Subject: FW: [Ccnsosecretariat] Initial assessment of recommendations to improve the ccNSO

Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020 at 10:55:21 AM Mountain Daylight Time

From: Kimberly Carlson

Attachments: FAIIP for_ccNSO Review_Approved RWP and support Council.pdf, ATT00001.txt

---

From: Ccnsosecretariat <ccnsosecretariat-bounces@icann.org> on behalf of Katrina Sataki <katrina@nic.lv>

Date: Monday, July 6, 2020 at 5:07 AM

To: Lars Hoffmann <lars.hoffmann@icann.org>, Jean-Baptiste Deroulez <jean-baptiste.deroulez@icann.org>

Cc: ccNSO Secretariat <ccnsosecretariat@icann.org>

Subject: [Ccnsosecretariat] Initial assessment of recommendations to improve the ccNSO

Dear Lars and Jean-Baptiste:

I am pleased to inform you that the ccNSO Review Working Party has concluded its assessment of the recommendations of the Independent Reviewer and the ccNSO Council supports the results of the RWP's work. Included you'll find the FAIIP as completed by the RWP and adopted by the ccNSO Council at its 24 June meeting. It is our understanding that as the next steps, you will submit the FAIIP to the Board Organizational Effectiveness Committee, and the RWP will be invited to discuss the results of its assessment with the OEC and Independent Reviewer. Could you be so kind to confirm?

Thank you and kind regards,

Katrina Sataki, RWP

ICANN
ccNSO Review Work Party

ccNSO Review
Feasibility Assessment &
Initial Implementation Plan

Table of Contents

Introduction

In September 2019, the ccNSO organizational review final report by the independent examiner, Meridian Institute, was published. The final report includes an assessment of the ccNSO and 14 recommendations for improving its operations.

The independent examiner presented its findings and resulting recommendations for improvement in three categories:
- Continuing purpose
- Structure and operations
- Accountability

Based on its detailed review of the final report, the ccNSO Review Work Party (RWP) has prepared this Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan (FAIIP). This plan includes an analysis of recommendations made in the final report for usability and prioritization, provisional budget implications, anticipated resources and proposed implementation timeline. The RWP has noted any objections or proposed modifications to recommendations where applicable, along with supporting rationale.

Once finalized, the RWP will present this document to the Organizational Effectiveness Committee of the ICANN Board (OEC) to inform its recommendation to the Board of next steps.

1. Overview of Recommendations

The Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO) is responsible for developing and recommending to the Board global policies relating to country-code top-level domains. The ICANN Bylaws stipulate that the ccNSO be independently reviewed at least once every five years. In accordance with this requirement, the independent examiner's review included an assessment of:

- Whether the ccNSO has a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure.

- How effectively the ccNSO fulfills its purpose and whether any change in structure or operations is needed to improve effectiveness.

- The extent to which the ccNSO as a whole is accountable to the wider ICANN community, its organizations, committees, constituencies, and stakeholder groups.

- The implementation state of the ccNSO's prior review.

The independent examiner's report provided 14 recommendations and associated findings using a multi-modal approach to data collection and analysis to conduct the ccNSO review. This included conducting 45 targeted stakeholder semi-structured interviews with ccNSO members and participants as well as members of other Supporting Organizations (SOs), Advisory Committees (ACs), and bodies within the ICANN ecosystem. Data collection also included an online survey, which received 78 complete responses from 111 individuals. Meridian Institute also observed ccNSO Members Day meetings at ICANN63 and ICANN64, as well as a ccNSO Council meeting at ICANN64. Interview and survey data were fact-checked and supplemented through a document review process. In addition, an Assessment Report was published on 8 April 2019, and feedback reflected upon in the preparation of the report was solicited from the ICANN community via email to the RWP on mailing list, which is publicly archived.

