

---

KOBE – ccNSO Review - Community Consultation on the Assessment Phase

Tuesday, March 12, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:00 JST

ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

JENNIFER BRYCE:

Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to the ccNSO Review session. If you wouldn't mind taking a seat, we're just going to go ahead and get started since it's 5:00 and we are between you and a cocktail. My name is Jennifer Bryce. I work for ICANN Organization Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives Department. One of the projects that we oversee is the ICANN Organizational Reviews of which the ccNSO Review is one of those. So I'm just going to do a very, very brief introduction before I hand over to Kristy and Mallorie here.

Just to be clear about the organizational reviews, these are mandated by ICANN's Bylaws and to take place every five years. They are an independent review of each of ICANN's Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees, and so they are carried out by independent examiners. Kristy and Mallorie to my right are the independent examiners from Meridian Institute and they will introduce themselves.

The ccNSO Review kicked off in August and it's expected to take about one year. We're currently in the assessment phase of the

---

*Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.*

---

review. So, with that, I'll hand it over to Meridian Institute. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Thank you very much, Jennifer, for that introduction. Hello, everyone, and thank you for making time on the agenda for us to present our findings on the independent evaluation. My name Kristy Buckley and I'm joined by my colleague, Mallorie Bruns. We are Senior Mediators and Program Managers with Meridian Institutes and serving as part of the team conducting the independent evaluation of the ccNSO.

We'd like to briefly reintroduce ourselves since we met many of you in Barcelona or via telephone doing the interviews. As a reminder, our organization, Meridian, is mission-driven non-profit organization. We serve as a trusted third party that provides design and facilitation in research and strategic advising for multistakeholder processes.

We work within and across lots of different sectors and topics from science and technology, to environment and natural resources, to public health and so on. What we bring to every project including this one is our core organizational values which are that we don't have predetermined outcomes, we customize our approach to address the needs of the people and the institutions involved. And in partiality, integrity,

---

inclusiveness, and respect for differences are integral to our organizational culture and our work. We bring these values to every project we undertake.

So, quick briefing outline. We will quickly review the methods and the respondent demographics of who we heard from and what constituencies and groups they represent. We'll share briefing of the findings from the draft assessment reports but this will be released in April for public consultation. And then we also want to hear from you throughout this presentation.

During the presentation we'll occasionally pause to take questions and comments, and we would like to hear which findings seem important or significant to you and why. And if you have any initial ideas or suggestions for how to address a particular finding at this time, that would be helpful. Our understanding is that the review process is designed so we as independent examiners separate the findings from the recommendations in order to provide opportunities for the community to provide feedback before moving to the recommendations phase.

So at this stage, we have not yet developed recommendations. That said, many of you, many respondents provided suggestions for continuous improvement and this will heavily inform our recommendations. We welcome any additional ideas that you

---

might have today, tonight, or in the weeks ahead as we develop that report. Please keep these discussion questions in mind as we go through the presentation because we'll pause to ask them.

As you might recall from Barcelona, our methods included document review, interviews, an online survey, and working with the Review Working Party to validate the data and help ensure factual accuracy. Could I just quickly ask for our RWP colleagues to raise their hand if you're in the room just so others can see the membership of this group? Okay. If you're part of the RWP, please raise your hand. Okay, great. Thank you. And we want to thank the RWP and everyone that participated in this review.

Just briefly on the weighting, you'll see in the draft report when it's published in April that we have a whole section on weighting. We won't get into every detail of that here but we wanted to highlight that references to respondent statements and views are of course not consensus. There were sometimes wide-ranging views on topics of similar in nature. We coded all of that data in order to identify themes, topics, and subtopics, and the quantitative data that you'll see came primarily from the online survey. Wherever possible, we've provided a rough sense of how many respondents shared a particular view through the use of

---

quantifier terms. And in the report where only one person expressed a particular viewpoint, we've noted it as such.

Now, I'll turn to my colleague, Mallorie, who will review the respondent and survey and interview demographics.

MALLORIE BRUNS:

Hi, everyone, I'm Mallorie. Thanks for sticking with us through the day. I'm going to quickly go through the respondent demographic information. Between October and November 2018 last fall, we conducted 48 interviews to inform our assessment and they were done through a combination of virtual and in-person conversations at ICANN63 in Barcelona. These charts simply show the demographics by gender and by region.

