
ICANN68 | Prep Sessions – Enhancing the Effectiveness of ICANN’s Multistakeholder Model – Next Steps
Tuesday, June 16, 2020 – 00:00 to 01:00 MYT

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, everyone. This is Eleeza again, from ICANN Org. I think we’re ready to begin the recording.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Eleeza. Thank you, everybody, for joining us at this prep week for ICANN68 where the webinar is focusing on the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model. The multi-stakeholder model is at the core of how we do things and it’s crucial that we keep it working in that way.

So, working together with you on this is something that the board is really eager about, and we look forward to the interaction. We want to remind everyone that we’re offering interpretation in French, Spanish, Portuguese, Arabic, Chinese, and Russian. For this, you need to use an app, and staff will provide more information about this service in the chatbox if you haven't found that information yet.

I urge you to take advantage of this opportunity to listen in and ask questions in your chosen language. We also have an opportunity for Q&A at the end of the presentation. This will be a first, to use this language service. I think we’ll use it much more over the weeks to come, also, in ICANN68, so it’s also good to try to make this work.

So, this webinar is to brief you, the community, on enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model next step document

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

that was published for public comment on June the 4th and is now open for 60 days – August 2nd.

The document that is out for public comment is a continuation of the work by the community to enhance the effectiveness that we started last year. It’s a priority for the ICANN Board. Matthew Shears and Mandla Msimang are the board’s shepherds in this.

It’s not a standalone initiative, as part of our holistic approach to evolve the multi-stakeholder model, and [this actually should be] recognized as part of that in the strategic objective for making the governance model work in a five-year strategic plan.

It’s important that, as our environment becomes more complex, our governance model evolves, too. So, with that, I’d like to toss to Matthew. Matthew, please, the floor is yours.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thank you, Maarten. I hope everyone can hear me well. I just wanted to add my welcome and to say how delighted Amanda and I are to be with you here, today.

A fantastic turnout to this prep session. Just a little bit of background on this, just going through this slide – the other slide, two. This is the set of issues that we’re going to cover with you today: how we’ve taken this process forward, enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model.

We’ll do a brief summary of the public comment that came in at the time of the year. We’ll talk about how we have approached trying to define and refine this process, and hopefully to make it fit within the broader context of the overall evolution of the multi-stakeholder model at ICANN, and talk about the various initiatives that are underway and how we see this particular component of it as addressing the gaps that remain.

And then, we’ll get a little bit into what we hope to gather in terms of input from the community in the part of the public comment that Maarten just referred to, and the timeline of what the next steps are.

We’re going to run through the slides and then open it up for discussion. So, if you have questions, either put them in the chat and we’ll be gathering them, or just hold on until the end and then we’ll take it from there.

Could we have the slide three, please? So, I think many of you are familiar with this. This comes from a specific objective in the Fiscal Year 2021-2025 Strategic Plan.

Well, there was a record that came out of the recognition that there was a need to evolve ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model of governance to look in particular at how we prioritize work, how we streamline processes, and a general sense that we need to evolve our multi-stakeholder model of governance to be more effective and more efficient.

This work, as you know, was started by Brian Cute. There were a number of in-person sessions that were held with the community over the past year and a half.

And at the end of the year, you saw that Brian, as the facilitator, synthesized the input from the community into a number of discussion areas and work areas. And that work plan was appended to the Fiscal Year 2021-2025 Operating Plan that was put out for public comment.

I think it’s important just to say a couple of things, here, before we actually get into the bulk of this. What we’ve tried to do, in many ways, is to, through ... Listening to the community is a part of the process.

So from the very beginning, the board has listened to the community. We recognized, I think, as the process that was going on, that what we really didn’t want to do was to create unnecessary work or to do anything that would further burden the community.

And what we’re presenting today, and what’s out for public comment, is very much a reflection of that. Just a couple of other quick points, and then I’ll just turn it to Mandla.

One of the things that we’re really trying to do is that we’ve taken the community input. We’re looking at how work is progressing as a whole; not only the work that we’re going to talk about here, but the bigger picture of how we evolve the multi-stakeholder model.

