Cover Letter - Working Group Report

ICANN's Geographic Regions

Dear All,

The ICANN Geographic Regions form the basis of the regional structure of the ALAC and ccNSO, and are used to ensure the geographic diversity of the ICANN Board, ccNSO and GNSO Council. The Geographic Regions are defined by:

1. Assigning countries to geographic regions on the basis of the United Nations Statistics Division's current classifications of "Countries or areas, codes and abbreviations," as revised 16 February 2000, and "Composition of macro geographic (continental) regions and component geographical regions," as revised 16 February 2000; and

2. Some territories in a physical/geographic area are assigned to an ICANN Geographic Region on the basis of citizenship of the persons from that area. These territories are grouped together with the country of citizenship for that area.

At the ccNSO Lisbon meeting, the ccNSO ICANN Geographical Regions Working Group presented a progress report (see: http://www.icann.unrealgraphics.net/meetings/lisbon/presentation-ccnso-members-b-27mar07.pdf). The Working Group was tasked with:

1. Revising its draft report is the light of discussions in Lisbon, and

2. Circulating the draft to ccTLD managers to:

   a. ensure their opinions concerning regions were included in the report, and
   b. establish whether or not there was general support for the recommendations of the Working Group.

Based on the feedback received, the draft report and its recommendations (attached) have been further amended to reflect the following:

1. Confirmation that the concerns about the present implementation of ICANN Geographic Regions are shared. The Working Group and responders appear to be unanimously of the opinion that the *representational* issues highlighted in the report should be addressed by the ICANN Board. However, the Working Group has not been able to agree about whether or not the present regional structure adversely impacts *participation* in ICANN. This split is also reflected in the

comments received so far. The current draft report therefore more fully reflects these divergent views.
2. Support for the recommendation the the Working Group prepare a ccNSO submission to ICANNs Regions review process.
3. Support for the short term solution of self-selection by ccTLDs that are currently assigned to an ICANN Geographical Region on the basis of the citizenship criterion.
4. Mixed support for the recommendation that the ccNSO facilitate the creation of sub-regional or interregional groups. This recommendation therefore has not be carried forward.

Despite the Working Group's failure to agree on the impact that ICANN's Regional Structure has upon participation (Paragraph 1 above), it *is* unanimous that improving participation in the ccNSO (and ICANN generally) is an important issue. It is therefore appropriate to report the divergent views to the ICANN Board, and to strongly recommend that the ccNSO actively pursue ways and means of increasing participation.

As the next step in the process, the Working Group would appreciate input from ccTLD managers and other stakeholders, including the GAC, on the report generally and on the following questions in particular:

1. Do the concerns as described in Section B of the report adequately represent the concerns? If not, please indicate what needs to change.

2. Do you support the recommendations (Section D) of the Working Group? If not, please indicate if you support any of the other options detailed in Section C.

On Behalf of the ccNSO Working Group on ICANN Regions

David Archbold, Chair

Report ccNSO Working Group
ICANN Geographical Regions
for public consultation

20 June 2007

Working group members:
David Archbold, (Chair), .ky
Becky Burr, ccNSO Council Member
David Chen, .tw
Mohamed El Bashir, .sd
Don Hollander, APTLD
Andy Kang, .kr
Oscar Moreno, .pr
Oscar Robles-Garay, .mx
Ron Sherwood, .vi

ICANN staff support
Donna Austin
Gabriella Schittek
Bart Boswinkel

Contents *4*

A. Background

The Purpose of Geographical Regions

1. The ICANN Geographic Regions form the basis of the regional structure of the ALAC and ccNSO, and are used to ensure the geographic diversity of the ICANN Board, ccNSO and GNSO Council.

2. The ICANN Geographical Regions were originally created to ensure regional diversity in the make up of the ICANN Board, in particular, though the appointment of the At-Large directors.