Of the 48 interviews, 45% of those we spoke with identified as ccTLD managers. Approximately 20% of the people we talked with were ccNSO councilors and approximately 10% were ICANN board members. Between late November and early January, we put out an electronic survey that was made available to the ICANN community. In total we had 111 respondents, 70% of them actually completed every survey question. These charts show the survey respondents by gender and by region.

---

In comparison with the interviews, what this graph shows us is that the survey allowed us to get a slightly broader set of input from ICANN stakeholders and of the survey respondents, the largest group did identify as ccNSO members. Of the ccNSO members and councilors that completed the survey, this chart shows the length of time they have been involved in the ccNSO. And the largest group on the chart are those who have been involved at least 10 years.

Okay. I'm going to now turn to our findings, so be ready to contribute after I get done here in a few moments. The scope of independent reviews for Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees have three main categories, continuing purpose for the groups, any changes needed in their structural operations and their accountability to constituents.

We want to acknowledge that we heard a small minority view expressed that there is not a continuing purpose of the ccNSO and that major structure and operational changes should happen. However, consistent with what Kristy described earlier in terms of our approach to weighting the data, overall, our findings show that, yes, the ccNSO has a continuing purpose, there are no major changes in structure and operations necessary and that, yes, it is accountable. That said, our findings do show opportunities for continuous improvement in these areas which we will briefly review next.

So, in terms of continuing purpose, before I dive in, I want to note that we're really providing a briefing during this presentation. The report itself is about 50 pages long so we can't go through every finding that we provided, but the assessment report will be available for public consultation in April. I also should mention that we've organized our findings into the three main categories of the assessment but there are often relationships between our findings. For example, findings and comments in regards to governance often relate to all three of the categories. So, please keep this in mind as we share our findings.

As I said, a clear majority believed that there is a continuing purpose for the ccNSO and many pointed primarily to its value as a cross-community dialogue for that opportunity on a range of operational issues for country codes such as technical, legal, or commercial matters. This slide highlights the three most common purposes that survey respondents selected for the ccNSO's purpose which were information sharing (the most), policy development (the second), and collective security for ccTLDs (third).

We also heard through interviews that the ccNSO provides a platform for ccTLD managers to work together, to identify these communities' top needs, concerns, and priorities, and to communicate those in a unified voice to the ICANN

---

constituencies. As evidenced in these responses, ccTLD managers are joining largely because it's a learning and networking opportunity for them by participating.

Specifically, respondents found value in the ccNSO's function as facilitating peer-to-peer learning and some expressed their belief that by participating in the ccNSO, they are actually more effective managers of their ccTLDs. At the same time, some of the interviewees shared that while they do feel they get value out of participating, it is not always easy for them to articulate that value of the ccNSO to justify their ongoing participation and time commitments.

With regard to respondents' level of satisfaction with the ccNSO's facilitation of information exchange, over 60% were either satisfied or very satisfied. At the same time, some expressed the desire for the ccNSO to be more systematic about information exchange. When we heard this and asked for further clarification, given that there are information exchange avenues such as Tech Day as one example, we heard from respondents things like, "Most of my learning at the ccNSO meetings happen on an ad hoc basis and/or through one-on-one conversations."

Last point on continuing purpose before we open it up to a few questions and input from the audience, the ccNSO has a great asset and that a lot of the members here who have been



---

involved for a long time hold a great deal of institutional knowledge about the ccNSO, and that's a great asset. Yet, some also recognized the need to foster a new generation of leadership to carry this work forward in the future.

So, just as a reminder, we do want to open it up now and what we're looking for is any questions or comments on what we've so far presented. And if there's a finding that we've presented that is particularly significant to you, if you can speak to why it is or if you have any suggestions for how you might address the finding, we would more than welcome that.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Thanks, Mallorie. Before we go on to present findings from structure and operations and accountability, any questions so far? Anything that struck you as important, significant? Any ideas? I know you're all waiting to go to the cocktail hours. Thanks for staying awake. Are you going to fight each other? Okay. Okay. One at a time. One at a time.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

[We do have] two questions.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Aren't you going to say the same thing? I recognize the need to kind of pay attention to the next generation because –

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: That's all, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's always the same people talking.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: The past generation, the next generation, yeah. That's what I meant.