And what we’re doing is we really focused-in on some actionable areas where we believe there are gaps. And you’ll see those outlined in the

public comment, but what we’re really trying to do is look at the multistakeholder holistically, look at its evolution, and then find where we can fill the gaps and add rather than complicate or add to the overall work. Mandla, I don't know if you wanted to add a couple of comments here? Mandla may be muted.

MANDLA MSIMANG: I'm sorry. Can you hear me now?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Here we go. Yes. Loud and clear.

MANDLA MSIMANG: Thanks, sorry about that. Thanks, Matthew. I think I really just wanted to re-emphasize what you said about not creating significant new workstreams and trying to make processes easier through this multi-stakeholder model project.

So, instead, what we’re trying to do, and as you’ll see, is to make small adjustments to the existing work that lead to improvements with little or no added work aspect. So, we’re hoping that these small adjustments will help ICANN to serve [inaudible] more efficiently and effectively.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Mandla. Thank you. I think, now, what we’re going to do is we’re going to proceed with a more in-depth look at the genesis for

this work that we put out for public comment, now. I'm going to turn it over to Eleeza. Eleeza, over to you. Thanks.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Hi, Matthew. Thank you very much. I'm the strategic initiatives director with ICANN’s Multistakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives function, which many of you know by our shorthand of MSSI.

I'm speaking today on behalf of Theresa Swinehart, my boss, our senior vice-president who leads our function and is unable to join us today on the webinar. She sends her apologies.

So, I wanted to go over with you today, if we could go to the next slide ... Sorry about that. I have a small child at home you may be hearing. So, if I could go over a little bit on the process to date, as many of you recall, this process really kicked off back in February of 2019 with our former board chair, Cherine Chalaby, who led the effort and drew the attention to this project which really provided our work [around] developing the ICANN’s strategic plan for FY 2021-2025.

During the trend identification exercise that we held to help inform that strategic plan, it became clear that continued evolution of ICANN’s multi-stakeholder model was really a priority for the whole community.

That dialog continued throughout 2019 with cross-community sessions at every ICANN meeting, as well as at webinars and public

comment periods that we have, which are all independently facilitated, as Matthew mentioned, by Brian Cute.

That phase of work completed at the end of last year with the publication of a draft work plan in the draft five-year operating plan. Sorry. I seem to be having an audio issue. Thank you. So, the board reviewed the comment that we received on that draft work plan [inaudible]. Are you able to hear me? I'm sorry.

MARY WONG:

Eleeza, I think you cut out for a while because someone else had their microphone on, so you might need to repeat your last couple of sentences. Apologies.

ELEEZA AGOPIAN:

Thank you, and apologies for that. I hope this is clearer. I think I was speaking about the draft work plan. So, as I noted, that was published with the ICANN’s five-year operating plan at the end of 2019, and we received quite a few comments on that from the community, so thank you very much for that.

The board reviewed those comments and incorporated them into the revised work plan that we recently published and which we are discussing today.

In addition, Maarten and Göran met with the SOAC Leadership Group in June to provide them with an update on this work and the approach we’re taking in the revised work plan.

As at previous face-to-face ICANN meetings, this regular gathering of SOAC leaders with the board chair and the CEO provides a really helpful opportunity to keep the community updated on ongoing projects, and I understand that was a productive conversation.

If we could move to the next slide, please? So, as I mentioned before, there were quite a few comments from the community on the draft work plan, and the board heard those, and really took them to heart, and agrees that this is a holistic approach. It doesn't duplicate any work that's already underway but really harmonizes with existing work efforts.

So, what you see before you on this slide is a sample of the comments we received on the draft work plan. The comments you see here really reflect the range of sentiments that we received on the work plan.

We saw a shared belief that the work to enhance the effectiveness of our model is critical and that commenters also really agreed on the importance of prioritizing these issues so as not to overtax our community's already stretched volunteer time and resources.

Several commenters also agreed that many of the work areas proposed in the draft work plan were already being addressed by some existing projects that are underway in the community and within the Org. Can we go to the next slide, please?

So, as I mentioned in the public comment proceeding, we also asked the community to rank the six proposed work areas based on what

issues they felt were most pressing, which resulted in the prioritized list that you see before you in this order.