A draft final report was released on 7 June 2019 and was open for public comment through 4 August 2019. The draft final report was presented for discussion in person at ICANN65 and via webinar on 10 July 2019. The conversations and comments from this public comment period were helpful to the independent examiner, who conducted its assessment of the ccNSO from August 2018 through September of 2019. That assessment found the ccNSO to have a strong continuing purpose; there does not seem to be a significant need to make structural or operational changes; and the ccNSO is accountable to its constituencies, including its members. The report provided 14 findings across a broad set of topic areas, including:

- Continuing purpose
- Structure and Operations
    - Working groups and Committees
    - ccNSO Council
    - Barriers to participation
    - Orientation and onboarding
- Accountability
    - Accessibility and transparency of information
    - Accountability of the ccNSO Council
    - Independent reviews

2. Feasibility Assessment & Initial Implementation Plan

Recommendation #1: The ccNSO Council, with support from the Secretariat, should develop communications materials (including talking points) that clearly articulate the value of the ccNSO to potential new and current ccNSO members.

Finding: To address the findings regarding the ccNSO's ongoing continuing purpose, the ccNSO will need to involve next generation ccTLD managers and ensure that ccNSO work and meetings remain relevant.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N		
Does RWP support the issue?	N	The pool of next generation ccTLD Managers is very limited. However, to focus more on interested representatives from ccTLD Managers is worth pursuing.	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	Articulating the value of the ccNSO, as part of larger outreach and engagement package is valuable	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?			
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?			
Additional Details & Comments			
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.			
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.			
Review Working Party comments			
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	Creation of outreach and Engamgent Framework /strategy		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ccNSO		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)			
Expected budget implications			
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Relatively easy to implement this specific recommendation		

Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	As soon as the Framework has been developed, the ccNSO will start with implementation - independent of the Board decision
Duration: What is the anticipated duration of the implementation effort to completion? Short: 0-10 months Medium: ≤ 20 months Long: ≤ 30 months	Short
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	
Task List, Sequencing (milestones in **bold**): and Owners of tasks: Proposed detailed implementation steps (based on the high-level steps provided by the RWP)	
Metrics to measure successful implementation	
Task(s) Owner	
Tasks Costs	

Recommendation #2a: The ccNSO Council should amend Annex B of the Guideline: ccNSO Working Groups to indicate the *Call for nominations*, *Selection Process,* and *Selection Criteria* will employ a 1/3 quota system for individuals that have been involved in the ccNSO for less than three years. The *Call for nominations* should request the name and the number of years they, as an individual, have been involved in the ccNSO.

Finding: There are opportunities to enhance participation, diversity, and leadership in working groups and committees.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

	Y/ N	RWP RESPONSE
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	In general, the RWP supports that increasing the level of participation in activities is necessary to ensure continuation and sustainability of the work and relevancy.
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	The RWP does not support the recommendation as such, it is considered too limiting.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		Specific measures, such as the one proposed, are too limiting and do not recognize the realities of ccTLDs (limitations in staff/ time to spend on ICANN and ccNSO related work). Moreover, they do not take into account the dependency on the ccTLD Managers: individuals rely on their employer to be able to participate. The RWP interprets the recommendation of the reviewers as an incentive to increase the outreach and engagement efforts. Alternative instruments, such as introductory and informative webinars prior to public meetings, might lower barriers to participation in working groups and committees.
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		ccNSO

Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Easy
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Implementation of recommendation or alternative is independent of Board decision.
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #2b: The ccNSO Council should establish a running roster of individuals interested to volunteer—both those that attend ccNSO meetings *and* their colleagues that may not be able to attend meetings but could participate remotely in the ccNSO's work. This list of individuals and their contact information can be drawn upon as opportunities arise.