3. ICANN's original (November 1998) Bylaws[1] stated:

   "Section 6. INTERNATIONAL REPRESENTATION

   In order to ensure broad international representation on the Board, no more than one-half (1/2) of the total number of At Large Directors serving at any given time shall be residents of any one Geographic Region, and no more than two (2) of the Directors nominated by each Supporting Organization shall be residents of any one Geographic Region. *As used herein, each of the following shall be a "Geographic Region": Europe; Asia/Australia/Pacific; Latin America/Caribbean Islands; Africa; North America.* The specific countries included in each Geographic Region shall be determined by the Board, and this Section shall be reviewed by the Board from time to time (but at least every three years) to determine whether any change is appropriate."

4. The primary references to Geographic Regions within Article IX (Country-Code Names Supporting Organisation) of the Bylaws are:

   "**Section 3. ccNSO COUNCIL**
   1. The ccNSO Council shall consist of (a) three ccNSO Council members selected by the ccNSO members within each of ICANN's Geographic Regions in the manner described in Section 4(7) through (9) of this Article; (b) three ccNSO Council members selected by the ICANN Nominating Committee; (c) liaisons as described in paragraph 2 of this Section; and (iv) observers as described in paragraph 3 of this Section.

   2. There shall also be one liaison to the ccNSO Council from each of the following organizations, to the extent they choose to appoint such a liaison: (a) the Governmental Advisory Committee; (b) the At-Large Advisory Committee; and (c) each of the Regional Organizations described in Section 5 of this Article. These liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO Council, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO Council. …."

   And

   "**Section 4. MEMBERSHIP**

---

[1] http://www.icann.org/general/archive-bylaws/bylaws-06nov98.htm#V

4. The Geographic Regions of ccTLDs shall be as described in Article VI, Section 5 of these Bylaws. For purposes of this Article, managers of ccTLDs within a Geographic Region that are members of the ccNSO are referred to as ccNSO members "within" the Geographic Region, regardless of the physical location of the ccTLD manager. In cases where the Geographic Region of a ccNSO member is unclear, the ccTLD member should self-select according to procedures adopted by the ccNSO Council.

The Definition of ICANN's Geographic Regions

5. In July 2000, at its meeting in Yokohama, the ICANN Board agreed[2] to adopt the regional structure defined by the United Nations Statistics Division in its "Composition of macro geographic (continental) regions, geographical sub-regions, and selected economic and other groupings [3]", following GAC advice that "ICANN should make reference to existing international norms for regional distribution of countries"[4],

6. However, to settle some issues concerning allocations of countries and territories to ICANN's five geographic regions presented by the region-based selection of At Large Directors, in particular the treatment of persons from areas that are not countries, persons from these areas would be grouped together with the country of citizenship for that area. "Thus, a resident of Guadaloupe (an overseas department of France located in the Caribbean) would be grouped with Europe rather than Latin America/Caribbean[5]".

7. The ICANN Board directed the staff to assign countries to geographic regions on the basis of the United Nations Statistics Division's current classifications of "Countries or areas, codes and abbreviations," as revised 16 February 2000, and "Composition of macro geographic (continental) regions and component geographical regions," as revised 16 February 2000.

8. Accordingly the ICANN Bylaws define five regions. They are:
    I.   Africa,
    II. North America,
    III. Latin America/Caribbean,
    IV. Asia/Australia/Pacific and
    V.   Europe.

    Secondly, some territories in a physical/geographic area are assigned to ICANN Geographic Region on the basis of a secondary criterion; persons from an area that is not a country are grouped together with the country of citizenship for that area. The complete assignment of countries and territories

---

[2] http://www.icann.org/minutes/minutes-16jul00.htm
[3] http://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm
[4] http://www.icann.org/committees/gac/communique-14jul00.htm
[5] http://www.icann.org/minutes/minutes-16jul00.htm

to ICANN's Geographic Regions can be viewed at
http://www.icann.org/montreal/geo-regions-topic.htmurl.

9. This decision was subsequently endorsed at the 3 yearly review held in Montreal in June 2003[6].

10. As a result of the current definition of the Geographic Regions various different "regional structures" have been established within ICANN. These structures not only include the Geographical Regions but also include the "regions" used by the ASO/NRO[7], and the "regions" to which Regional Liaison Officers have been allocated by ICANN staff[8].