So, prioritization of the work, precision in scoping the work, and consensus were the top three issues, followed by complexity, culture, trust and silos, and roles and responsibilities. If we can go to the next slide, please?

So, the proposed work plan that you saw published last week now focuses on three high-priority work areas rather than the six that were originally proposed in the draft work plan.

We think it’s important to note that neither the community, nor the board, nor the Org have the resources to take on all six of those priorities. So, the three high-priority work areas were established using the input from the community provided during the public comment period.

In the work plan, which, hopefully, you’ll all get a chance to read during this public comment period, we focused-in on, as I noted, prioritization, scoping the work, and consensus, representation, and inclusivity.

The work plan itself describes the work underway across the ICANN ecosystem that addresses each of these areas and identifies some gaps in those work areas that are related to evolving the multi-stakeholder model. It also compares the current work that we have to those identified gaps.

Finally, the work plan suggests some actions to address each of those gaps and the participants who could help to address them, which we’ll get into on some of the next slides.

You’ll note that there are three work areas that were not included in this work plan that came from that original list of six we just looked at a couple of slides back. Those were complexity, culture, trust and silos, and roles and responsibilities of the board, Org, and the community.

Those three issues may be revisited in the future as progress on the three priority issues is considered. And in fact, progress made on these three priority areas may also help to deliver some benefits to address the remaining areas.

So, for example, community work to address prioritization may have an impact further on down the road on culture, trust, and silos. We know that some community groups have also expressed an interest in leading efforts on these remaining work areas, and the board welcomes that effort, should those groups want to continue that work. Can we move to the next slide, please?

So, as I noted earlier, the work plan captures each of the existing projects or processes underway. The diagram that you see on this slide demonstrates how many of those projects overlap across the three priority areas.

The board has made clear that this effort should not further tax our hardworking community. To that end, it is apparent the community is already doing much work to address the priorities you have identified.

For example, both in the public comments and throughout last year’s community dialog, the changes proposed by the GNSO’s PDP 3.0 process have really been cited quite often as an example for how to enhance our multi-stakeholder model.

As a result, a work plan that’s open for public comment now builds on these areas and proposes either some enhancements to this work or a few new efforts to address gaps where perhaps the existing work may not be sufficient to address each of their priority topics.

So now, let’s talk a little bit about the gaps that we have identified. I could move to the next slide. Thank you. So, in the first area, prioritization of the work, and really across all of the work areas ... And I should say we took a look at the work that’s already underway and mapped it against these work areas, and looked for areas where small modifications, or perhaps some additions, would add incremental values. These are what we’re calling the “gaps” in these areas.

What we’ll go over in the next three slides is some proposed actions that could be taken to address those identified gaps. In many cases, some of these actions are work that’s already going on that you may have seen referenced in the Venn diagram a few slides before, and what is being proposed is really an enhancement to that work.

So in this area, we noted two gaps – one in community-developed processes for prioritization and retiring work. In here, there are two proposed actions that build off of existing work with some enhancements, one which would ask for community groups to create their own priority list each year and share it across the community, and another to institute regularly scheduled touchpoints with the community, the Org, and the board to agree on prioritization of work and what should be retired.

Another gap is on community alignment on cost management and budget allocations. Here, we suggest, again, additions to some existing work on creating a standardized process for community leaders to prioritize work across all groups, and to begin engaging earlier on the budget between ICANN Org and the community.

If we can go to the next slide? So, in precision and scoping the work, we noted a gap here on maintaining an appropriate scope of work in various settings throughout ICANN as a whole.

So here, we have proposed several activities that build off of existing work. One would have the Org brief review teams on bylaws-mandated operating standards. Another is to fully leverage those operating standards requiring timelines, work plans, and a scope to be set when a review begins, as well as documenting review teams’ agreement with those standards.

Another is to create a process for sharing review teams’ defined scope of work and periodic updates with SOAC leaders so they can follow

that progress. And finally, have review teams prioritize their recommendations by high, medium, or low.