Finding: There are opportunities to enhance participation, diversity, and leadership in working groups and committees.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N		
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	In general, the RWP supports that activities - aiming to increase the level of participation - are necessary to ensure continuation and sustainability of the work and relevancy.	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	A comparable initiative has been undertaken in the past. However, with no result.	
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?			
Additional Details & Comments			
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The RWP supports the need to address the underlying issues of lack of participation to be addressed. However, it also believes that the proposed measure is not implementable over time. It relies ultimately on the efforts of ccTLD Managers to maintain the roster, and like other in other instances, over time maintenance may prove to weaken. The recommendation of the reviewers is viewed as an incentive to increase the outreach and engagement efforts. Alternative instruments, such as introductory and informative webinars prior to public meetings, might lower barriers to participation in working groups and committees.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.			
Review Working Party comments			
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation			
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ccNSO		

Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #3: The ccNSO Council should update Section 3.5 of the Guideline: ccNSO Working Groups to clearly articulate and standardize the process for nominating and appointing Working Group Chair(s).

Finding: There is perceived lack of transparency and standardization around the selection process for Working Group members and Chairs.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N		
Does RWP support the issue?	N	Basic and general practice is that ccNSO WG chairs are nominated by the WG and appointed by the Council. Only exception: CCWGs, and review teams	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N		
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	N		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	N		
Additional Details & Comments			
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	Given that chairs (and vice-chairs) of all ccNSO WGs are nominated by the WG membership, there is no need to address this. As stated, it is a perception issue.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.			
Review Working Party comments			
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation			
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?			
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)			
Expected budget implications			
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies			
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)			

Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #4: The ccNSO Council should request a change in the Bylaws requirement for the IANA Naming Function Review Team, which requires two ccNSO members and one non-member. **NOTE**: This request was made to the ICANN Board[1] on 12 April 2019 and, as the IE, we concur. We recommend that the three seats on the IANA Naming Function Review Team be geographically diverse and membership-neutral.

Finding: The ccNSO's participation in the IANA Naming Function Review Team should not be impaired due to fluctuations in the number of ccNSO members and non-members.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	Note the Recommendation has become obsolete as it is already fully implemented.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	Y	Section 19.5 of the ICANN Bylaws includes a similar requirement. This section will need to be aligned with section 18.7 of the Bylaws
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The recommendations have already been fully implemented	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource		

[1] Correspondence: Composition of the IANA Functions Review Team: proposed ICANN Bylaws change. (2019, April) Retrieved from https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/sataki-to-chalaby-12apr19-en.pdf

requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #5: The ccNSO should limit the number of consecutive terms a Councilor can serve. In regions with fewer members to draw upon and/or in the case of no willing volunteers seeking election, this requirement could be waived for that term. **NOTE:** a more restrictive version of this recommendation was made in the 2010 ccNSO Review that did not take into consideration diverse regional contexts which may prevent a region from cultivating new candidates. The recommendation was not adopted due to lack of feasibility across all regions.[2]

Finding: The number and diversity of people involved in the ccNSO Council could be improved.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	It is recognized that a reasonable and regular replacement of Councillors is in the interest of the ccNSO, the broader ccTLD community and ICANN.
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	The RWP recognizes that the issue as identified needs to be addressed. However, various factors need to be taken into account in defining a solution. . Some of them, for example the aa solid pool of potential candidateswhat needs to be taken into account is that the members should allow a representative to become a Councilor and there should be an interest to become a Councilor.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments:		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	This recommendation should be discussed with broader community. As noted, a comparable recommendation was made in the 2010 round and at the suggestion of the ccNSO at the time NOT included in the implementation plan. As noted at the time, it is ultimately up to ccTLD Managers whether or not they allow their employees to stand.	

2 Organizational Review of ICANN's Country Code Names Supporting Organization (ccNSO). Final Report.
https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/items-ccnso-organisational-review-15jun10-en.pdf

If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.	The RWP proposes that the ccNSO Council provides an overview to the ccNSO membership and discuss alternative approaches to resolve the issue identified, amongst other but not limited to: the bylaw change as suggested; a voluntary arrangement call to action of members to nominate candidates. The RWP's alternative approach or recommendation is to create awareness of the issue, understanding the underlying reasons and resolving the issue based on that analysis. The intital conversation and discussion with the membership has to take place at a in person meeting. The RWP therefore suggests that no fixed time is set, but the result of the recommendation is considered in the next ccNSO review.
Review Working Party comments	
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #6: The ccNSO Meetings Programme Committee should develop and adopt meeting formats to allow more varied interaction between participants at ICANN meetings (e.g., small regional group discussions followed by small group topical discussions). **Suggestion R** includes several ideas for implementing this recommendation.

