

Outcome Report

20th Anniversary World Cafés and Next Steps

The world cafés	2
The Hamburg Café	3
Cross Community Involvement	3
Trust & Credibility	3
Collaboration, Engagement, Community	3
ccNSO Relevance to Wider ICANN Community	4
Inclusion	4
Value ccNSO	4
The Virtual Café	4
Trends	4
GAC -relations	4
Showcasing	5
Onboarding	5
Next steps: what to do with the outcome?	5
Annex A – Notes Hamburg Café	6
Table 1 - Cross Community Involvement	6
Table 2 - Trust & Credibility	7
Table 3 - Collaboration, Engagement, Community	9
Table 4 - ccNSO Relevance to Wider ICANN Community	11
Table 5 - Inclusion	12
Table 6 - The value of the ccNSO to a ccTLD	13
Annex B – Notes Virtual Café, organized by table	16
Table 1 - Trends	16
Table 2 - GAC-ccNSO relation	17
Table 3 - How to Showcase?	18
Table 4 - Onboarding	19

The world cafés

As part of the 20th Anniversary of the ccNSO, the Celebration Committee organized sessions to look back (Cancun, March 2023), celebrate the current state of affairs (Washington, June 2023) and look forward (in-person only session in Hamburg, October 2023 and fully virtual session, December 2023).

The goal of the forward looking sessions was to engage and involve ccTLD community members and others in a conversation on how the ccNSO should evolve to remain relevant to the community in the years to come. Attendees were asked to share their views on what needs to change or be maintained or even stopped to allow the ccNSO to stand the test of time and remain relevant for ccTLDs and others.

The format for both forward looking sessions was the “world café”: This is an easy-to-use method to stimulate a dialogue around a theme and topics that matter at tables and in sequential rounds, to allow all attendees to participate in the conversation on the topic they would like to discuss with others.

The general theme for both the Hamburg Café and Virtual Café was **“how the ccNSO should evolve to remain relevant to the community in 2030.”** In the Hamburg Café the participants identified 6 topics to discuss and share views in 3 rounds:

- Cross Community Involvement
- Trust & Credibility
- Collaboration, Engagement, Community
- ccNSO Relevance to Wider ICANN Community
- Inclusion
- The value of the ccNSO to a ccTLD

Following the in-person meeting the Celebration Committee organized the second, completely Virtual Café. Goal of this session was to have conversations around topics that emerged from the Hamburg Café. The topics were:

- Trends
- GAC-ccNSO relation
- How to Showcase?
- Onboarding

In this report the Committee provides a summary of the outcome of the conversations in the Cafés to the ccNSO Council and suggestions what to do with them. To provide a complete picture, the rough notes from the conversations at the tables in both Cafés are included in Annex A and Annex B. As the conversations were held under Chatham House Rule, they cannot be attributed to individuals.

Finally, the Celebration Committee suggests the Council and broader community to think about using this methodology to discuss other topics as well. The method has proven to be inviting and interactive, and creates a safe place for open, and frank conversations. However, they do require a fair amount of effort, both to prepare, visiting hours and follow-up.

The Hamburg Café

The Hamburg Café was only in person, under the theme “how the ccNSO should evolve to remain relevant to the community in 2030.” The following 6 topics were selected by the people present:

- Cross Community Involvement
- Trust & Credibility
- Collaboration, Engagement, Community
- ccNSO Relevance to Wider ICANN Community
- Inclusion
- The value of the ccNSO to a ccTLD

Each of these topics was discussed in 3 rounds, allowing attendees to select a topic they wanted to discuss, and, secondly allowing attendees in second and third rounds to build on results of the previous round(s).

The outcomes of the conversations are summarized below per topic. The full results of the conversations on these topics (the “6 tables” and 3 rounds) were captured in notes. These notes are included in Annex A of this paper.

Cross Community Involvement

- ccNSO & GNSO collaboration isn’t of much value, but ccTLD and gTLD registries should have a stronger connection as they share the same environmental factors with little or no competition
- ccTLDs need to be explained clearly across ICANN.
- As there is high turnover in the GAC, so education needs to be ongoing, participate in the capacity development workshops for instance. Showcasing solutions could be an engagement technique

Trust & Credibility

- **Awareness of emerging technologies.** capability around technology and innovation around new technologies. ccNSO should have a leadership role to create a place for invite new technologies into our multi stakeholder world
 - 40 years out we may be doing something else beyond just the current DNS
 - If we have a short term view we could fall behind
 - This should be a safe place to have conversation around new technologies
- **Predictability of the ccNSO**

Collaboration, Engagement, Community

- **Buddy system**
 - Caribbean that has little islands that may need mentorship
 - We operate a two character TLD, there is no other commonality, the objectives are different
 - From ccNSO we ran a case of mentoring. Someone comes to the ccNSO, in whatever role they have, to try to have mentoring in order to understand the elections, procedures, etc. It would be more motivating for the newcomers to continue participating. Review the prior experience and see what can be done in the future.
- **Mentoring** will help engagement and involvement.
- **Knowledge transfer**
 - ccTLDs in the South Pacific Region need help, a number of islands that can benefit from knowledge transfer
 - Create a library for case studies. Need to find a place to make knowledge accessible, systematic, and organized.

