

## ccNSO repository for Bylaw changes version 8, September 2021

### 1. Introduction

At times the ccNSO is made aware of the potential need for an ICANN Bylaw change. To capture this, and to maintain an action list and repository of required changes, the ccNSO maintains this Bylaw change repository.

The following will be captured:

- **Item:** number of change
- **Description:** Brief description of change needed.
- **Bylaw Section:** Reference to the section in the ICANN Bylaws Bylaw
- **Bylaw text:** The text in the Bylaw
- **Issue:** Rationale to ask for change
- **Bylaw type:** Fundamental (F) or Standard (S) Bylaw, has implication whether it needs to be approved by EC or only open for rejection. Fundamental Bylaws (F) are included in list of section 25.2 (a) of the ICANN Bylaws. All other Bylaws are Standard (S)
- **Change process:** Is PDP required/ request Board, other way
- **Priority:** urgency and importance for ccTLD community
- **Change update:** Expected start of change process current status.

Colour codes:

If part of cell is marked **yellow**, update of section

If row is marked **green**, bylaw change has been completed and is final time included in overview. Section will not be included in next version.

If complete row is marked **yellow**, bylaw change has been added/suggested and/or need still under discussion.

## 2. Repository

Item	Description	Bylaw section	Bylaw text	Issue	Bylaw type	Change mechanism	Priority	Change time
1.	<p>Definition of ccNSO members.</p> <p>Identified by PDP WG Retirement. Additional issue, reference on overall IDN PDP WG. See letter chair PDP WG: <a href="https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/deerhake-to-council-13jan19-en.pdf">https://ccnso.icann.org/en/about/deerhake-to-council-13jan19-en.pdf</a></p>	Article 10.4	For purposes of this <u>Article 10</u> , a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain, or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain.	<p>Highlighted part does not make sense.</p> <p>No consultation ccNSO.</p> <p>Original: For purposes of this Article, a ccTLD manager is the organization or entity responsible for managing an ISO 3166 country-code top-level domain and referred to in the IANA database under the current heading of "Sponsoring Organization", or under any later variant, for that country-code top-level domain.</p> <p>Underlying issue: reference to Sponsoring Organisation as included in IANA database</p>	S	Letter to the Board, requesting change.	High (urgent and important).	Letter to Board requesting change has been send. Response with questions received. Response has been send in February 2021
2	Voting mechanism in Article 10 and Annex B to be reviewed, if one organization manages two ccTLDs from different Territories.	Artcile 10.4 (a), Annex B, 13	Updated text section 10 4(a) Annex B: "The vote of members shall be electronic and members votes".	Some organizations manage two or more ccTLDs of different countries. Should voting be limited to one vote per entity? to ensure parity of members, who run multiple ccTLDs. Note, Organizations or entities who run multiple	S	Bylaw change	M	Bylaw change became effective in June 2022