Can you go back one slide please? If you can elaborate a bit more about the findings, if you can of course, regarding the next generation. If you have you know any specific or a bit more granular, let's say, detail if possible. If not, you just say, "No, wait for the report."

KRISTY BUCKLEY: I would say, as we mentioned earlier, there are many topics like this that are part of other components of the review. So, we are going to talk a little bit more about structure and operations as it comes to next generation in terms of visibility and selection of next generation leaders. So maybe let's cover that and then if you have further question that we can elaborate a bit more at

---

the end if we haven't already covered it in the rest of our presentation. Does that sound okay? Yes?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. I have one – well, what struck me as surprising is to have a more systematic way of sharing information. Was that correct or maybe I misunderstood? How?

MALLORIE BRUNS: That is precisely what we asked and follow up was how to be perhaps more systematic. I think, as we said, people just reflected that a lot of their learning that they get is happening just on an ad hoc basis and in-between sessions and networking. So, it's a finding and we would love to hear feedback from the community on how to enhance that feature. Kristy, you want to add?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah. I wouldn't say that everyone expressed this, some people said that a lot of the benefit that they see is in the dinners and the networking and the coffees and the lunches and the cocktail receptions. When they have one-on-one conversation, they learn a great deal from their colleagues about how they are doing things in terms of their own ccTLD management, and they

---

wanted more of that and maybe some sort of systematic way for facilitating that beyond Tech Day, if that answers your question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yes. Because I was thinking we have all the e-mail list, all the social media, we have the newsletter now, and I was thinking more about the information regarding ccNSO activities rather than one-on-one peers, but thank you very much.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: That’s an important clarification. Thank you for that question.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Can I ask you another question? So, this is the feedback? This is a summary of the feedback from ccNSO members and/or ccTLD managers or does this include the communities, the other stakeholders that we have seen in another slide?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Overall our findings are representative of everyone that we interviewed and that was surveyed. This particular finding about next generation really came from ccNSO members. People outside of the ccNSO we’re not talking about next generation so much.

---

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: But some other findings are also inclusive of the comments you have received from other stakeholders?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Because I think this is important for us to understand. I've interviewed stakeholders from ALAC and other communities and this is going to be reflected in some of the findings.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes, that's right.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. We can take one more question then we'll move on to structure and operations. Please.

IVY CONTRERAS: Hello, Ivy Contreras from .gt. So far, it seems like very nice presentation. I think because it is a good answer. I mean ccNSO feels and looks that is perfect and nice. But I was wondering,

---

why there are no more ccTLDs joining us? I mean if it's okay this is mostly – everybody's satisfied about it and they say it's good and nothing has to be changed so far, so why there are no more of them here? I don't know if you can answer it now or later but I think that is the most important thing. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

It's a good question. I don't know that that's something that we explicitly cover in the report nor is it necessarily part of the scope, but I will say anecdotally when we interviewed a few non-members and even some of the members were sort of questioning – because comments are very open and welcoming environment, they were saying, “Well, why join? I get a lot of the benefit of the ccNSO without becoming official member.” And so they weren't really sure. But then others that have joined they said, “Why not join?” So you see it both ways but just anecdotally that's what I recall hearing, if that helps. Yes?

PARTICIPANT:

[Inaudible].

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Yeah. That's something that we can try to speak to. One last question and then we'll move on to structure and operations. Please.

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible], .uk. You mentioned that a lot of the value was seen in the sort of informal networking and I'm sure we can all in this room identify with that, looking forward to cocktails, etc. Some of the respondents obviously are not ccNSO people, it's other constituencies. I wondered if there was any commentary you could give us on how people outside of our constituency view us as an effective participant in a wider community? Because obviously they don't get any of the informal cocktails to the ccNSO networking I have. They got the stickers.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: They don't have a sticker then. Yeah, it's a fair question. I think we will cover that to some degree in the accountability section. That's really where it plays a role in terms of ccNSO's accountability to other constituencies and SO/ACs, so I'll try to speak to that when we get to that section.

Thank you very much for those questions. We'll continue with structure and operations.

Okay. Findings on structure and operations. As Mallorie noted, we didn't see any major needs for changes on structure and operations, but again the findings show opportunities for continuous improvement and so we'll cover some of those now.