And finally, if we can go to the last slide? Sorry, the next slide. I said last slide. Thank you. On consensus representation and inclusivity, we noted a gap in resolving impasse. Here, we have two proposed new actions, as well as one enhancement.

And then, in the area of “new,” it’s really building off of the work that has been done in the GNSO, and the consensus playbook, and PDP 3.0 to identify where there might be principles that could be useful to other groups within the ICANN ecosystem.

And another existing action is to increase usage and awareness of ICANN Learn to better engage a wider swathe of our community. With that, I think I’ll turn it back over to Matthew and we can turn to the next slide. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Yeah. Thank you very much, Eleeza. That’s a lot of text to get through. Thank you. So, I just wanted, before actually touching on this slide, to re-emphasize a couple of points that Eleeza has made going through these slides.

As we have said a couple of times so far, what we really took to heart in this process was the desire to build on the processes that are already underway. And you perceive by that diagram that we had up there how we have matched the various initiatives and tried to identify where there may be gaps.

For example, we have taken into account in this process the recommendations of ATRT3 and a range of other processes that are review processes or streamlining the prioritization work that’s ongoing across the community.

And what we have tried to do here, and what we really would like to have the community’s input on, is, have we identified the right gaps? And the proposals that we’re making in this document, are they the right direction to be going to address those gaps?

And really, the focus of this is about enabling the work, hopefully making it more effective and more efficient if we can agree on these gaps and identify what actually needs to be done to address the challenges there.

On this slide, one of the things that became very apparent as we were going through this process is that this particular initiative that was kicked off and facilitated by Brian is a part of a much bigger challenge that we face that was identified in the strategic plan, and that’s really the evolution as a whole of the multistakeholder.

So, what became clear was that we need a mechanism. And again, we’re looking to the community for help on this. We need a mechanism to be able to understand and make an assessment as to how we believe this evolution is going.

One of the things that we talked a lot about was this can’t be seen as kind of a one-off. This isn’t a review with a defined period of time, and then the recommendations, and then they’re done.

In many ways, this is more complex and it’s actually a little bit more ongoing. You’ll recall that, as a part of the strategic plan, when we said that we needed a review of the strategic plan to ensure that it was up to date and they reflected current trends and things like that.

And in many ways, this evolution of the multi-stakeholder model is the same kind of animal. It’s hard to actually say, “When has it evolved enough?” It’s going to be an ongoing process.

So, what we’re looking for here is, really, your inputs into what we’re calling an evaluation mechanism, or an assessment mechanism, and what that would look like, and what’s the timeline, or how would it be undertaken?

One of the ideas was, of course, that we would link it to the strategic plan and its review, and that seems to be a relatively reasonable time period within which to assess how things have progressed.

But again, your assistance in figuring out what that should look like is really key to actually knowing whether or not we’re evolving the multi-stakeholder model. Okay. And of course, that raises the big question which is, how do we measure success? How do we know we’re progressing on that evolution path? Okay. Next slide, please?

So, there are three parts we have kind of touched upon, already. There are really three parts we’re seeking your input on. One, this evaluation challenge that we face. How do we assess the entirety of the work that’s going on that evolves the multi-stakeholder model?

In particular, in these particular gaps that we have identified, are they the right gaps? Are there other gaps that are missing in these priority areas?

And the third part, which is really, as we have on the side, there, the remaining work areas, it’s not that we are saying that they are less important. But when doing the analysis and the prioritization, we felt that, as was mentioned earlier on, if we managed to make progress in the three priority areas then that would have a very positive knock-on effect in the other three areas that were identified as a part of the process that Brian led.

So, the remaining areas are there, and we want input on what additional activities the community would like to address those challenges. And therefore, your thoughts on that are very welcome. What’s missing? Are there other things that are missing that would help significantly evolve the model?

And then, the next slide, please. So, what’s the timeline? So, we have just put this out for public comment, recognizing that there’s an awful lot going on and that times are a little different these days. We have extended the public comment, so you’ll see that it actually goes through to the beginning of August.

There is, obviously, ICANN68 coming up, and we wanted, really, to see this issue of the evolution of the multi-stakeholder model before ICANN68 because there may well be learnings from this new virtual model that we’re living with at the moment that might inspire

thoughts on how do we evolve the multi-stakeholder model going forward.