Balance of the paper

11. In the balance of this paper the concerns raised regarding the definition of the Geographic Regions will be described and their impact (Section B). In this section some the comments received have been taking into account, which also resulted in a reconsideration of the views of the Working Group. In the following section (Section C) potential options to resolve the concerns are offered. The first part of Section C deals with options to the ICANN Board in the framework of the ICANN review of Geographic Regions. The second part is describing options open to the ccNSO. In order to enable further discussion of the options by the ccNSO membership and other stakeholders, the working group makes two recommendations (Section D). In Annex A

---

[6] http://www.icann.org/minutes/minutes-26jun03.htm

[7] The five "regions" used by the Regional Internet Registries are:

AfriNIC –   Africa
APNIC –   Asia and Pcific
ARIN –   Canada, the United States, and several islands in the Caribbean Sea and North Atlantic Ocean
LACNIC –   Latin America and parts of the Caribbean
RIPE –   Europe, Parts of Asia and the Middle East

See http://aso.icann.org/rirs/index.html

[8] The "regions" for which ICANN Regional Liaison Officers have so far been appointed are:

Africa
Armenia. Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazrgyzstan, Moldova, Russia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine & Uzbekistan
Australasia/Pacific
Canada & the Caribbean
Europe
Middle East

See http://www.icann.org/general/staff.html

specific language for one of the Recommendations is proposed. Finally, in the same section (Section D) the consultation process is described, including a tentative time line and milestones.

B. The Concerns

Problems with current definition of the Geographic Regions

12. The present ICANN Geographical Regions are not the same as those defined by the UN or other existing international norm for regional distribution of countries.

13. UN Statistics Division defines its five regions as;

     I. Africa,
     II. Americas (consisting of *Latin America & the Caribbean* and *Northern America*. To complicate matters, in Note b/ to its table, the UN Statistics Office states, "The continent of *North America (003)* comprises *Northern America (021)*, *Caribbean (029)* and *Central America (013)*. In other words, according to the UN, both the Caribbean and Central America may be considered to be part of *Latin America & the Caribbean* or *North America,* presumably depending upon context),
     III. Asia,
     IV. Europe and
     V. Oceania (consisting of Australia & New Zealand, Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia).

14. It may be that ICANN staff, as directed by the Board, were trying to squeeze the UN Statistics Division's country allocation into the predefined ICANN Regions. Nevertheless, by doing so, the Working Group is of the opinion they invalidated the Board's reason for adopting the UN allocation in the first place, i.e. to avoid being involved in assigning countries to regions by adopting some independently prepared and authoritative list for this purpose.

15. Secondly, the criterion to assign certain territories to a specific Region based on the citizenship of a person – however useful at the time at-large directors were appointed to the Board by the at-large membership - has lost its meaning since 2003 at the conclusion of the evolution and reform process as initiated in 2002 by former President and CEO of ICANN. As of 2003 the ICANN Board no longer has At-Large directors. It is therefore unclear what the rationale is for maintaining the criterion of citizenship for the definition of the Geographic Regions as of 2003.

Impact of the current definition

16. Initially, the Geographical Regions appear to have been defined primarily as a means of balancing representation at the Board level. With the passing of time, the concept of international representation was broadened and applied to the regionalization of the ALAC, the ccNSO, the ASO and ICANN itself.

17. In the opinion of the Working Group the current definition is not only confusing to the individual, it makes it more difficult – particularly for smaller countries with limited resources - to be actively engaged in different aspects of ICANN. There are more meetings to attend, different people to know and different structures to understand. For example, ccTLD managers in the Middle East are by definition part of the Asian, Australian, Pacific Region. At the same time for the allocation of IP number resources, they rely on RIPE NCC, the Regional Internet Registry for Europe and the Middle East, and therefore are considered to be part of the European Region. If somebody from the Middle East would be elected through the ccNSO to serve on its Council or the ICANN Board, he or she would be considered to originate from the Asian, Australian Pacific Region. If elected through the ASO to serve on the ASO EC or the ICANN Board that same person would take a seat for the European Region.

18. If the citizenship criterion is applied as well the consequences are becomes even more complex and confusing. For example, representatives from Caribbean Islands are depend for IP Number Resources on either LACNIC (Latin America) or ARIN (North America). For ASO matters they are assigned either to Latin American Region or the North American Region. For ccNSO, and Nom Com matters they are sometimes considered to be part of the European Region. It is instructive to note that the GAC does not operate under a regional structure.