Finding: It is important to engage a diversity of voices through varied, interactive meeting formats to enable participation from people who are not as comfortable standing up with a microphone in front of the membership.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	The RWP notes that the MPC has taken several steps to improve and increase the interaction between participants. Most recently, conducting virtual meetings
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The RWP agrees that interaction of attendees (whether in person or remotely) at ICANN meetings is important and should, where feasible, be optimized. The RWP appreciates the suggestions included in the report. The RWP is also of the view that the MPC is working on and experimenting on changing formats and has taken other steps to increase active interaction and participation at sessions. In addition, this is a continuing area of improvement, following a long-established practice of post- ICANN meeting surveys.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	Creation of outreach and Engagement Framework /Strategy. The Recommendation itself is considered to be implemented	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		

Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #7: ICANN should provide real-time scribing of ccNSO Members Day meetings. As the Independent Examiner, we recognize that addressing this finding is outside of the ccNSO alone to remedy.

Finding: The lack of real-time scribing of ccNSO Members Day meetings presents a barrier to participation for remote participants and non-native English speakers.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	In the past, the ccNSO has requested several times for real time-scribing, however, to date it has been declined for changing reasons.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	The RWP suggests that the ccNSO Council sends a letter to the Board in support of the recommendation	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ICANN Org	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	Unknown, driven by ICANN Org	
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Unknown, however considered urgent and important to increase level of involvement, both at f-2-f meeting and remotely.	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	More efficient and effective process.	

Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #8: The ccNSO Council should request to ICANN that the written ccNSO course on the ICANN Learn portal should be translated into all ICANN languages.

Finding: Many respondents indicated that more could be done to enhance the orientation and onboarding of new and newer (< 2 years) ccNSO members as well as newly-elected leaders.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE	
	Y/ N		
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	The RWP agrees that more could be done to enhance the presentation and onboarding. This is one of the driving factors for the need for a strategic approach in this area. Translation of the onboarding material is just one of the instruments.	
Does RWP support the recommendation?			
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?			
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?			
Additional Details & Comments			
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.			
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.			
Review Working Party comments			
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation			
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ICANN Org		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	Unknown, driven by ICANN Org		
Expected budget implications	Unknown, driven by ICANN Org		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies			
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)			

Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #9: We recommend streamlining the mentorship program to more efficiently connect mentors and mentees. Recognizing the need for mentors may be greater than the availability of them, there may be efficiencies gained through group mentoring and/or dedicating face-to-face time at ICANN meetings for mentors and mentees to connect.

Finding: Many respondents indicated that more could be done to enhance the orientation and onboarding of new and newer (< 2 years) ccNSO members as well as newly-elected leaders.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	On boarding of newer members to the ccNSO and Council is a generally shared concern.
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	On-boarding i.e. increasing involvement in the activities requires a broad, integrated approach, ranging from on-boarding material, mentorship, webinars, to special meetings at in person meetings.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	On-boarding i.e. increasing involvement in the activities requires a broad, integrated approach, ranging from on-boarding material, mentorship, webinars, to special meetings at in person meetings. With respect to this specific recommendation the RWP notes that the ccNSO has undertaken an unsuccessful (informal) attempt before and established on 1 December 2018 a mentor/mentee coordination committee. The activities of this latter are subject to review by the Council, however to date have not been successful: The first team of mentor/mentee under auspices of the Programme joined too late to be able to apply for ccNSO travel funding, was not able to attend the Montreal meeting (ICANN66) for visa issues, and ICANN67 has been cancelled. The RWP suggests that first a proper framework and instrumentalization of the framework needs to be in place, before focusing on specific actions like recommended.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		

Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Difficult, important but not urgent
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #10: Resources for newcomers (including multi-lingual ICANN Learn ccNSO portal materials) should be assembled into one location that is prominently featured and easily accessible on the ccNSO website.