And as you can see there, we’ve got the timeline in terms of the months, we’ve got the trajectory, which is in green, on the paper itself, and then, underneath that, we give a couple of examples of ongoing work that is very much a part of the multi-stakeholder model as a whole. Okay.

I think that is it for this slide, if I'm not mistaken. I think what we’re going to do now is open up the floor to the comments. As Maarten said in the beginning, we have live interpretation.

If you would like to ask a question in one of those languages, please unmute yourself and introduce yourself with your name and affiliation, and indicate which language you would like to speak in.

There was one question that we wanted to just kick things off with that came in, that was pre-submitted, which was a question around three particular issues that this question was raising, which is points around recruitment, representativeness, and consensus, and what strategies are going to be used to achieve those or to move that forward.

And in a way, I think that two of those, recruitment and representativeness, are very much dealt with by the fellowship program, NextGen ICANN program, and a range of other outreach and promotion activities that are ongoing, largely led by ICANN Org and the ICANN community as we go through the year.

The second one, which is really about how do we build this kind of scope, is really the representativeness one. There, I think, is where the ICANN Org, and its regional offices, and the Global Stakeholder Engagement team really play a critical role in ensuring that that representativeness is there and there is outreach going on in those different regions. As you all know, there are offices in Brussels, Istanbul, Montevideo, and Singapore, etc.

The third part, which is obviously the question of consensus, is one of the very issues that we’re trying to grapple with, here. So, as Eleeza said, there are a number of resources that are available to the community, such as the consensus playbook was published recently, that we’re very much hoping that will become seen as a part of a package for encouraging or bringing about consensus in the various processes.

Okay. Let me end it there for the slides. Let’s see what questions we’ve got coming up. I’d like to make it a little bit of a dialog. So, Maarten, Mandla, Eleeza, feel free to jump in. I don’t want to be answering all of these myself. Does somebody want to read the questions, and then we can see who would like to ...?

DIANA MIDDLETON:

Hi. Thank you, Matthew. A first question we have is from Nadira Al-Araj: “Why under the current stakeholder model community leaderships or members are allowed to belong to too many different SOs and ACs?”

MATTHEW SHEARS: That’s a great question. Thank you very much. It’s an interesting one. It didn’t come up in our particular review and our work on this in terms of identifying the priorities and what gaps could need to be filled, but it’s certainly an interesting question.

As far as I'm aware, but maybe somebody else can confirm it, I don’t believe that cross-membership is limited in any way by the bylaws. I believe it’s dependent upon the charters of the SOs and ACs, but somebody else could probably chime in on that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Matthew, that is correct. Just in case, this is one of those things that if it isn’t changed it should be through a community process, but it can be the current situation as far as I'm aware of.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten. I see Chris noted that he was not aware that people were belonging to multiple SOs or A ACs But a good question. Thank you for that. What’s the next question?

DIANA MIDDLETON: Thanks. The next question is from Jeffrey Neuman: “The report assumes that achieving consensus can be accomplished through the consensus playbook and PDP 3.0. It sort of brushes aside the notion of providing incentives to compromise and not rewarding those that

stick to their siloed position. What work can be done to provide these incentives?”

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Great question. Yes. I don't think that we're assuming that the issue of consensus will be solved slowly through the consensus playbook and PDP 3.0. I think, rather, we're seeing that as ways of encouraging people to think about consensus.

But I agree with the comment that you made that there needs to be a much greater focus spent on, how do we incentivize compromise, as was suggested? And those are exactly the kinds of things that we're looking for in the public comments, so please bring ideas on that to the public comment. Thank you. Next question.

DIANA MIDDLETON:

Hi. The next question is from Javier Rúa-Jovet: “Hi to all. Is there a simple list of bullets of specific proposals and/or initiatives to enhance the multi-stakeholder model? A link perhaps?”

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Well, yes, but it's kind of in the paper itself, Javier. I completely understand the desire to have that made, perhaps, just into a simple list. Hopefully, it comes out well enough in the paper that's up for comment, but please do look at that.