---

With regards to culture, we talked to [inaudible] about whether we should ask the question about culture and is that part of structure and operations but a lot of people mentioned it in the interview, so we ask a survey question about it. And over 75% of survey respondents were satisfied or very satisfied with the ccNSO's organizational culture which influences operational effectiveness in a membership-based organization. Many interviewees described it as open and welcoming, and overall we're very positive about the culture of the ccNSO.

With regard to the bylaws, overall ccNSO members perceived the structure to be capable of supporting the ccNSO's operation while remaining lightweight and flexible. An exception noted by some interviewees are the bylaws, certain provision are difficult to adhere to but are also difficult to change. One example which I think was also referenced this morning is that the ccNSO must appoint one non-member ccTLD manager to a seat on IANA Function Review Team which is increasingly difficult requirement to meet given that you have so many ccTLDs that are members and a dwindling pool of non-members.

For the working groups, many acknowledge their importance in doing the substantive work of the ccNSO. There were some concerns that the work of those groups often falls through a small set of members which run the risk of burnout or exhaustion due to increasing and competing demands for their



---

time and energy. Other respondents observed that there are not enough responses to calls for volunteers, leaving a lot of the responsibility for guiding and motivating working groups to the Council Chair.

With regards to the structure and operations of the Council, interviewee shared mixed views on whether the size and the structure of the Council impedes or promotes effectiveness. Over half said that it was very important or somewhat important to explore possible efficiencies but I would not say that there was agreement on what those efficiencies should be. For example some expressed that 18 seats are not sufficient to represent the full diversity of the ccNSO membership. Other discussed how the number of councilors is too large. Some regions struggle to fill their three seats with qualified and interested candidates, whereas other regions are comprised of many diverse countries. They feel that three seats is not enough to represent the region's diversity. And there's also some perception among members that not all councilors are as active as engaged as others and that perhaps the size of the group reduces individual councilor sense of responsibility.

With regard to diversity, many interviewees and some survey respondents worry that the ccNSO is not benefiting enough from new ideas, energy, and creativity due to limited diversity and leadership. So, that gets a little bit to the next generation

---

question, Giovanni. Some observed that a similar set of individuals volunteer for most leadership positions in the ccNSO, which in part a result of the time these positions demand. Smaller or lesser funded ccTLDs don't necessarily have the capacity to dedicate as much time

Some interviewees also described difficulties in building visibility and leadership experience among next generation of leaders without having the alliances, mentorship, and knowledge that comes from many years spent in the ccNSO.

Finally, for the structure and operations findings, a few subtopics arose in the interviews that we would like to acknowledge that we heard. However, we also recognize that these findings are not something that the ccNSO alone can remedy. These findings included, one, the important role of the ccNSO Secretariat and the desire to create more redundancy in individual institutional knowledge – not looking in particular, Bart. There was a number of people that expressed frustration with the current website, which again we recognize as not something that the ccNSO alone controls. A number of people expressed the challenge of not having simultaneous interpretation for non-native English speakers, which many interviewees highlighted as a barrier to participation. There was also some concern expressed over the perceived lack of

---

transparency of affiliations among ccTLD, gTLD managers in particular for those that manage both.

Again, we are still seeking guidance on whether or not it's appropriate or useful to make any recommendations on these findings given that the responsibility for them again lies outside of the ccNSO. In addition – this is not on the slide – but we also want to acknowledge that a majority of interviewees raised the topic of ccTLD financial contributions to ICANN as a challenge. However, this topic is explicitly outside of the scope of the review and so we will not include it in our recommendations although we acknowledged it in the report. Again we're still seeking some guidance on these findings but we want to acknowledge that we heard you in the interviews and the survey.

Before I turn to accountability findings, we want to just see if there are any questions or comments so far on structure and operations findings? Anything that struck you as particularly important? Any ideas for how to address some of the findings that were raised? Questions?