19. A number of ccTLD managers and Internet communities are dissatisfied with the present ICANN regional structure as they believe it adversely impacts their representation and participation in ICANN as a whole, and the ccNSO in particular as was presented during the ICANN Lisbon meeting (see: http://www.icann.unrealgraphics.net/meetings/lisbon/presentation-ccnso-members-b-27mar07.pdf)

Representational Issues

20. As a result of both internal debate within the Working Group and the public consultation amongst the ccNSO membership, it appears that there is general consensus that the present regional structure results in representational difficulties such as:

   • Within the ccNSO, candidates for Council must be nominated, seconded and voted in by Members from within their own region. In practical terms,

in order to gain such support, a candidate must be able to attend either main ICANN meetings or Regional meetings on a regular basis, and probably has to have views and interests (with respect to ICANN) that are shared by his constituency. The geographical remoteness of, for example, some Overseas Territories from the region of their mother country, or even of countries at the extremities of a large Region, makes these preconditions to election unlikely.

- Groups of countries that have strong affinity because of culture, language, political affiliation, etc, could find that their regional representative, elected by other interests, does not adequately represent their views.
- Other ICANN organisations, such as the ALAC, whose elections are similarly based upon ICANN's Geographic Regions may be encountering similar issues.

21. As assignment of some of the ccTLD to a Geographic Region is based on citizenship, it is unclear if it is citizenship of the Sponsoring Organization, Administrative Contact or Technical Contact. If it is based on citizenship of the natural person who fulfils the role of Administrative or Technical Contact and this person is citizen of another country or territory then to which Region is he or she assigned? Secondly, it is unclear if citizenship as criterion should be extended to encompass legal persons as well.

22. The Bylaws on membership of the ccNSO seek to redress one consequence of the definition of Geographic Regions: "For purposes of this Article, managers of ccTLDs within a Geographic Region that are members of the ccNSO are referred to as ccNSO members "within" the Geographic Region, regardless of the physical location of the ccTLD manager." However, this provision only solves specific implications of the Geographic Regions as defined. Situations as described above (Nr. xx), nor other effects associated with the citizenship criterion are covered by aforementioned provision.

Participation Issues

23. Whilst there is general consensus about the need to resolve the representational issues stemming from the present defintion of ICANN Geographc regional structure, the same is not true with respect to its impact upon participation in ICANN. Indeed, opinions seem to fall within one of two opposed camps; those that believe that Regions are relevant only to representation and have nothing to do with participation, and those that consider participation to be the important issue with representation being only a minor problem.

24. The first group believes that the degree of participation by any country is a direct reflection of the degree of interest in ICANN held by the individuals involved. Some are of the view that many in the Internet community, including ccTLD managers, consider the matters discussed by ICANN in general and the ccNSO in particular to be irrelevant to their day-to-day

operations. If they were interested, they would find a way to participate irrespective of the regional structure. Conversely, no "tinkering" with the regional structures will increase participation.

25. The alternative view is that participation is a concern for similar reasons to those for representation, but in this case, the reasons apply not just to ccTLD managers, but to entire local Internet communities. On the one hand, individuals from some jurisdictions can face unrealistic travel requirement, only to find little shared interest with members of the "home" Region or, on the other, attend a nearby regional meeting in a foreign language and with no "official" recognition. Whilst the degree of individual interest is an important factor, a better organised, meaningful regional structure is more likely to motivate individuals to participate, and will better support other outreach initiatives.