If you look at the work plan that we have in the document, you'll see that there are specific proposals in there but we're really looking for

additional ones, in addition to your thoughts on the ones that are being proposed. I just also wanted to remind you that you can raise your hand in the chat if you wish, and speak, so please do make the most of that. Next question?

DIANA MIDDLETON: Hi. The next question is from Harish Chowdhary: “What are the steps taken to enhance the multi-stakeholder participation/model on Universal Acceptance?”

MATTHEW SHEARS: I think I got the gist of that. Is the audio better now? Okay. So, can people still hear me? Because it’s gone a bit, the sound.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay, fine. And as I said, Maarten, Mandla, jump in, please. The Universal Acceptance is an initiative that’s part of ICANN’s operating plan a domain name part of the strategic plan. So, in a way, it’s accounted for there. So, hopefully that addresses part of that concern.

But again, if there are specific things that you believe should be incorporated that relate to that as part of this process, then please do suggest. But I think you have to look at the strategic plan/the operating plan for specific activities in that regard.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Mandla, please go ahead.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yep.

MANDLA MSIMANG: If I could just add that the paper doesn't really try to single out any particular projects, so Universal Acceptance wouldn't be addressed directly in that one. But what we're trying to do is make suggestions that can be applied to multiple communities and different workstreams. So, I think it is addressed inherently, but not directly.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Mandla. Okay. Any questions? Any hands up? I don't see any hands up at the moment.

DIANA MIDDLETON: Matthew, the next question is from Shiva ... Upadhyay? Sorry. "What strategy is ICANN planning to adopt to increase non-English-speaking people in ICANN activities?"

MATTHEW SHEARS: Does someone else want to take that? I'm happy to, but I'm going to catch my breath.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yep. I'm happy to take that. To increase non-English-speaking participation, to facilitate that is, of course, done by translations. I think that we are also finding a way to do that even in virtual environments - for instance, through the [aspect] is now truly serving six languages.

Overall, the strategic and operating plan must have multiple ... Has local potential for engagement efforts – also original, also in different languages. And the earlier mention, projects from Universal Acceptance, is just one of those where it’s demonstrated in excellence, I think.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten. I understand, also, that the new website, the ITI enhanced website, will also provide better access to translated materials to help. Hopefully that will contribute, as well.

DIANA MIDDLETON: The next question is from Avinash Sood: “What is the criteria to include any language in ICANN activities?”

MATTHEW SHEARS: Again, I’ll look to my fellow presenters. But as far as I'm aware, I'm not sure ... Are we talking about languages? We do that through ... Maarten, did you want to take that? I thought, maybe ...

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Oh, it’s pretty straightforward. Ideally, we would want to serve all languages, and that is virtually impossible. So, there is a language services policy, and we keep to that. In that way, we try to serve as much as the community needs, as is realistically possible. So, it’s the language services policy that you need to look at with this.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten. Next question? Not seeing any hands, still.

DIANA MIDDLETON: The next question is from Jeffrey Neuman: “We talk about increasing non-English languages, which is commendable, but these translation services have never been available in policy development processes, which is the heart of what ICANN is supposed to be facilitating. Are there any efforts to get translation services for the policy working groups, as well?”

MATTHEW SHEARS: Maarten, Mandla?

MANDLA MSIMANG: I just wanted to comment. I think that the language services team will get engaged in this work and I think that the comments that are being raised around the importance of people being able to communicate in these processes, especially the policy processes, was critical. So, I think we’ll take it up. It might be something, also, good to submit as a

public comment. But I think that we’ll engage the language [there is still on].

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Mandla. So, a good couple of comments in the chat, as well, about that this is an issue with a topic that’s broader than just the working groups. Next question, please?

DIANA MIDDLETON: The next question is from Marita Moll: “In the two years of discussions, 21 issues were distilled to six issues. We now have three. How can we avoid not dropping off the last three, which are just as important?”

MATTHEW SHEARS: No, it’s a great question. Thanks, Marita. We’re not dropping them. As you’ll see in the paper that’s up for public comment, we either reflected the prioritization based upon the public comments, and also on where we felt that there could be a significant accreted value to making process on those three.