- [ccNSO library](#): knowledge repository @
- Knowledge sharing is an avenue for ccTLD collaboration
- There is a gap in taking the ccTLD knowledge and sharing that into the broader community - we need more channels to share our knowledge - it is relevant beyond just the ccTLD community
- The ccNSO should have more presentations at regional forums where we can recruit new members. ccTLDs are attendees at these events but apart from the ccNSO update there is not much on programs for participating etc.

ccNSO Relevance to Wider ICANN Community

Presented similar suggestions as Cross Community Involvement topic.

Inclusion

Presented similar suggestions as Collaboration, Engagement, Community topic.

Value ccNSO

- Different countries, different ccTLDs. Voice towards ICANN, IANA. it is harder to do that on your own. Tech, political, social aspects.
- ccTLDs can share info via ROs. But that is within one region. Via the ccNSO, my ccTLD can reach ccTLDs globally. You can reach the world
- Collaboration, for the benefit of ccTLDs. That is what the ccNSO is.

The Virtual Café

The second, completely Virtual Café was held in December 2023. Under the general theme “**how the ccNSO should evolve to remain relevant to the community in 2030**” the attendees were invited to discuss the following 4 topics:

- Trends
- GAC-ccNSO relation
- How to Showcase?
- Onboarding

These topics emerged from the conversation in the Hamburg Café and were again discussed in 3 rounds. The outcomes of the conversations are summarized below per topic. The full results of the conversations on these topics (the “4 tables” and 3 rounds) were captured in notes. These notes are included in Annex B of this paper.

Trends

- **Technology**
 - How competing technologies may affect the DNS. Alternative technologies. Accelerated with AI.
 - Social media is a big factor and challenge for ccTLDs, especially regarding IDNs. punycode is challenging for the user experience
- **Security** - Something should be done to make the DNS safer for all of us
- **Governance** – Pressures on multistakeholder. Is it moving towards multilateralism?

GAC -relations

- Distinguish between GAC and relation with individual GAC-member. Relation with GAC-member important for individual ccTLDs, relation with GAC less of interest.

- GAC to produce consensus positions on public interest topics. Focusing on gTLDs. Focus on ccTLD sovereign/national matter (not ICANN's remit)
- Bilateral topics (Government- ccTLD) not discussed at GAC-level.
- ccTLD as information source for GAC

Showcasing

Confirming what was discussed in Hamburg

Onboarding

- No new insights. Need for new people
- There needs to be a formal process for onboarding. Mentor to be recruited for onboarding newcomers. Have more material on ICANN to learn.

Next steps: what to do with the outcome?

The two world cafes did provide a wealth of suggestions and topics that need to be further considered. Note that the Virtual Café emphasized and detailed results coming out of the Hamburg Café.

The next step is to embed the results within the ccNSO. For that matter some suggestions and topics are already within the remit of the working groups and committees, whether explicitly – for example designing and maintaining knowledge libraries on Universal Acceptance and DNS Abuse mitigation – or emerging as a topic – for example WSIS+20. The reverse is the case, some topics are getting less traction than suggested, for example a buddy or mentorship system.

Therefore it is suggested that first the Council assesses whether each and any of the suggestions from a cafe is within the remit of the ccNSO and strategic remit.

If a suggestion is not within the remit of the ccNSO, no further action will be taken.

If a topic is within the remit of the ccNSO, it needs to be determined whether the suggestion/ topic is within scope of the ccNSO Council or one of the existing ccNSO committees or working groups. If so, the group will need to be informed and should be asked to consider if and how it intends to include it as a work item, and report back to the community through the Council.

If a suggestion is not within the scope of the Council, a committee or working group, the Council is expected to consider whether it needs to be further explored and included in the portfolio of the ccNSO.

Finally, Council is advised to report back to the community if and how the various suggestions have been incorporated in the portfolio of activities of the ccNSO.

Annex A – Notes Hamburg Café

Included are the rough notes from the Hamburg Café, organized by table.

The topics per table resulted from a poll to select 3 out of 6 predefined topics and 3 topics suggested by the community.