IVY CONTRERAS:

Well, yes. Regarding the website, I do find it horrible so I would please ask you if you could include it maybe it just to have it as a fact that it's included in the report. People have complained

---

about it, so maybe we can go a little bit up the schedule renewing our website. That would be one of my suggestions.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Yes. And all of those findings will be included in the findings report. We're just seeking guidance on whether or not we can make recommendations on how to address those findings if they fall outside of the ccNSO's responsibility loan, if that makes sense. So they'll be there, we just can't say if we'd make any recommendations on that. Actually, MSSI colleagues set up a meeting with Information Transparency Initiative which is the group that's conducting the overall revamp of ICANN.org website. So we met with them and shared the frustration with the ccNSO website. They're well aware of that now as well and it will be in our report.

Any other questions on structure and operations? Don't fight. It's okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I wouldn't be surprised if the item you just mentioned on participation in working groups and the possibility having the means to participate to one of your most supported areas that you will touch. As far as I know, it's been an area that has been touched by multiple reviews so that brought me to the question

---

or the assumption – I assumed that you will plot your findings, findings of previous reviews and check how we’ve been doing – is that part of your scope?

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Yes. The last review is in 2010 and there was a self-evaluation done by the ccNSO – was it two years ago? Yeah, we have all of that in the documentation review as well. So in the report you’ll see that we present findings from the interviews in the survey and we also fact-check those findings with documentation review with the help from our review working party colleagues to make sure that anything that we say as a finding is fact-checked and if it’s not factually accurate, we call that out in the findings report.

As you’ll see later on when we get to accountability, sometimes there was information in the interviews of the survey that was a perception but it was not actually reality. So there’s sometimes a gap between what is perceived to be true and what the documentation shows to be accurate, if that makes sense. I can clarify when we get to accountability.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

The documentation shows to be accurate. It can also be a perception but ... okay.

---

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah. There’s sometimes a difference between perception and reality, if that makes sense.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, okay. I think that if you could come up or if we could come up with some implementable recommendations in this area, that would already make this whole review worthwhile because I think that’s definitely something that people are doing the work are struggling as well as the people who are enabled to contribute as much as they would like to.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes. Again, we hope to hear from you all tonight or the coming days and weeks. We heard a lot of suggestions in the interviews especially, so if someone raised a challenge, we would say, “Okay, that’s an interesting finding. How would you suggest to address it?” So we didn’t just let them say, “Here are all the problems.” We would say, “How would you practically try to address this?” So we have a lot of that information from the interviews in the survey. We just didn’t include it in our findings report because we want to keep the findings quite distinct and separate from anything that looks like a recommendation.

---

So first we present the findings, we make sure that there's nothing that's factually inaccurate, we get input from the community and the findings, and then we move to, "Okay, how do we address these findings?" A lot of those recommendations will be informed by what we heard from you all. Any other questions on structure and operations?

Okay, we'll move to accountability findings and then we'll have final questions at the end as well.

Okay, this is where we get into the perceptions. On accountability, there was some uncertainty among some of those interviewed about what formal accountability mechanisms the ccNSO has in place. Again, it's not perhaps a challenge for accountability itself but for people's perceptions of accountability.

Another finding was that information that may be publicly available for instance on the website is not necessarily perceived by members and stakeholders as accessible. Sometimes they're unaware that exists or how to find it on the website. So as a result, information that is available is perceived as inaccessible and this impacts perceptions of transparency and accountability.

With regard to continuous improvement on accountability, overall, respondents indicated the ccNSO and the Council are

---

accountable. And at the same time, 60% said that they thought that transparency and accountability could still be improved.

As mentioned, under structure and operations, there were some concerns over individual councilor accountability in terms of consistent participation and engagement. Some respondents thought that election processes might better foster next generation and diverse leadership if they were more qualitative in nature and perhaps more transparency around those processes.

There were some concerns – this was seemingly minor but we thought of sharing it because of the broader perception of risk here – was that occasionally Council agendas are edited right up until or before the meeting, whereas the rule states that they're supposed to be published seven days in advance. This was not identified as an immediate concern but there was an awareness that this could create a precedent and perhaps reduced transparency in the ccNSO and other SO/ACs over time.

Our concluding remarks – just to remind people that this is again focused on the findings, it does not include recommendations at this time. We anticipate working collaboratively with the review party colleagues to ensure validation of this information, remove any inaccuracies and ensure overall clarity of the draft report before it is released in April.



