*ccNSO update to GNSO (for Council meeting – ICANN52, Singapore)*

**IANA stewardship transition**

* Very strong discussions (and well attended) ccNSO members day which outlined the status of the CWG as well as a more indepth look at the various proposals (internal and external to ICANN as well as alternative options such as the trust model put forward by auDA).
* Decision making and outreach: How the ccNSO will sign off on a proposal – ccNSO council or entire ccNSO. How to engage beyond the ccNSO. Regional Organisations such as CENTR is a good avenue but we should not be too ambitious on this topic as many ccTLDs globally are not aware of the topic.
* Timing of proposals: ccTLD Board members Mike Sibler and Chriss Disspain noted that the accountability side needs to happen no matter what. There is a window of opportunity on the IANA transition however it was felt the September 2015 deadline may have flexibility.
* Current charter requires endorsement of the SO/ACs – this means that if even 1 government objected, the GAC could not endorse. It was noted that perhaps there would be something the GAC could do to overcome that.
* Discussion on outreach – how to communicate with ccTLDs beyond the ccNSO. Regional Organisations such as CENTR can assist however it was noted that there are many ccTLDs around the world with limited to no knowledge/interest in the topic.

**Comments on current set of models**

* The principle of Separability has strong support
* Limited consensus on internal vs external to ICANN solution as to maintain separability principle
* How to ensure multiple new structures don’t just create new accountability problems.
* Some favour a simple solution to what is a simple/clerical function. Concepts such as the golden bylaw could help to achieve this. Others warn of the ‘siren of simplicity’.
* There is divide between internal and external to ICANN solutions, however legal advice and accountability questions have yet to be addressed (on the way). These will help.
* It was felt that the ccNSO could likely be having to make a decision on a proposal by ICANN53. The process of how they would arrive at that decision still needs to be worked out.
* Other discussion was around the IAP (independent appeals mechanism) however it was felt there was not sufficient knowledge to allow ccTLDs to input meaningfully.

**ccNSO Strategy and Operating Plan WG**

ccNSO SOP WG made comments ICANN Operating plan and budget 2016-2020. Some points:

* ccNSO SOP complimented ICANN staff for progress of the structure of the plan. ccNSO SOP members are happy that the plan includes a financial model with assumptions and principles that will serve the organisation to produce the yearly Operating Plan and Budget.
* ccNSO SOP reiterated disappointment that (despite having underlined it to ICANN countlessly) there are few KPIs. ICANN staff stated that there are currently 20 KPIs, but they will progressively inserted. It is vital that metrics actually measure progress against strategic goals and objectives, so that they can be understood by all stakeholders and enable monitoring and assessment of progress on an annual basis. In SOP view the proposed set of KPIs do not achieve this.
* The WG recommended that the Five-Year Strategic Plan, Five-Year Operating Plan and Annual Operating Plan continue to be presented to the community in the same format to facilitate their reading and ensure fast and appropriate community feedback. The ICANN staff reassured that the Plan outline will not be changed in the next years.

**Adoption of Framework of Interpretation report**

Background: According to the charter the FOIWG is to develop and propose a "Framework of Interpretation" (FOI) for the existing policies and guidelines applicable to the delegation and re-delegation of ccTLDs.

Status: FOIWG finalized its produced [final report](http://ccnso.icann.org/workinggroups/foiwg.htm) with recommendations in October 2014. They requested GAC support however there is potential concerns from GAC with status of RFC1591 trumping local laws.

**Annual IDN**

The main purpose of this group is to assist ccTLDs with an interest in the IDN ccTLD, and particular in a review of the Fast Track process in preparing input and feed-back into the review. A public comment period is open and interested ccTLDs/ccNSO may input comments.