Table 1 - Cross Community Involvement

CROSS COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
<p>ROUND 1</p> <p>DEF: Cross community platform: between other SOs and ACs or between CCs? It can also depend on which SO and AC, ties with the GNSO can be strong as interests can be the same between ccTLDs and gTLDs: protecting consumer interest, collaboration with the registrants.</p> <p>UNIFORMITY? ccTLDs need to be explained clearly across ICANN. And there is high turnover in the GAC, so education needs to be ongoing, taking part in the capacity development workshops for instance. But it could be that education needs to happen between CCs and their governments rather than via ICANN.</p> <p>SOLUTION: Need built in regular training, 30 min sessions. ICANN can be intimidating (acronyms), solid knowledge transfer is key, as well as mentoring when possible. . Create identification links with communal issues, problem solving, Having information about goals of a community, gantt chart of project milestones.</p>
<p>ROUND 2</p> <p>Cross community here: within ICANN. GAC: Capacity building often done at the national level. At ICANN level, a 2-day capacity building workshop is done without CCs.</p> <p>The ccNSO should be encouraging their CCs to work with their governments directly. Being a regular feature of the GAC Capacity building would be good for the ccNSO. It has been done with AFNIC who were very satisfied. As ccTLD registries we should be having regular contact with gTLD registries , not necessarily within ICANN. Registry voices should be louder within ICANN. ccNSO & GNSO collaboration isn't of much value, but ccTLD and gTLD registries should have a stronger connection as they share the same environmental factors with little or no competition. It's something which cannot be done at the regional level, only at an ICANN context, without using ICANN resources.</p> <p>Existing information needs to be reviewed and corrected when warranted (ICANN website: talking about registrants as only gTLD users).</p> <p>It can be difficult for newcomers to understand the role of each community and how they can contribute, main representation for non EN countries happens in the GAC and GAC only (Portuguese speaking countries). Multilingualism and lack of, is a hindrance to cross community involvement, with clarity on sensitive topics.</p> <p>ccNSO engagement as the ccNSO could make sense with At-Large, as they are often participating in a national capacity.</p>
<p>ROUND 3</p> <p>Would be useful to be able to provide what "chapter" the ccNSO is in (ready to begin the second round) and give a sense of continuity.</p> <p>Pbs of the GNSO: some CCs have already solved them, showcasing solutions could be an engagement technique. Often the GAC doesn't have awareness of ccNSO topics, unless their own CC runs into issues (auda).</p> <p>Joint meetings are good but nowhere near enough. Having a GAC member engaging with their respective regional organisation or ccTLD, would that help? When GAC members have a good working relationship with their CC managers, it's mutually beneficial.</p> <p>Taking part in the GAC Capacity Building workshop, as a standing item would be good, just to explain the differences between the CCs.</p>

If you know about the different stakeholders' positions, you take better decisions. ccNSO needs to push their involvement across the board, are there enough resources to do so?
 It's hard for GAC & ccNSO to find common topics to exchange on. Informational videos could be a good way forward.

Table 2 - Trust & Credibility

<p>TOPIC: Trust / Credibility</p>
<p>ROUND 1</p> <p>Flipchart Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ Predictability/Stability ★ Consistency ★ Have common principles that represent CCs ★ What is the “ccNSO voice” in ICANN? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inform advocacy ★ Representative number = large part of the community + educated in issues related to cc’s ★ Clear rules and procedures <p>Discussion Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What makes the ccNSO trusted in your view? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Having more active involvement with other ccTLDs around the world. ○ Consistency and predictability in what ccNSO is doing and how it reacts ○ We not on the same page always since we have different opinions and needs ○ As the ccNSO, we should have stability, even though positions evolve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ E.g. ccNSO is not involved in individual cases ● We should state some high level principles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ E.g. We don’t have anything to do with content ○ Like a map/guide ● What is the voice that the ccNSO has speaking into the ICANN community? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Developing trust within your audience. ○ If we are not making a comfortable environment for ccTLDs we may lose trust and membership ○ Stay in the principles of the ccTLD community ● What made us trusted during the IANA transition: we always arrived at a rough consensus on numerous different professional positions. Better to have a large swath of the community and a variety of input to develop a common position. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Active and diverse participation contributes to credibility ● ccNSO voice: informed advocacy. Can the ccNSO develop positions on that ● Clear rules, procedures, and expertise contribute to credibility ● What do you think about the differences among the ccTLDs? Some are private/public/small/large/ etc. Is it possible to have common principles? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ That is the strength of the ccNSO ○ There are no geopolitics, like in the GAC ○ No competing commercial interests like the GNSO. We realize there is more benefit trying to agree than try and be smarter than the others
<p>ROUND 2</p> <p>Flipchart Notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ★ Transparency: Why do? What do? ★ Heart + core of ICANN - Diversity

- ★ Collaborative work
- ★ Make ccNSO position view in ICANN
- ★ Balance between technology work (DNS) and policy
- ★ Message from the community to ICANN
- ★ Sharing expertise = Tech Day
- ★ Bad behavior (interpersonal) = Risk
- ★ Less visible! Technologies that may make the DNS less visible (Risk)

Discussion Notes:

- We want to distinguish ourselves from the GAC by being neutral
- In ccNSO, everyone is working together for common interests toward a common goal (more contentious in the GAC)
- ccNSO is very heterogeneous and diverse, that is its strength
- What does the ccNSO need to do to REMAIN trusted? What should we do?
 - Transparency, being open about what we're doing and why we're doing it
- Does the ccNSO have a Charter? United view or deliverables?
- To what extent is the ccNSO see itself as a significant contributor in other areas outside the ccNSO
 - We are the heart/core of ICANN. The diversity of ICANN.
- We should be involved in the bigger plays outside the ccNSO to build trust and credibility.
 - Do we or can we show up as one voice?
- What unites us is the technology on the table, the balance of technology and quality of work
 - Tech Day is about sharing expertise
- The ccNSO is a way for the community to convey messages to ICANN. We are convey messages to ICANN, not the reverse - bottom-up
- After a presentation, talk about what your working on means to others, giving a broader perspective
- At the moment developing technologies is not on the table in the ccNSO
- What are the barriers to trust/credibility
 - I've heard from ALAC that ccNSO is just ccNSO managers and not a voice of users. They may have a desire to be more involved in our work
- What are the risks to credibility?
 - How we deal with people who behave badly: being rude, domineering (interpersonally)
 - Are we aware of technologies that make domain names less visible, affecting TLDs and the DNS in general.
 - That may be worth a discussion
- What about Web 3, blockchain, the fact that we don't talk about that in the ccNSO a risk to us?
 - What are registries going to do or not do about it? They have different approaches

ROUND 3

Flipchart Notes:

- ★ ccNSO has a leadership role in the evaluation of new technologies
- ★ How to make more ccs active in the ccNSO?
- ★ Avoid short term view related with new technologies
- ★ Technical leadership => trust
- ★ Risk -> lack of discussion about innovation
- ★ Technology solutions to the users problem
- ★ Invite experts and innovators
- ★ Reach out to academic communities
- ★ ccNSO must do things for cc's
- ★ Advise - new technologies

Table Notes:

- ★ Bring discussion about innovation -> new perspectives, future focussed

- ★ Be representative of cc community
- ★ Trust from capability in technology -> need to invite new tech in the prepare for future
- ★ Bring relationships w/i academia & lessons learned to broader community -> look outside community!

Discussion Notes:

- There is an intersection capability around technology and innovation around new technologies. ccNSO should have a leadership role to create a place for invite new technologies into our multi stakeholder world
 - 40 years out we may be doing something else beyond just the current DNS
 - If we have a short term view we could fall behind
 - This should be a safe place to have conversation around new technologies
 - Could add to our credibility
 - Polishing the diamond
- Has this evaluation of new/frontier technologies happened in ccNSO
 - We don't really engage with them. Our focus has been the DNS
 - This is common across ICANN
- Where is the place in ICANN for serious discussion around innovation?
- Risk: if we don't do it, someone else will
- We can be neutral, unbiased and pool our knowledge and experience.
 - New members are interested in new technologies
- New technologies should be more of ICANN's focus
 - Current systems may be challenged by new computers, quantum computing
- Whether there are technology solutions to consumer problems instead of regulation
 - Because regulators don't understand(or want to understand) the technologies
- External people from the industry should come here, speak to the ccNSO & inform us
- We can use the credibility of the ccNSO to invite experts
 - The ccNSO could reach out through the academic communities
- It is difficult to find the best academic people in and out of ICANN
- Now that we are hybrid, we can invite them to speak virtually without travel
- If you want ccTLDs to trust ccNSO, it has to do things for ccTLDs
 - ccNSO can offer services, advice, new technology
 - Help ccTLD to grow and improve, they will trust the ccNSO
- There are many ccTLDs that dont participate in ccNSO, why?
 - They have not been provided with a good pathway in
 - Some are not confident to join/participate
- Add to trust between members: share knowledge and expertise

Conclusion

Table 3 - Collaboration, Engagement, Community

Collaboration, Engagement, Community
<p>ROUND 0</p> <p>Question: What things we can do to improve collaboration? What we have done in the past that worked? What we could do in the future to improve?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase visibility for ccNSO. Collaborate with ICANN, do cross community work. ccNSO has been inside its shell. - Share technical knowledge? Share policy knowledge? What are the tools to use to increase collaboration.

- ccTLD news session, sharing experience, knowledge transfer, case studies, trends. We have common problems, common concerns. Collaboration will be important to find common ground and understanding and opportunity to discuss to solve problems.
- Knowledge transfer can be bottom up and top down. Collaboration has no direction. We have to teach other communities about ccNSO does.
- Some ccNSO has good relationship with their corresponding GAC representatives. GAC are discussing ccNSO topics without understanding the details. The result is no concrete outputs.
- ccTLDs are very diverse (gov to private model), effort to teach outside about ccNSO will learn about the legitimacy that ccNSO brings to ICANN itself. Contribute to internet governance. ccNSO is a parallel of multistakeholder model. Transnational conversations. Legitimacy.
- The translational mandate comes from ccTLDs. ccNSO has sovereign states, sovereign territories, private companies

ROUND 1

Question: What can we do to improve collaboration?