---

Finally, based upon request during the interview phase in Barcelona, we've also held space for regional discussions here in Kobe. The last regional discussion is for Asia Pacific tomorrow at 8:00 AM (if you're awake that early) in the Lilac Room in case you're from the region and you wish to join us, we will be there

Following ICANN64, Meridian will share the final draft assessment report with the Review Working Party before it's published for public consultation in April.

Turning again to our discussion questions. With the remaining time available, we welcome any input you have on the accountability findings or overall findings as this concludes our presentation. So, any other questions, comments, anything that stuck you as particularly significant or interesting ideas that you might have on how to address these findings? Yes, please. We have one more.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Yes. I'm quite curious about a particular slide which is about perception of accountability. I'm sorry, my English is not sophisticated enough to understand. I mean I was trying to discern these conclusions. Some uncertainty on formal accountability mechanism is in place. Not a challenge for accountability but for perceptions of accountability. Can you elaborate on this a little bit more because you might be willing

---

to cite whatever particular comments just to understand? What is wrong? Because next slide shows that the overwhelming majority – well, at least – okay, [inaudible] neutral and I don't know. Okay, yeah. Quite a proportion is in favor of that statement that ccNSO and Council are accountable. Can we just go through that? What kind of perceptions are you talking about? What was wrong with perceptions or accountability per se? Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Yes, thank you. Again, some of the interviewees were unaware of some of the accountability mechanisms in place so they ask questions. They said, "I don't really know what the accountability mechanisms are. I'm not really aware." Some others asserted things that were factually inaccurate and so when we did the document review and fact-checking, we found that things that they said were not in place or didn't exist in fact are in place and do exist. So again it's not necessarily an issue of accountability in terms of what is written down in the way the ccNSO actually works but it's a lack of awareness and understanding of those accountability mechanisms that create a perception of lack of transparency and accountability. Does that help answer your question? Okay. Sorry if that was confusing.

We have another question up here?

---

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just from the point of view of the documents you're considering that was an accountability report Work Stream 2. I just wanted to know if you were aware of that.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes, we are aware of that and we're aware of those recommendations and that the SO/ACs are in the process of implementing those recommendations. In the report you'll see all of our findings are referenced with regard to documentation. So anything that we say, we back it up with references to documents. Any other questions or ideas, suggestions on the findings? Yes?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Yeah. Thank again. I'd like to ask you, how much did you know about ccNSO before you started this journey to the ccNSO? I guess you applied to RFP or something like that for conducting the study. I don't know what was the process for selecting the Meridian Institute so I just want to ask, what's the process behind this? I don't know if ICANN org can answer.

---

JENNIFER BRYCE: Sure. I'm happy to answer that question. With all of the organizational reviews, we follow the same process with our ICANN Procurement Team and so we have an RFP that gets published to ICANN.org and included in that is some skills and expertise section. So what we look for is not necessarily knowledge of the ICANN community as being a member of the community but just an independent examiner who has the skills and expertise to be able to facilitate a review process like this. Under that evaluation process, Meridian Institute came off that.

So it's an important question that a lot of people ask and has been asked throughout the previous organizational reviews is, "How do you find an independent examiner who has the knowledge and the expertise of a very specific community but also can remain independent at the same time?"

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you. So you're part of the question, "How much did you know about the ccNSO before you started this review process?"

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yes. It's a good question, Giovanni. I personally have attended previous ICANN meetings. I was a facilitator for the .eco community gTLD application and engaging the sustainability community around that. So I was broadly familiar with ICANN

---

and SO/ACs and I knew what the ccNSO did. When we saw the RFP issued, as a trusted third party, we thought we're used to very complex policy processes often at the multilateral and international levels and every process has its own culture and its own set of acronyms and its own complexities. But we felt like we could bring our general expertise and value as a trusted third party to the space. Does that answer your question?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Yeah. It does. Just a follow-up question. We have been speaking about perceptions and I'm sure that you have perceived how diverse and multicultural is this community when you interviewed them. I'm speaking about only the interviews you have conducted with members of the community. So I just would like to ask you if the fact the community is so diverse and multicultural and multilingual will be reflected in the final report but also in possible recommendations because I guess when you end up having different needs, whatever, all the differences, the different input, it's hard to make a recommendation because the recommendation will mean that you may please only part of the community rather than all communities. So I'd like to ask you how much of this diversity will be reflected in the final report and possible recommendations.