26. Even within the current ccNSO section of the Bylaws, it is clear that Regions impact more than representation. Clause 2 of Section 3 states:

> *"There shall also be one liaison to the ccNSO Council from each of the following organizations, to the extent they choose to appoint such a liaison: (a) the Governmental Advisory Committee; (b) the At-Large Advisory Committee; and (c) <u>each of the Regional Organizations described in Section 5 of this Article. These liaisons shall not be members of or entitled to vote on the ccNSO Council</u>, but otherwise shall be entitled to participate on equal footing with members of the ccNSO Council. …."*

Section 5 (Regional Organisations) states:

> *"The ccNSO Council may designate a Regional Organization <u>for each ICANN Geographic Region</u>, provided that the Regional Organization is open to full membership by all ccNSO members within the Geographic Region. …."*

27. Regional Liaisons are not members of the Council and are not entitled to vote. This therefore is not a "representational" issue. Yet the ccNSO can "designate" (whatever that means) only regional organisations that are tied to ICANN's Geographic Regions. It follows that ccNSO recognition and support will almost certainly be channelled to these "designated", ICANN Regions – based local organisations.

28. The above is not to say participation of ccTLD managers is not considered an issue by the members of the Working Group. It is only to say that there is no agreement if, or to what extent, the defintion of ICANN Geogragraphic Regions is a cause for the Participation issue. The Working Group is unanimous in its view that increasing participation in the ccNSO by ccTLD managers should be a major concern for the ccNSO. Current participants in

the ccNSO should endeavour ways to increase participation. However, recommendations to this effect are outside the scope of this Working group.

C. Options

Options for the ICANN Board

29. Because the Bylaws require a review of Geographical Regions every three years, and the last review was in 2003, the ICANN Board does not have the option of "doing nothing". The available options therefore are:

   (1) To pass a Board resolution that properly authorises the *status quo* with respect to Geographical Regions.

   Such a resolution is likely to be difficult to draft. It would either have to acknowledge that ICANN is creating its own definition of Geographical Regions, independent of any other international standard, or it would have to explain and explicitly authorise all deviations from the UN Statistics Office definition. Moreover, the present allocation of "areas that are not countries" is said to be based upon "citizenship" (albeit that it has been incorrectly applied in some instances), yet "citizenship" is an attribute of individuals, not areas.

   (2) To pass a Board resolution that authorises new or revised Geographical Regions. Because of the complexity of the issue, it is likely that the ICANN Board would wish to appoint a Working Group to study the issue and make recommendations prior to the Board making its determination.

Options for the ccNSO

30. From the recent ccNSO survey on Regions, it would appear that the majority of ccTLD managers who responded support the concept of a regional structure that will maximise ground level participation and representation in the ccNSO. The possible courses of action are:

   (1) To do nothing.

   (2) To start with a clean sheet of paper, and design a new regional structure that better meets the needs of the ccNSO.

   (3) To make minor, short-term modifications to the existing regional structure so as to remove some of the more obvious anomalies (e.g. Overseas Territories).

(4) To make a submission to the ICANN Board drawing attention to the concerns about the ICANN Geographical Regions that have been expressed by ccNSO members and, where possible and appropriate, suggesting potential solutions.

Option 1 – Do Nothing

31. Doing nothing will not resolve any of the issues that have been raised by ccTLD managers.   It is also apparent that the ICANN Board will have to take some action. If the ccNSO were to do nothing, it would be giving up the chance to make input to that process – whatever it may be. This option therefore is not recommended.

Option 2 – Design a New Structure

32. An alternative option would be to design a new regional structure for the ccNSO only, which is designed to maximise participation and representation, and is flexible enough to take into account the differences detailed above. However, undertaking such a task in advance of any action taken by ICANN as a whole may well be premature. It is therefore not recommended. A better approach would be to provide the ICANN Board with the Issues Paper recommended in Option 4.

Option 3 – Minor, Short-term Modifications

33. Although minor modifications to bring quick relief to some of the problem areas might be possible, or even desirable, in the short term, the underlying problems would remain and would undoubtedly come to the surface once more. The biggest concern is that the present regional structure has the effect of imposing a "one-size-fits-all" solution on large areas of the world and does not have the flexibility to take into account the language, cultural, political and economic differences that have a great impact upon work at the practical level.

34. Two such minor, short-term modifications were originally proposed for consideration.   They were:

Option 3a. Allowing a ccTLD within an area such as the Caribbean to choose whether it belongs to the LAC, NA or EU region for ccNSO purposes.

Option 3b. Facilitating the creation of sub-regional or inter-regional groups.