Finding: Many respondents indicated that more could be done to enhance the orientation and onboarding of new and newer (< 2 years) ccNSO members as well as newly-elected leaders.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

	Y/ N	RWP RESPONSE
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	The RWP notes the dependency on the ccNSO Website.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	On-boarding i.e. increasing involvement in the activities requires a broad, integrated approach, ranging from on-boarding material, mentorship, webinars, to special meetings at in person meetings. With respect to this specific recommendation the RWP notes that the suggested material is available, but difficult to track/find, due to the structure and issues with maintaining the current website. The RWP suggests that this recommendation is integrated in the re-design of the ccNSO website, whenever scheduled.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ICANN org in coordination with ccNSO	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	Unknown	
Expected budget implications	Unknown	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Difficult, not urgent, but important	

Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Depends on the decision to re-design the ccNSO Website
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #11: We recommend the ccNSO website should be redone as soon as possible. It is one of the more (if not the most) outdated SO/AC websites yet it is a key tool that supports accountability, transparent communication, and efficient operations.

Finding: Many of the findings related to accessibility and transparency of information are rooted in challenges with the current ccNSO website. As the Independent Examiner, we also experienced difficulty in trying to locate documents on the website for fact-checking. Lack of easy access to information also presents a barrier to participation.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	The ccNSO Council will be suggested to send a letter to the Board stressing the urgency and importance of this recommendation and underlying findings
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	Unknown, depends on priority set by ICANN Org	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	ICANN Org with assistance of ccNSO, when required	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	Unknown, ICANN Org	
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	Difficult, Important and Urgent. High impact on ccTLD community	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient	Increased transparency, enhanced effectiveness and efficiency	

process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	High
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	Unknown
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #12: The ccNSO Secretariat, in collaboration with the ccNSO Council, should review the process for naming, filing, and uploading documents to the website to ensure a clear, transparent, and efficient process going forward. Standardizing information through templates, tagging, and automation could help improve the efficiency and transparency of information and accessibility.

Finding: It appears that the inability to locate the appropriate Guideline to use for the recent ccNSO Vice-Chair election process arose from unclear file-naming and lack of consistent file storage and sharing. This led to developing a last-minute election process that was confusing to Councillors.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	The RWP agrees that standardized access to information, through templates, tagging etc. would be beneficial to improve efficiency and transparency.
Does RWP support the recommendation?	N	The recommendation has been already been implemented. However the RWP notes that the major gain is through a clear and easily usable method for filing and uploading document to the website, andsearch structure of the website. See also recommendation #11.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	**N**	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	**N**	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The RWP supports the need for increased efficiency and effectiveness. The RWP is also aware of the incident referred to, and considers it an incident, and is aware that the Council and secretariat have developed a practice to adequately publish correspondence, guidelines and decisions, and does not see the need to undertake further action.	
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		

Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #13: The ccNSO Council should adhere to the ccNSO Council Practices Guideline. If the guidelines for Council agendas are too restrictive or impractical to follow, then the Guideline should be updated to reflect practices that are sustainable, keeping in mind members' interest in continued transparency and accountability.