---

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah, that’s a great question. I would say that our recommendations will be heavily informed by the interviews and the surveys that we heard where people had suggestions for how to address. My sense is that in many cases, the recommendations will not be prescriptive but offer a range of options to consider in relation to a finding so the ccNSO can take it forward and figure out, “Here are some options that were presented to address this. How do we want to move forward as a group and what’s most appropriate for us as a group?” We really see our role – we mentioned this in Barcelona as sort of facilitating bottom-up community input into the continuous improvement of the ccNSO. It is different than coming in as an outside party and saying, “Here are all the things that you should be doing differently and this is our opinion.” That’s a distinction but it’s an important one and that’s how we will frame our recommendations.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot. I believe we all agree that there’s always room for improvement. So, thanks a lot for your work.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thank you. Any other questions, comments? Yes, please, Joke.

---

JOKE BRAEKEN: Thank you. There's a question from remote participant, Mary Uduma. She's asking, "Were there comments of further explanations by the respondents on what they mean by new generation of ccNSO members? Is it in terms of new membership or members sending younger representatives of managers to ccNSO meetings?"

KRISTY BUCKLEY: So the question is, what is meant by "next generation of leaders"?

JOKE BRAEKEN: Mary, could you please clarify that question? But that is indeed how I read it. I can read it again. "Were there comments of further explanations by the respondents on what they mean by new generation of ccNSO members? Is it in terms of new membership or members sending younger representatives of managers to ccNSO meetings?"

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Sure. Yeah, that's a good question. We'll make a note to try to define that a bit more in the report. If I recall correctly – and, Mallorie, feel free to jump in if I miss something – for the most part, the respondents and interviewees in particular were talking about younger and newer members. Next generation,

---

meaning the people that haven't been involved for 10+ years or they are newcomers. And there were a number of people that are not defined as newcomers that have been involved for say two to four years but still very much feel like newcomers and they don't yet have the confidence to raise their hand to volunteer, they feel like their institutional knowledge is not high enough yet or not comparable to others that have been involved for much longer period of time. So this is what was referenced broadly as sort of cultivating that next generation of whether they're new or whether they're younger, just people that have not been involved for very long period of time, if that makes sense.

Did I answer her question hopefully? We'll make a note to define that in the report as well.

JOKE BRAEKEN: Mary has not added anything to the chat.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Joke. Yes?

IVY CONTRERAS: Hello. For the record, Ivy Contreras from .gt. I really feel that we miss an opportunity to really answer a good question that is –



---

this is ccNSO – “Why aren’t you a member of the ccNSO?” because that leads us to improvement. I think if everybody here or mostly everybody here is happy with the work of the ccNSO and what they get from it, the benefits, why other people isn't here? Why the rest of us isn't here? Is there something wrong with the ccNSO? What can we improve? Or is something wrong with them? I don’t know. That is a question I wish you’ll ask. Why aren’t you a member and what can we improve? Because for us it’s perfect, but is something missing? That’s what I wanted to ask.

MALLORIE BRUNS:

Yeah, you are not the only one to ask that question. We’ve definitely heard that in the interviews. I don’t necessarily – let me speak anecdotally as Kristy did – I think one of the findings in the Purpose section of the report is that we heard frequently people say, “I come to the meetings. I think they're very helpful and yet it’s really hard for me to articulate why it’s important for me to come to my bosses and supervisors. I don’t have the elevator pitch for why I should be going.” I think what we heard from the community is that you're missing that really good narrative that people can use to potentially invite new members to the ccNSO and even that you all can use for yourselves to continue to justify why you need to keep participating. So it’s more of communication, messaging question for this

---

community. How do we define the value for ourselves of why we do this and why we spend our time doing this?

IVY CONTRERAS:

Thank you because what I get from the presentation is that they learn more just talking one-on-one with someone else, so what I feel is maybe we should extend the coffee breaks or have more cocktails because if they come to the meeting they say, “I’m not getting anything but I get it when I talk with someone else.” Maybe that should be one of the recommendations. I don’t know. But thank you very much.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Longer coffee breaks. Yeah, it’s a fair point. I don’t necessarily think people were asking for longer coffee breaks but looking for more opportunities to make those connections and learn from one another. And exactly how you do that, whether it’s more cocktail hours, more coffee breaks, we’ll think about that and we welcome ideas that you will have given that you understand the culture of the ccNSO and the community that you are operating in. Any ideas that you have for facilitating that would be great. Please.