- TechDay
- Policy Forum is a good for policy transfer
- Helpful to share when ccTLD managers share their operation knowledge, with a operational focus, CSR session is interesting
- Focus on the pacific region, need our help, how to reach out to them and ccNSO is available to provide help. It is a friendly group
- Outreach, mentoring would help, so newcomers don't need to work out everything themselves
- Buddy system
- Caribbean that has little islands that may need mentorship
- We operate a two character TLD, there is no other commonality, the objectives are different
- Mentorship doesn't matter who you are
- From ccNSO we ran a case of mentoring. Someone comes to the ccNSO, in whatever role they have, try to have mentoring in order to understand the elections, procedures, etc. It would be more motivating for the newcomers to continue participating. Review the prior experience and see what can be done in the future.
- Mentoring will help engagement and involvement
- TechDay, people to present the technical results, what can others can learn from our experience, it is not specific to your operation, can generalize to other community
- There is disparity among the TLDs. Some TLDs have a lot of expertise, but some lack them. Find the mechanism to bring the gap of expertise.
- What we have in common is operator of two-character TLDs. If you have fantastic process of registration, but if it is run by the government and has little budget, and not selling the domain names.
- Improve the quality of the ccTLDs, some has no resources.
- Jamaica has zero resources and is not engaged in registering domain names.
- Giving free domains are not sufficient. Some bad actors will take advantage of it. DNS abuse. We need to start registering domain names and charge for them.
- Important to identify the nature of various ccTLDs to provide them with ideas that are digestible. Every TLD's objectives are different.

ROUND 2

- Identify that mentorship as a path to help smaller ccTLDs to gain knowledge
- TWNIC paper helped Pablo's research
- ccTLDs in the South Pacific Region need help, a number of islands that can benefit from knowledge transfer
- TWNIC has done a lot of case studies, for certain topics. Rarely to see a collection of all case studies. Create a library for case studies. Can find answers in the library. Need to find a place to make knowledge accessible, systematic, and organized.

- ccNSO library: knowledge repository
- Knowledge sharing is an avenue for ccTLD collaboration
- On the regional basis, share resources? Each ccTLD in that region will not need to duplicate resources? African region came up with an idea to say a pool of accredited registrars can operate across border.
- LacTLD created a WHOIS for the TLDs in the region.
- Create a platform that can facilitate cross border collaboration.
- ccTLDs can create a common platform to share information in the region, for capacity building, etc. How to increase my domain registration, what can I do? How to combat DNS abuse? I want a big server to manage the ccTLD, how to go about with it. That kind of information.
- Belgium's presentation on the CSR. Singapore has the same case. If you collaborate with the other ccTLD, you can solve the same problem.
- Commercial collaboration
- CSR Collaboration: It may be useful that for the other ccTLD to reference

ROUND 3

- Some ccTLDs are more advanced than others, and are in position to help others
- Mentorship in the form of knowledge transfer, technology and policy wise, both direction
- Creation of ccNSO library, knowledge repository, to store information on TLD ops, CRS, etc.
- How can we unit resources, efforts and initiatives to help each other commercially (e.g., a common WHOIS for the LAC region, can find what's available, what can be registered, perhaps can be done for other regions)
- What else can we do to increase collaboration among the ccTLDs themselves?
- Make it easier to copy each other's ideas
- Learn what they are doing, sharing info to junior people
- ccTLDs are not particularly thinking about applying for fellowship or nextGen
- Can have a ccNSO sponsored applications
- Learn how other ccTLDs do their business, marketing, cybersecurity, etc.
- Find ways to give each other projects, e.g., zoom master. Project management capacity building
- Wiki page on ICANN site, deposit stuff made for the ccTLDs
- Translate the materials regarding TLD ops in the seven languages that ICANN use
- It could be difficult to collaborate if translation is not provided
- Can have language community groups to enhance collaboration
- Exchange among ccTLDs' technical, legal, admin staff is key
- If we want to involve some regional organizations, can ICANN fund to support those?
- To create summary of work to easily engage incoming newcomers
- Share to certain extent regulatory environment. There may be slightly different from region to region. Not to duplicate the effort from neighboring country / territory.
- Global overview would be helpful to learn practices in regions far away. How to enhance long distance collaboration.

Table 4 - ccNSO Relevance to Wider ICANN Community

ccNSO Relevance to Wider ICANN Community

ROUND 1

- Put the "multi" in multistakeholder model
- Non-competitive environment enables diversity to flourish - all in it together
 - Same basic values and function
- Bring a big picture POV

- Bring specific value to ICANN - input of ICANN org strategic planning for example - that other groups build upon
- Participate in order to:
 - Share information
 - Engage in cooperative activities to prevent/support against malicious attacks
 - Engage in technical collaboration

ROUND 2

- Change is easier than those bound the RAA - we can be creative to find solutions
- Conduit to the sovereign without being a representative of that government
 - Conduit of information back and forth
 - More senior individuals are usually found in the cc community vs. governments often sending more junior delegates
- Should the ccTLD community consider a joint document (like the GAC Communique)?
 - Perhaps something that is shared annually or bi-annually

ROUND 3

- There is a lot to be learned from ccTLD community regarding the next round of new gTLDs - we want to share that knowledge and help prevent pitfalls
 - There are opportunities for improvement here
- There is a gap in taking the ccTLD knowledge and sharing that into the broader community - we need more channels to share our knowledge - it is relevant beyond just the ccTLD community
- Joint spirit of improvement