Item	Description	Bylaw section	Bylaw text	Issue	Bylaw type	Change mechanism	Priority	Change time
				IDN ccTLDs related to one (1) country or territory will at a maximum have one (1) vote.				
3.	<p>Reference to non-ccNSO member for IFRT. See letters Council to the Board: <a href="https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/sataki-to-chalaby-et-al-06dec18-en.pdf">https://ccnso.icann.org/sites/default/files/field-attached/sataki-to-chalaby-et-al-06dec18-en.pdf</a> .</p> <p>Issue not only relevant for current and future IFRTs, also for Special IFR.</p>	<p>Section 18.7 (a) &amp; (b)</p> <p>Section 18.12 (b) referencing section 18.7 (a) and (b)</p>	<p>One non-ccNSO ccTLD representative who is associated with a ccTLD registry operator that is not a representative of the ccNSO, appointed by the ccNSO</p>	<p>With growing number of members, attracting non-ccNSO member becomes difficult, if not impossible. See overview of membership as well</p>	<b>F</b>	Request Board to change after consultation of community. Bylaw change must be supported by the Empowered Community	Medium (important, needs to be resolved in next 2 years)	Letter to the Board send. Public comment closed 16 July 2019. Completed. Bylaw has been changed 28 November 2019
4.	Reference to non-ccNSO member for Special Cross-community WG for separation	Section 19.5 SCWG Composition	One non-ccNSO ccTLD representative who is associated with a ccTLD registry operator that is not a representative of the ccNSO, appointed by the ccNSO;	With growing number of members, attracting non-ccNSO member has proven to be very difficult, if not impossible. In event of SCWG high risk	<b>F</b>	Request Board to change after consultation of community	Medium (important, needs to be resolved in next 2 years)	
5.	Change of reference in Section 4.3 ( IRP) to delegation and Redelgation	Section 4.3 ( c ) (ii)	<p>Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section 4.3, the IRP's scope shall exclude all of the following:</p> <p>(ii) Claims relating to ccTLD delegations and re-delegations.</p> <p>...</p>	<p>Language in Bylaws is not consistent with language Fol and IANA NAMng Function Contract. Should be: Delegations, transfers, revocations and retirement ( after adoption of the policy) <b>and potentially to slection IDNccTLD strings</b></p>	<b>F</b>	Request Board to change after consultation of community	High (important, needs to be resolved when ccPDP 3 is submitted to the	To avoid misunderstandings as soon as Retirement and review policy become implemente

Item	Description	Bylaw section	Bylaw text	Issue	Bylaw type	Change mechanism	Priority	Change time
							Board or as part of it as recommendation by ccPDP 2 WG 2)	d Bylaw needs to be clarified. Requires Fundamental Bylaw change
5A.	Change of reference in Section 4.2 (Reconsideration) to delegation and Redelgation	Section 4.2		Language in Bylaws is not consistent with language Fol and IANA NAMng Function Contract. Should be: Delegations, transfers, revocations and retirement ( after adoption of the policy) <b>and potentially to slection IDNccTLD strings</b>	<b>F</b>			To avoid misunderstandings as soon as Retirement and review policy become implemented Bylaw needs to be clarified. Requires Fundamental Bylaw change
6.	Bylaw require ccNSO AGM. To date never conducted.	Section 10. 4 (f)	There shall be an annual meeting of ccNSO members, which shall be coordinated by the ccNSO Council. Annual meetings should be open for all to attend, and a reasonable opportunity shall be provided for ccTLD managers that are not members of the ccNSO as well as other non-members of the ccNSO to address the	Recurring point of discussion also contained in the 2004 Rules. To date no need to designate one of the meeting as AGM. ccNSO is NOT a member organization for example like an association.	<b>S</b>	Request Board to change after consultation of community	Low. Recurring point of discussion also contained in the Bylaws.	Suggestion: By the time 2004 Rules are updated and adopted.

Item	Description	Bylaw section	Bylaw text	Issue	Bylaw type	Change mechanism	Priority	Change time
			meeting. To the extent practicable, annual meetings of the ccNSO members shall be held in person and should be held in conjunction with meetings of the Board, or of one or more of ICANN's other Supporting Organizations.					
7.	Date ccNSO members elected Councillors take their seat	Section 10.3 (d) i	The regular term of each ccNSO Council member shall begin at the conclusion of an ICANN annual meeting and shall end at the conclusion of the third ICANN annual meeting thereafter	Practice has evolved since inception of the creation of the ccNSO that elected Councillors take their seat at the first meeting of the calander year (Community Forum)	S	Request Board to change after consultation of community	Low. Recurring point of discussion also contained in the Bylaws.	Suggestion: By the time 2004 Rules are updated and adopted.
8	Clarify number of votes of entity managing multiple ccTLDs raled to different Territories			Current rule is eihier one vote per ccTLD manager or one vote per Terriory ( in limited cases). What if oen tnroty maanges ccTLD related to multiple Territories. Does ccTLD maangers get as many (formal) voes as nu,ber of related Territories ( so 3 votes in case the maanger maangers ccTLDs from thee different Terrotories)	S		Low	