Finding: The ccNSO Council does not always adhere to the ccNSO Council Practices Guideline with respect to publishing confirmed Council agendas seven days in advance of a Council meeting.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	**Y**	Predictability and transparency of Council meetings is paramount. However, the RWP note that the Council agenda is published a week in advance of the meeting, with excpetion at times of the Council agenda's during ICANN public meetings, when the agenda depends on outcome of members sessions and / or WG meetings.
Does RWP support the recommendation?	**N**	The RWP does not agree with the wording used in the Report. To date experience has shown that the agenda and decision list are published in time.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?	**N**	
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?	**N**	
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.	The RWP supports the general sentiment. The RWP is aware that in the past the agenda was not always posted at least one week in advance of the meeting or was difficult to find. However the RWP noticed the practice and Guideline are now aligned. At the same time the RWP is also aware that the Guideline allows the chair of the Council to divert from this general practice when needed, for example at ICANN public meetings when the agenda depends on outcome of members sessions and / or WG meetings. In addition - and again with an eye to members' interest in continued transparency and accountability - the RWP notes that since ICANN67 all Council meetings (whether in person or through conferencing tools) are open and and the details are made publicly avaible well ahead of the meeting.
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		

Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation	
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?	
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)	
Expected budget implications	
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies	
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)	
Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

Recommendation #14: We recommend that for future ccNSO reviews, the Independent Examiner have access to archived mailing lists for the period in review and/or be able to join as an observer to the mailing lists for the period of the review.

Finding: Considering the number of respondent statements that discussed the level of transparency of information being shared on various mailing lists, it would have been helpful to be able to independently verify this information in order to make more informed recommendations.

RWP Consensus Level for Assessment and Implementation Details: [*last step: enter level of consensus here*]

		RWP RESPONSE
	Y/ N	
Does RWP support the issue?	Y	
Does RWP support the recommendation?	Y	Dependent on use made of the information shared on the list: Should only be for verification purposes.
Does RWP suggest a revised recommendation?		
Does RWP support the revised recommendation?		
Additional Details & Comments		
If RWP does not support the independent examiner's final recommendation, please provide rationale.		
If RWP suggests a revised recommendation, please state the suggested revised recommendation along with supporting rationale.		
Review Working Party comments		
Activities, if any, on which implementation is dependent, or that are dependent on implementation of this recommendation		
Who will implement the recommendation: ICANN community, ICANN Board, ICANN organization, other?		
Anticipated resource requirements (FTEs, tools)		
Expected budget implications		
Prioritization level, i.e. difficulty/ease to implement this recommendation, based on expected resource requirements, budget implications and other dependencies		
Potential benefit of the implementation of this recommendation for ICANN as a whole? Please consider: improved Board Governance, more efficient process, greater NomCom accountability and transparency, etc. (high, medium, low)		

Expected level of implementation effort	
How long after the Board decision can this be implemented?	
High-level summary of proposed implementation steps	

ANNEX 1: Background

Timeline
22 February 2018 – start of review
20 June 2018 – IE assessment report published for public consultation
15 October 2018 – IE draft final report published for public comment
17 December 2018 – IE delivery of final report

Review Scope
Acting on ICANN Bylaws' stipulated requirements, an independent review of the ccNSO is mandated to occur at least once every five years. In accordance with this requirement, the independent examiner's review included an assessment of:

- Whether the SSAC has a continuing purpose within the ICANN structure.

- How effectively the SSAC fulfills its purpose and whether any change in structure or operations is needed to improve effectiveness.

- The extent to which the SSAC as a whole is accountable to the wider ICANN community, its organizations, committees, constituencies, and stakeholder groups.

- The implementation state of the SSAC's prior review.

Role of the RWP
The SSAC Review Work Party (RWP), acting as a steering committee, serves as the primary group working on the SSAC review. The roles and responsibilities of the RWP include:

- Sharing input into review scope and IE selection criteria
- Providing community outreach support
- Sharing input into data collection – online survey and interviews
- Providing clarification and factual corrections throughout the review

Once the independent examiner's final report is submitted, the RWP is responsible for:

- Establishing the RWP's level of agreement with the final report
- Assessing feasibility of recommendations
- Providing proposed alternatives if there is a disagreement with the feasibility of the independent examiner's recommendations
- Providing detailed rationale for each rejected assessment or recommendations
- Based on the above work, compiling a Feasibility Assessment and Initial Implementation Plan (FAIIP)
- Presenting the FAIIP to the OEC