Table 5 - Inclusion

We must have cycled through about 25 participants

What came out was (Rough priority according to m):

- Mentors for newcomers which Jordan refined into Buddies since he felt mentorship was something else and much more demanding. Ideally, someone who speaks the same mother tongue as the newcomers and will be there buddy for more than just meetings.
- The ccNSO should have more presentations at regional forums where we can recruit new members. ccTLDs are attendees at these things but apart from the CCNSO update there is not much on programs for participating etc. Try and find a ccNSO member who would be willing to wave the flag and answer questions etc. Remind people who are not members that you do not have to be a member to participate at ICANN meetings.
- Senior ccNSO members should participate in the GAC's capacity building which occurs for two days at every ICANN meeting. It was done once and seemed to be a great success and this would be good for the ccNSO and ccTLDs.
- Possibly limit the number of times the same people get funded to come to meetings so that we can get other people involved.
- Create LANGUAGE rooms/events for ccTLDs - pre or during meetings where people who speak the same mother tongue could do a mini ccNSO meeting in that language.
- ccTLDs through the ccNSO should work on establishing links with gTLD registries (observer etc.)
- Develop a program where ccTLDs could have people do internships at other registries for 3months etc.
- Ccnso to create a catalog of existing university-level courses or sessions by ccTLDs on the DNS for local university students to get them involved early on.
- Create and Oceanea regional ccTLD org.

Table 6 - The value of the ccNSO to a ccTLD

The value of the ccNSO to a ccTLD

Statement: The value of the ccNSO in the years to come is critical for the ccTLD community

ROUND 1

Q1 | How do you perceive the current value of the ccNSO for ccTLDs? How did it benefit your organisation so far?

Value of each ccTLD gives to itself. If ccTLDs consider themselves to be relevant, they will add to the relevancy of the ccNSO as a whole.

Value in many aspects. Capacity building. Helping ccTLDs to grow. Give advice to ccTLDs to improve the management of the registries. IGLC gives you tools on how to increase the value of the ccTLDs. We cannot stop the ccNSO. It needs to stay

We are colleagues under 1 umbrella. Each ccTLDs has its own policies, experiences, history etc. Here we can share the knowledge and experiences. We can learn from each other.

Different countries, different ccTLDs. Voice towards ICANN, IANA. it is harder to do that on your own. Tech, political, social aspects ...

ccTLDs can share info via RO's. But that is within one region. Via the ccNSO, my ccTLD can reach ccTLDs globally. You can reach the world

Collaboration, for the benefit of ccTLDs. That is what the ccNSO is.

Q2 | What should be improved? What needs to stop?

Nothing that needs to stop. Continue to find ways to actively engage ccTLDs. Usually I go to Tech Day only. Why not help newcomers and foster engagement prior to Tech Day?

ccNSO should stop relying on the same usual suspects to deliver the same messages. There should be someone like Souleymane, Andrew to bring different perspectives. If someone is too shy to give a presentation, he/she should be led by example. But: challenge to find the gems.

Q3 | What if there is no ccNSO?

- You would miss out on what others are doing?

Sharing experiences can be done at the coffee table?

- At a global level, it gives us a voice in and towards ICANN.
- Great variation of ccTLDs. Some may have find a way of promoting a voice elsewhere, whereas others do not have the means to do that
- We would be lost in space
- Without ccNSO, there would be no ICANN as we know it. The ccNSO as a conglomerate for ccTLDs. Otherwise ICANN would be a market regulator for gTLDs.
- Without the ccTLD contribution to the policy making at ICANN, ICANN would be a market regulator for gTLDs.

Q4 | Do you need more ccNSO? More sharing? Does the ccNSO need more collaboration, more XYZ?

Keep the sense of continuity. Improve for the future. Key messages such as what the GAC does.

Yes. but the resources are limited.

E.g. chair of a working group can work on the agenda for the next meeting, but the volunteers are limited.

Q5 | Should the ccNSO stick to the engagement model?

There should be more powerful tools to engage with people. E.g. instead of email invites, pick up the phone. Talk to someone, rather than sending emails.

Once there are 9 of us, the 10th will come by itself

Q6 | Are there barriers to overcome?

We do not have the resources

ROUND 2

Q1 | What is the value?

- Sharing information. I am part of the tech community. The RO have a regional reach, but the ccNSO is global.
- Different regions may have different problems. The global approach. TLD-OPS helps small ccTLDs globally.
- It gives us the opportunity to be involved in ICANN. We contribute to global policies. Much happens very well at a regional level. The exchange at the global level gives a different perspective. Presence, policy making, info sharing
- I am here to understand what the ccNSO does. I am a newcomer.
- We come from an environment that is strictly hierarchical. Horizontal interaction resulting in something ? That is not what we would automatically assume to happen. But it does within the ccNSO
- We seek other policy examples and hope to find them in the ccNSO. I approached someone and got some answers. That is the value.
- Developing relations with smart policy people. They help me to better understand legislation. What is similar? What is relevant globally? NIS2 is relevant to CIRA.
- ccNSO is growing. Keep the level of engagement accessible to all. Complement the bigger room session by sessions such as this one. Discuss matters in small groups. E.g. people could play chat roulette.

