

# Principle 5: The ccNSO collaborates effectively within ICANN

## Criteria and Indicators Assessment

Based on the workshop notes and flipcharts, here's what emerged for Principle 5:

### Understanding the Building Blocks

Think of **principles** as the big goals you're aiming for - in this case, ensuring ccNSO collaborates effectively with ICANN. **Criteria** are the conditions that show you're meeting that goal - like specific ways collaboration should happen. **Indicators** are how you measure whether those conditions are actually being met - the concrete evidence you can point to.

### The Criteria That Emerged

The discussions revealed six key criteria for judging ccNSO's collaboration:

**Contribute to Stability and Security** - Actively working to keep DNS abuse low, which directly supports ICANN's mission of maintaining a stable internet. **Uphold the Multistakeholder Model** - Demonstrating that tackling key issues like DNS abuse actually strengthens the bottom-up model. **Demonstrate Efficiency** - Proving the multistakeholder model works by showing faster policy processes.

**Act as a Proving Ground** - Being willing to try new approaches first within ccTLDs before wider rollout. **Promote Collaboration** - Actively sharing good practices with gTLDs and engaging with GNSO processes. **Be Outcome-Oriented** - Pushing for tangible results, not just holding meetings and activities.

### The Indicators to Track

The group identified several ways to measure these criteria. For guideline development, they'd look at ccNSO's ability to distill experiences and create clear documentation. For best practice dissemination, they'd track the creation of common principles and follow-up with ccTLDs.

Operational collaboration would include work with PTI/IANA through the Customer Standing Committee, plus technical contributions to DNSSEC and TLD-OPS. Internal effectiveness would be shown through ccNSO's own processes. Strategic alignment would be measured by contributions to ICANN strategic planning, while cross-community engagement would involve SO/AC Chairs meetings and roundtables.

### A Concrete Example

Let's say ccNSO develops new guidelines for handling DNS abuse within ccTLDs. Here's how it maps: The **criterion** is "Act as a Proving Ground" - trying something new first. The **indicator** is whether ccNSO successfully distills this into clear documentation that others can use.

The **measurement** would be tracking what percentage of these documented practices are later adopted by gTLDs, showing the collaboration had real impact beyond just ccNSO.

## Reasoning

The discussions showed a strong focus on outcomes over activities - participants questioned whether just counting sessions or public comments was meaningful. They wanted to measure impact: Were comments implemented? Were strategic goals completed? This shift from "did we do stuff?" to "did it matter?" runs through all the criteria.

The criteria also reflect ccNSO's unique position. Being the proving ground for new approaches, sharing technical expertise through TLD-OPS and DNSSEC, and creating cross-community guidelines aren't just nice-to-haves - they're how ccNSO specifically contributes to making ICANN's multistakeholder model work better.

## What to Explore Next

Consider diving deeper into **how to balance process vs. performance indicators** - the group noted this tension. You might also want to explore **what specific percentage thresholds** would signal success (the notes show XX% placeholders throughout).

Another avenue is **examining barriers to collaboration** that were mentioned but not fully developed. Finally, look at **how ccNSO's internal processes** can serve as proof-of-concept for the broader ICANN community - this came up repeatedly as both a criterion and an indicator.