Decision Making and Engagement

IANA Stewardship Transition

Decision Making

Timelines to Date:

- IANA Transition proposal needs ccNSO approval to proceed

- ccNSO will be asked to approve the CCWG's proposals on Accountably as well

- According to the revised timeline of the CWG chartering SO/AC's, including the ccNSO, would be given 3 weeks to approve the IANA Transition proposal, beginning in May and ending before ICAN 52 in Buenos Aires

Decision Making

- It is also quite possible that CWG will suggest to ccNSO that approval of IANA should be conditional on certain elements being approved in Accountability

    - the two proposals will be most likely be interconnected and expectation is for speedy ccNSO approval

- **What should the ccNSO approval process for the IANA Stewardship proposal be?**

Questions

- Is there any reason to change this process?

- How should non-ccNSO members be factored into the decision making?

- Can a decision on the 'IANA transition' package be separated from the 'Accountability Package?

- Do all ccTLD members and participants in CWG /CCWG have to support respective proposal?

- What is level of consensus in community needed for the ccNSO Council to take a decision?

- Both CWG and ccWG, the community and other chartering organizations may need our input on ccNSO timing for approval in order to more effectively plan their work.

Engagement

- The establishment of the ccTLD world list has been welcomed, and participation in the ccTLD survey in November 2014 was quite good, over 100.
- Overall, ccTLD engagement in the Stewardship process since then has been low:
  - 13 ccTLDs and two regional organizations, CENTR and LACTLD, provided written comments on Interim CWG proposal
  - only 7 ccTLDs who are not part of the process participated in the webinars
- Level of ccNSO appointed ccTLD Member participation in CWG is uneven
- There is a risk that 'late engagement' could undermine whatever is agreed.
- What can be done?