Q2 | Impact-effort analysis for TLD-OPS? How many ccTLDs benefited

Many ccTLDs do not want to communicate about security issues. Join the TLD-OPS session tomorrow afternoon. We need to find a new topic to address. And find a way to promote it.

Q3 | What needs to change?

We are all en par. The narrative of the ccNSO and icann itself, is still too caucasian. It is foreign to many. By the end of the day, the european-anglo-saxon group discusses issues that may not be of relevance to people from other regions. It is not about hearing all the voices, but also making the voices part of a solution.

Q4 | What about the future? Any challenges to overcome?

ROUND 3

Q1 | What is the value

- It is not a Regional Organisation
- ccNSO is a value in itself, not only valuable to ccTLDs. Micro-cosmos of multistakeholderism. Turn it around: the value of the ccTLDs to the rest of the world. ccNSO should stop talking to itself. Pat on the back, and come out. Outreach towards ICANN. Its value is evident, but now shown.
- Meet people from other parts of the world.
- If my gvt decides to change the name of the country, i can tell the board what would be the consequences. Because there are policies.
- People connect. Commercial collaborations, information sharing
- ccNSO is the home of ccTLDs in ICANN. I do not see how a ccTLD can be fully recognised locally, when not being involved in ICANN. However: 88 ccTLDs in AP region, but 35 have never been to ICANN
- I prepare with the local community nationally before the meeting, and follow-up after the meeting.
- Unintentionally ignored. The ccNSO is a school of self-governance. Members in AP are not used to this mode. Against their culture. The perspective changes. They learn how to do things differently.

- Idea generation. We hear new ideas at every meeting. How to manage communities. Inspiring to each other. This community puts the multi in multistakeholder.
- Pure capacity building. You are reminded of everything.
- Mutual existence. TLD-OPS. There is a community that helps if something bad happens. Direct operational benefit to each ccTLD
- Diversity of solutions to the same problem.
- Ccnso lobbies for relevant issues. E.g. IDNs
- ccNSO is very important to making sure that IANA is held to its standard, for the benefit of all ccTLDs.
- Other table discussed value of icann community. What is going down is shared knowledge. Cyber Security, operations, marketing etc. Repository.
- Value is to issue more policies. Difference between SO/AC. The SO may issue policies. Wondering if the ccNSO would not be better being a ccSOAC? More of an AC in the ICANN context. Anyhow, get rid of "supporting".
- Regardless of the form, in terms of the value, we all talk about the value of the MSM. ICANN is the ultimate expression of the MSM.

Q2 | something that needs to be improved?

- Be more outgoing. More cross-community
- Imagine one day, the goal of a fully free unrestricted and secure global internet is obtained. And then? The assumption that it exists.

Annex B – Notes Virtual Café, organized by table

The topics for the 4 tables were selected by the Anniversary Celebration Committee from reviewing the outcome of the outcomes of the conversations in the Hamburg Café. The topics are:

- Trends
- GAC-ccNSO relation
- How to Showcase?
- Onboarding

Table 1 - Trends

Round 1 (15 min)

Q1 | What are in your view the main drivers for change of the DNS industry in the next 5 years?

Technology

- lots of discussion about how competing technologies may affect the DNS. Alternative technologies. Accelerated with AI.
- AI is indeed a challenge in all topics. Main trend
- Does not like the industry name. DNS is a service. We provide services, are not an industry

Security

- regarding security services. Something should be done to make the DNS safer for all of us
- Regardless of the technologies, DNS will still be stable. There might be challenges to the DNS though.

Governance

- Pressure on multilateralism. Challenges on governance

Q2 | What will impact ccTLD most in the near future and over 5 years?

- new gTLD round: Customers will have more choices. Increased competition, more competitors for ccTLDs
- Someone wondered whether the first new gTLD round had an impact? Noting that the local ccTLD has a local advantage
- IDN TLDs. in some countries, it is important, popular. ASCII TLD and IDN are not necessarily competitors. UA friendly environment is important

Round 2 (17 min)

Q1 | What will impact ccTLD most in the near future and over 5 years?

- Round 1 referred to IDNs and new gTLD round. Anything else?
- Social media is a big factor and challenge for ccTLDs, especially regarding IDNs. punycode is challenging for the user experience
- Developing countries: what will impact us a lot is IoT in the ccTLD environment. We need to be careful.
- Regulatory bodies in our countries. Impact the development in our country. Shift to gTLDs.
- We need to frame well what we mean with DNS. abuse and how it impacts
- Social media may refuse the use of domain names. Opportunity to register new names. As a ccTLD, create IoT (under second level, create third level domains). This might be an opportunity
- For IoT: more devices. New challenges for domain management. Scalable.
- Sharp rise in domains during the pandemic. That phase seems to be over. Will this stay flat? How will the market demand evolve?
- Registration volume stayed stable during the pandemic. No bigger changes. CNNIC still has 20 million names.

