transparency regarding this issue and any other budgetary matters linked to the activities of the ccNSO and ccTLDs. The next release of ICANN Expenditure Analysis by Stakeholder Interest Area could be an opportunity to reduce the "perception gap".	.NZ: We do not support this recommendation, nor the claim that it will improve financial transparency. It is directed at how the ccNSO and ICANN resolve disagreements, which is out of scope for this review.
	ccNSO: This issue is outside of the scope. The ccNSO is making other arrangements, e.g. thru its Finance WG.
	.FR: It is unfortunate that interviews did not cover this area, although we realize that ICANN excluded it. It is unusual for an organisational review not to look at the financial aspects and the exclusion by ICANN remains unexplained.
	.UK: It is inappropriate for this section to be included as this issue was out of scope. Interviews did not cover this area and ICANN clarified that it was not included in the review. The analysis shows ccTLD contributions per domain name, but this model, used for gTLDs, is inappropriate for ccTLDs, where policy and other decisions are national matters. Despite ongoing dialogue there are still many questions unanswered on expenditure in the ICANN budget. If a Finance liaison would help address this we would welcome such an appointment.
	.CA: We disagree with the recommendation for a Finance Liaison. The Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group facilitates open and direct discussion with the CFO of ICANN and providing comments to ICANN on its budgeting and planning process.
	CENTR: The Financial section of the report is out of scope of the terms of the review and therefore it was inappropriate for it to be included in the report. The interviews did not cover this area and as the report states, ICANN clarified that this area was not included in the review. However, it is unusual that an organisational review is asked not to look at the financial aspects and the reasons for this remain unclear.
12. The ccNSO should develop and publish annually a policy road map for the next two three years to act as a strategy document for current and upcoming policy work and as a general marketing tool for information purposes within and outside the ICANN community.	.NZ: We could have agreed to this, but it is difficult to support a proposal that was not tested with participants.
	ccNSO: Noted. The ccNSO will consider this at its next meeting in Cartagena.
	.FR: Same as CENTR, see below.
	.CA: We agree with this recommendation. A 2-3 year strategic road map would assist with setting objectives, task distribution, and performance measurement.
	CENTR: A policy road map would enable members to better plan their participation and input. The ccNSO has progressed well, but its work should get more structured. However, the recommendations lose sight of the

	nature of the work of the ccNSO and its very limited role, whereas most policy is set locally. This is reflected in the report, but also ignored in parts. The PDP is also compared unfavorably to the IDN ccTLD fast track - its significant achievement was partly due to putting off the difficult discussions to the full PDP.
Other comments	.NZ: There are too many flaws in the methodology for any weight to be attributed to many recommendations. Some issues have been addressed properly but overall the report leaves as many questions unanswered as it answers - a missed opportunity for the ccNSO. **See submission (link) for detailed criticism of methodology!**
	ccNSO: Regarding the suggestion that PDPs on issues which concern governments could include a formal GAC approval, there is already a working relationship between the ccNSO and GAC. However, a formal GAC approval process could undermine the independence of the ccNSO and its policy processes. The Bylaws provide mechanisms to request the GAC Chair to offer advice and this is an appropriate framework for interaction.
	.FR: Note - most comments are consistent with those from CENTR, with additions on rec 1 and 11.
	.UK: Section 10 provides an amusing insight into imaginative ways some have used country codes, but some data on the scale of use would be helpful for drawing meaningful conclusions from this.
	OG: The report highlights the importance of the IANA function, but I would have expected IANA aspects to be at least mentioned in the recommendations. Also, given that the internal ccNSO Working Group model features repeatedly in the report, I would have expected this model to be highlighted in the recommendations.
	.CA: Throughout the report, there are proposals to incur more costs in an attempt to address various issues. As a Financial Contributions WG has been formed to assist in resolving ccTLD contributions, increasing resources for any recommendation should not occur until the ccTLD contributions issues have been sorted out. Also, we find comments with direct personal critique inappropriate to reproduce in the report.
	CENTR: The reviewers assume that members know the scope and purpose of the ccNSO, based on self assessments by the members. A comparison between the perceived purpose and the stated purpose of the ccNSO would have been useful. The review process could also have been done in a more efficient way, e.g. by giving the reviewers contact details to registry representatives that participate regularly in the ccNSO and are more aware of the various issues. Note: One CENTR member requested an opt-out from the submission.