BRUCE TUCKER:

Hi, my name is Bruce Tucker from .au. Just some observations I guess. I'm pretty new to being involved in the ccNSO. To me, it has dual role and I think that's what makes it hard perhaps when you're trying to do a review of it. One of the roles of the ccNSO, it's really an accountability mechanism for ICANN itself. So the ccNSO appoints board directors to the ICANN board. ICANN is looking after the overall root zone, if you like, with respect to top-level domain names and ccNSO is part of that framework. It's essentially an administrative function and the accountability is there. Does the ccNSO point board members on time? Does the ccNSO give input to ICANN on a strategic planning and operating planning on time? They're all things that you would hold the ccNSO accountable essentially to the rest of the ICANN organization.

But then there's a quite different role and you see a lot of that happening I think the Tech Day would be a classic example that the ccNSO [inaudible], which is really – it's a conference and I think a lot of people come to the ccNSO meetings because they're coming to a conference and they want to share ideas. In the net mode, the ccNSO is like a conference organization and we are members or participants in that conference and we could get feedback on what we'd like to see. We'd like to see good coffee and a coffee break. We want to see a nice cocktail function and so on. So in a way, the members are holding the

---

leadership with the ccNSO accountable for delivering on their needs in that conference format. But I think it might be just worth thinking about those two very different roles because the conference format doesn't even have to happen at ICANN, it's just convenient that it does, then this accountability function which is really its function as part of the overall ICANN governance.

MALLORIE BRUNS:

Thank you, Bruce. Absolutely. Those are really good points that you're making. The report does provide some more information on findings in regards to the ccNSO's broader role within ICANN org. I would say, just to reiterate, I think people shared with us that they do think that by having the ccNSO participating in ICANN that it brings legitimacy to ICANN because you all are showing up. So not only in terms of having board members from the ccNSO participate in that interaction and being part of the Empowered Community and being part of the Customer Standing Committee but also just this acknowledgment of the importance of all of you showing up and what that means for ICANN that there was an acknowledgment among people that's in our report. You want to talk about the multiple roles?

---

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Yeah. It was surprising when we started conducting the interviews when we would ask about continuing purpose and what do you see as the main functions and roles. We have a slide on the three main but I have to say there are probably dozens of identified functions and roles that we heard from you all about the value of the ccNSO, all of the different roles and functions that it plays and we did try to capture that in the report. We just didn't present all of that here for the sake of time and efficiency but yeah, there's a lot. And that dual role in particular is I think an important point that we recognize.

Please, Margarita.

MARGARITA VALDES: Good afternoon. This is Margarita from .cl. About this very helpful way that we are currently working in order to this networking – probably it's more than networking. Sometimes it's the friendship that we have since almost all the time that we have which is ... I'm not a newcomer obviously but I have a couple of years working around the ccNSO. I think that something that is very good in terms of the practice that we are currently doing is this kind of activities that we can work in groups, in teams because that's other opportunity to know our colleagues a little bit more in terms of we exchange ideas in

---

particular matters or issues that we need to conclude or something.

Probably from the organizational perspective, for example, we can do some kind of other dynamics that not necessarily are connected with technical matters that we commonly do. Perhaps something that improve the communication in order to improve the health or – I don't know the word – but something that help us to feel more confident in terms of the ccNSO, the colleagues that we know. After that, after we build this, probably we can share a lot of things that we normally share or knowledge practice or something like that. But I think there is very valuable work when we could discuss things in teams, for example. But because we were divided in different teams and normally we do not work with the usual friends of colleagues that we normally work. That's the good thing in this kind of work. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Great. All taken, yeah, great point. Any other final questions, comments? Going once, going twice. Okay. Thank you all for your attention this late in the day. Thank you all for your input on the interviews, the survey, all of the comments and questions that you shared this evening. We will be at the reception tonight. We have our stickers. Thank you for those.

---

If you have questions or ideas, please feel free to come up to us. Our e-mail is here. Please feel free to contact us over the coming weeks. Again you'll see the draft finding report come out in April for public consultation. While that is out, we will be developing the recommendations reports and we welcome your ideas and input on that. Thank you again.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**