(notes missing for final 3 min)

Round 3 (19 min)

Note: limited attendance. (1 person)

- Local eligibility requirements. Hence security impact limited.
- New gTLD round does not impact the local ccTLD much: the local ccTLD remains popular.

Table 2 - GAC-ccNSO relation

Round 1:

GAC relationship: ccTLD governments different models. Always link. Private company, some kind of regulation, report to them. Who is delegee (the company)

As ccTLD how do you see relationships? Only if GAC reps ask, it is provided. Not much interaction in other case, not so close as should be. GAC and ccNSO have much in common.

ccNSO members want GAC to understand how ccTLD are run

Does GAC want to understand what ccNSO / ccTLD does? From GAC representative, perspective broader group may be interested to learn from informal relation. Bilateral topics not discussed at GAC-level. Language barrier.

Regional, strong influence depends.

What makes the GAC interesting for you as individual ccTLD

Round 2

How is it related to your GAC representative? How ignorance can be powerful: Human rights discussion in GAC (2004). Important what your GAC reps does. Different situations. Some Individual gov. clear instruction, view for GAC. Effectiveness GAC reps dependent on person, change of person. For specific topics, distinct lack of consistency. Brief talk to individual GAC

Thematic sessions with GAC. ccNSO onboard GAC

GAC advise Individual ccNSO, only full consensus. Most government don't care: ccNSO narrow remit, very relevant for GAC

Even counter part Hot topic in GAC, start to think it is important comes back

GAC reps not into GAC discussions: understand relation other parts of ICANN, to give information.

Government to support the local ccTLD market from a global perspective.

Round 3

Relation with government changes with changing government. Relation with government successful in general: understanding the role of the ccTLD. Make an effort. Unsuccessful in getting more active in GAC.

Complication at national level, ccTLD needs to be managed properly. Frequent meetings. Internal aspects are also important, lots of governmental stakeholders.

Some cases GAC reps not actively involved in GAC. sometimes local support for GAC rep. ICANN/subpro topic may drive interest in GAC.

Only interested in practical topics, GAC advise, or if influence overall perception of ccTLD (example DNS Abuse)

GAC discuss issues ICANN stakeholder, opinion of GAC if and what topic affects ccTLD. To make/

Table 3 - How to Showcase?

<p>Round 1</p> <p>How to Showcase?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Internal or external – ccTLDs or ccNSO● Social media● ccTLD News - might be of interest to all attending meetings● Tech Day - invite other areas to participate, including hosting it● Showcase our PDPs - other tools include Meetings and Conferences, Outreach and Capacity Building, Publications and Reports, Collaboration with other SO's and AC's, Website, Reports, Strategic Planning. Mentoring, which is related to onboarding typically, was discussed.● Problem – others unable to attend due to parallel sessions● Problem - how do we use these tools better?● Showcasing when presenting to other groups/industries might get us out of our silos● Topics that are relevant and important <p>What is our goal?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Present ccNSO both within the community and outside the community <p>What do we want to showcase?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Things like best practices and sharing knowledge came up often, so community sharing. Presenting outside the ICANN community did not really get discussed – not seen necessarily as a concern at this moment [(S) I think IGF will change this!] <p>Outreach</p> <p>Internally or externally? to ccNSO or ccTLDs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● (S) I tried to get a discussion on both internal and external; people wanted to talk more internally. People could relate things better to ccTLD vs ccNSO, which was not quite where we wanted to go, however, it linked to the onboarding easier, even though this was ccTLD related● Already do some (i.e., joint sessions)● More than what we do now? (S) I thought this was interesting because there was hesitation -- I think the ccNSO vs ccTLD colored thinking● Reach out to other groups <p>What other blocks in showcasing the ccNSO?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Too much on the agenda --- many parallel sessions. (S) I think this is very important, I anticipate the continuous improvement will change this over time <p>Plenaries?</p> <p>More proactive in the plenary sessions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Selecting interesting topics that could be presented● Keep the message short <p>What we should not be:</p> <p>Boring!</p>
<p>Round 2</p> <p>No one joined Round 2.</p>
<p>Round 3</p>

Table 4 - Onboarding

Round 1

We all agree with the ICANN code of conduct. Session / video on behavior, history and how ccNSO upgrades. Most are not good at intro, new people just 'thrown in'. There needs to be a formal process for onboarding. Mentor to be recruited for onboarding newcomers. Have more material on ICANN learn.

Round 2

To become effective in ICANN processes, it takes a lot of work to read doc, bylaws etc. It is on the individual. Small / short groups needed so new members can join and get used to it. Young people / fellows need to be more involved in WG's. Need *new* point of views. Newcomers need more guidance, need to know what groups to join etc.

Round 3

Need more people to join ccNSO (.cn) Same people have been in ccNSO for years, need young people.
Teach ccNSO