

# ICANN's geographical Regions II : the sequel




Dave Archbold  
Chair, ccNSO Regions WG

25<sup>th</sup> June 2007

ICANN Meeting, San Juan



# The Two Regional Structures




25<sup>th</sup> June 2007

ICANN Meeting, San Juan



# From UN Statistics to ICANN



25<sup>th</sup> June 2007

ICANN Meeting, San Juan



# Process Since Lisbon

- Discussion at ccNSO Meeting in Lisbon
- Draft report revised by WG
- Circulated to ccNSO membership for comment (14 to 28 May)
- Draft report revised by WG
- Public consultation launched (20 June to 9 July)

25<sup>th</sup> June 2007

ICANN Meeting, San Juan



# Feedback So Far

- Confirmation that the concerns about the present implementation of ICANN Geographic Regions are shared by many ccTLD managers (and raised by ALAC this week).
- The Working Group and responders appear unanimous that the **representational** issues highlighted in the report should be addressed by the ICANN Board.
- Unanimous agreement that improving **participation** in the ccNSO (and ICANN generally) is an important issue...
- ...but there are very divergent views, even within the WG, on whether or not the present Regional Structure adversely impacts participation.

# Feedback So Far

- Support for the recommendation that the Working Group prepare a ccNSO submission to ICANNs Regions review process
- Support for the short term solution of self-selection, for ccNSO purposes only, by ccTLDs that are currently assigned to an ICANN Geographical Region on the basis of the citizenship criterion...
- ...but only mixed support for the recommendation that the ccNSO facilitate the creation of sub-regional or interregional groups. This recommendation therefore has not be carried forward.

# Participation – View 1

- The degree of participation by any country is a direct reflection of the degree of interest in ICANN held by the individuals involved.
- Some consider the matters discussed by ICANN in general and the ccNSO in particular to be irrelevant to their day-to-day operations.
- If they were interested, individuals would find a way to participate irrespective of the regional structure. Conversely, no “tinkering” with the regional structures will increase participation.

# Participation – View 2

- Participation is a concern for similar reasons to those for representation, but in this case, the reasons apply not just to ccTLD managers, but to entire local Internet communities.
- Whilst the degree of individual interest is an important factor, a better organised, meaningful regional structure is more likely to motivate individuals to participate, and will better support other outreach initiatives.



# Revised Draft Recommendations

- That the WG prepare a draft submission to the ICANN Board detailing the ccNSO's concerns about the present Regional Structure. The emphasis should be on representational issues, but the divergent views on participation should be included.
- That the ccNSO should permit Regional self-selection, for ccNSO purposes only, by ccTLDs that are currently assigned to an ICANN Geographical Region on the basis of the citizenship criterion.

# Revised Draft Recommendations

- That in the longer term, the ccNSO consider whether tying the designation of Regional Organisations to ICANN Geographical Regions (as is currently done in the Bylaws) is necessary or appropriate. A more flexible approach might be to amend Section 5 of the Bylaws to read, for example:

*“The ccNSO Council may designate a local membership organization provided that the local membership organisation is open to full membership by all ccNSO members, and provided it has, and maintains, a membership of at least (say) ten ccTLD managers ....”*

- It is now suggested that this latter proposal be changed to a strong recommendation that the ccNSO actively pursue ways and means of increasing participation.

# Self-Selection Criteria

- 1. Applicability.** These procedures are available only to those ccTLDs that are currently assigned to an ICANN Geographical Region on the basis of the citizenship criterion, and are members of the ccNSO.
- 2. Options.** The ccTLD may opt to join the ICANN Geographic Region with which the ccTLD Manager and the Government believe the country or territory has the closest geographic, linguistic, cultural or economic ties.
- 3. Procedure.** The ccTLD manager is to submit a request, which must include a letter of support from the ccTLD government, for consideration by the ccNSO Council.
- 4. Limitations.** From the date that an application under these provisions has been approved by Council, no further applications (for self-selection) from that ccTLD will be considered [for a minimum period of 5 years]. In the event the application is approved by the Council, the assignment to the ICANN Geographic Region only has affect for matters relating to the ccNSO.

# Provisional Next Steps

- Continued consultation.
- Discussion by ccNSO membership and recommendation to ccNSO Council.
- Mid-July : ccNSO Council Decision on Recommendations.
- 9 to 16 July : ccNSO membership approval process.
- Tentatively 23 July: Submission of ccNSO advice to Board, and implementation of Council Resolutions

Your Comments & suggestions welcome



25<sup>th</sup> June 2007

ICANN Meeting, San Juan