Following consultation, it appears that there is insufficient support to proceed with Option 3b as a short term measure in advance of any decision by

ICANN. This option is therefore withdrawn. On the other hand, general support has been received for Option 3a, an this is described more fully in the following paragraphs. An overview of the comments received is included in Annex B to this document.

35. Concern about mis-allocation of some "overseas territories" has been raised and discussed at the past two ccNSO meetings at least. In some cases it is clear that, even under ICANN's existing rules, errors in regional assignments have been made. Fairness suggests that such errors should be quickly corrected where it is within the ccNSO's power to do so. Given that the ICANN Regions review may provide a permanent solution to this problem, a temporary solution could be implemented by specifying specific procedures for self-selection of a Region.

36. According to clause 4 of section 4 of the Bylaws:

   "In cases where the Geographic Region of a ccNSO member is unclear, the ccTLD member should self-select according to procedures adopted by the ccNSO Council."

37. This implies the ccNSO (Members and Council) is able to define a procedure for self-selection, which would alleviate some of the concerns for the ccNSO itself without having to go through the process of a Bylaw change. No changes in the rules for election to the ccNSO Council would be required. However, whatever procedure would be defined (and suggested procedures and attached at Annex A), the underlying concern of lack of transparency for outsiders and newcomers to the ICANN environment as a result of the definition Geographical Regions will not be redressed.

38. An alternate view is that it is "dangerous" for the ccNSO to take unilateral action prior to a decision on regional structures being taken by the ICANN Board. It has also been pointed out that no elections to the ccNSO Council will take place for another 12 months (January 2008). Therefore there is no apparent need to take precipitous action. The counter argument is that it has already taken well over 12 months for the ccNSO to get to the present stage in its discussions. The full ICANN Regions Review could likely take much longer to reach conclusions and even longer to implement them. In any event, for the very small nations involved, the concern is not so much about representation (in practical terms, they too small to make any difference) but rather the feeling that their concerns are being ignored by the ICANN community and that "injustice" is being allowed to continue. This leads to disillusionment, and a lack of interest and participation.

Option 4 - Prepare a ccNSO Submission to ICANN's Regions Review

39. Many of the concerns expressed in this Discussion Paper have an impact that goes far beyond the ccNSO. They and their potential solutions may involve

the redefinition of ICANN's Geographic Regions themselves, in addition to the allocation of specific countries to those regions. It is therefore recommended that the ccNSO should prepare a submission to the ICANN Board for consideration as part of its Regions Review. This submission should present the views of the ccNSO membership, both for and against, with respect to changes to the regional structure. In particular, it should:

i.   Detail the concerns and potential solutions contained in this paper with respect to representational issues. Particular emphasis should be placed upon the need for flexibility. The concepts of national sovereignty and the application of common sense when allocating countries to regions should be incorporated into the submission.

ii.   Discuss, from the ccNSO perspective, the objectives that should be sought when designing an ICANN regional structure. For example, should it be simply to ensure the geographical diversity of elected representatives, or should the same structure be used to encourage local participation in ICANN? Where there is more than one such objective, it should specify if possible the recommended priorities that should be assigned to them. Where there is a divergence of view within the ccNSO, all such views and the reasons for them should be explained.

iii. If the ccNSO view is that there should (continue to be) more than one regional structure within ICANN, highlight what the consequences would be.

D. Recommendations and Proposed Procedures

40. Individual ICANN Board Members have requested the ccNSO's input on the Regions issue. Various ccNSO members have expressed concerns about the present regional structure. The ccNSO would therefore be failing in its responsibilities to ICANN and its membership if it did not make a submission on the subject, even if it were to be restricted to detailing the issues that have been raised, and the full range of concerns voiced by its membership. It is therefore strongly recommended that **Option 4 (Prepare a ccNSO Submission to ICANN's Regions Review)** be approved.

41. In addition, it is recommended that members consider approving the **Minor, Short-term Modification** proposed in **Options 3a.**

42. In the longer term, the ccNSO may wish to consider whether tying the designation of Regional Organisations to ICANN Geographical Regions (as is currently done in the Bylaws) is necessary or appropriate. As has been previous noted, such designation has no impact upon the composition of the

ccNSO Council. A more flexible approach might be to amend Section 5 of the Bylaws to read something like the following:

"The ccNSO Council may designate a local membership organization provided that the local membership organisation is open to full membership by all ccNSO members, and provided it has, and maintains, a membership of at least (say).ten ccTLD managers …."

43. Finally, it is recommended that ccTLD managers endorse the following procedures and time line for progressing this matter:

#	Action Step	Tentative Dates
a.	The ccNSO has conducted a survey of all ccTLD managers[9] and a summary of the results was presented at the ccNSO meeting in Sao Paulo[10].	Completed
b.	Consultation with the GAC has been conducted at ICANN's Lisbon meeting.	Completed
c.	The Working Group will revise the paper based on the comments received.	To be concluded 9 May
d.	Consultation of the ccNSO membership on the paper to seek further input and comments	14 to 28 May 2007
e.	Working group will adjust paper based on input received from membership	29 May to 1 June 2007 Completed
f.	Public consultation on paper which will include a second face-to face consultation of the GAC at the ICANN Puerto Rico meeting. The ALAC and ASO will be specifically be invited to give input	20 June to 9 July 2007
h.	Recommendation from membership to ccNSO Council to be discussed at the ICANN Puerto Rico meeting.	
i.	Advice of ccNSO Council to Board i.e. Resolution of ccNSO Council for procedure	Mid-July

---

[9] A fundamental problem is that changes in the regional structure are needed so as to encourage participation by those not already involved. But if you are not yet involved, you are unlikely to respond to a survey.

Unfortunately, there has been little input so far from the Arab States, and so their desire for their own region remains anecdotal for the moment.

Input from ccNSO regional organisations has been requested, but only the AfTLD Excom has so far responded. It is strongly of the view that the African Region should continue to cover the entire continent, and that this should include the Arab States situated in northern Africa.

[10] http://www.icann.org/meetings/saopaulo/archbold-ccnso-sp-05dec06.pdf

	for self-selection	
j.	ccNSO membership approval process of ccNSO Council decisions	23 July to 6 August 2007
k.	Submission of ccNSO Advice to Board	Tentatively 17 August 2007
l.	Implementation of ccNSO Council resolutions	17 August 2007

**Draft Procedures for the Self-Selection of ccNSO Regions
Under the Provisions of Clause 4 of Section 4 of the ICANN Bylaws**

1.   **Applicability**. These procedures are available only to those ccTLDs that:

   a.   are currently assigned to an ICANN Geographical Region on the basis of the citizenship criterion, and

   b.   are members of the ccNSO.

2.   **Options.**   The ccTLD may opt to join the ICANN Geographic Region with which the ccTLD Manager and the Government believe the country or territory has the closest geographic, language, cultural and economic ties.

3.   **Procedure.** The ccTLD manager is to submit a request, which must include a letter of support from the ccTLD government, for consideration by the ccNSO Council.

4.   **Limitations**. From the date that an application under these provisions has been approved by Council, no further applications from that ccTLD will be considered [for a minimum period of 5 years]. In the event the application has been approved by the Council the assignment to the ICANN Geographic Region only has affect with regard to matters relating to the ccNSO

Annex B
Consolidated overview of comments received.

Comments received on draft regions report

Respondent	Date	Concerns	Rec. 4	Rec 3A	Rec 3 B	Alternative	Comments
.CA (Bernie turcotte	22/5/2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	No		
.NU (Bill Semich)	22/5/2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
.NA (EL)	22/5/2007	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		If need a regions (debatable)
.JJ/ (Nigel Roberts	23/5/2007					Self-selecting regions in general	Response on comment
AFTLD (Paulos)	23/5/2007					No carving up of Africa	Comment made during ccNSO meeting, and confirmed in submission
.NO (Hilde Thumen	25/5/2007	Partial	after consultation and concensus specifically the GAC	after consultation and concensus		Alternative time lines, to allow broad consultation of other stakeholders in particular GAC	Limit to representa-tion. Balancing and participation Other core concepts
.ZA (Vika Msipane)	24/5/2007	Partial (discrepancies like Cayman Islands)should be addressed	Partial	Yes	No	No carving up of Africa	