It’s our intention to drop them, and that’s exactly the reason why, as I mentioned, we’re really looking for further thoughts on how we can make progress in those other areas.

It’s just that, when we were looking at it as a whole and trying to match it up against a bigger picture, as you saw in that diagram, we felt that prioritization, which was largely the one that would give us the most value going forward in the immediate term, and where we

could make progress. But I don't think there's any intention to drop the others, so we very much welcome input on those. Thanks.

DIANA MIDDLETON:

Thank you. The next question is from Chokri Ben Romdhane: “Did the work plan take into account revealing working group outputs such as ATRT3 outputs?”

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Yes, very much so. Basically, we went through a process of understanding how the various processes that are underway at the moment, so ATRT3, the streamlining work, prioritization work, the various reviews, how they would be contributing to some of the key issues or concerns that have arisen over the past couple of years, or indeed before, about how the multi-stakeholder model could be made more efficient and effective.

And so, we did take those into account. We have looked at what ATRT3 is suggesting and recommending and taken those into account, but I think, perhaps, Maarten wants to add to that.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yes. In fact, before I became chair I was also the board's liaison to ATRT, and ICANN testing pilot at multiple moments. Also, Brian reported back to ATRT and listened to the ATRT team that was working on their recommendations. So, at every moment, he's tired to coordinate this as much as possible. So, rather than do double work

without knowing, we clearly coordinated that work, so it’s mutually informed.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten. I do want to just point out, again, that the ATRT3 recommendations are part of the considerations, and we saw that, I think, in this timeline slide. Thanks, Maarten. Okay. Next question, please?

DIANA MIDDLETON: Yes. The next question is from Jeffrey Neuman: “With the recent reorganization, where does improving the multi-stakeholder model fall within ICANN Org’s responsibilities?”

MATTHEW SHEARS: I’m sure somebody from Org might want to comment to this, but I understanding was that there is no less of a prioritization for this particular piece of work. But maybe Eleeza or somebody?

ELEEZA AGOPIAN: Hi, Matthew. Thanks. Yes. So, I am part of the Multi-Stakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives team, MSSI. We have been leading this work from the Org side since last year, even with Theresa’s new responsibilities in the combined MSSI-GDD space where, now, we’ll continue to lead this work until the work plan itself moves into the implementation phase. I hope that’s helpful. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Eleeza. Another question?

DIANA MIDDLETON: The next question is from Susan Payne: “Regarding ATRT3, I noted that when you developed the “next steps” document you were relying on draft recommendations, for example on reviews. But the final recommendations differ greatly from the draft recommendations. How will you take that into account?”

MATTHEW SHEARS: So, this has been an ongoing process over the past couple of months, and we have been tracking very carefully what has been coming out of ATRT3. Obviously, as a part of the process, the board has to consider the final recommendations, and it’s part of this responsibility, and we’ll take action on the final report from ATRT3.

And so, insofar as those comments may come in and suggest something different with the ways of approaching these challenges, then, obviously, we will take those into account.

And I think, also, it’s important—and Susan, thank you for the question—to recognize that we have this extended public comment period, so it gives us time to understand and adapt to, if necessary, where these various other initiatives are and which direction they go in. Thanks. Do we have more questions?

DIANA MIDDLETON: Yes. There’s a comment from Judith Hellerstein: “While we are not dropping the other three issues, they seem to have lost priority, and that is really sorry to hear.”

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yeah. Judith, understood. I think as I’ve said, we’re not dropping them. We were just trying to find a way forward that would not overly burden the community. We felt that if we moved on all of these, which would not necessarily have been reflective of the bulk of the public comment, that might have added further work to the community that, perhaps, at this particular time, would not have been wise.

But as I said, I think in response to ... I think it was Marita’s comment, we’re really keen to have comments on these other issues. And if there are parts of the community that want to take forward addressing some of those issues, then we’d like to hear about it. Thanks. Anyone else want to add?

MANDLA MSIMANG: Thanks, Matthew. I just wanted to add that I think Judith’s point is a good one. But also, what we took into account is that, in addressing the top three that we have identified, we hope that we might also kind of narrow the scope of the rest and address them in the process.

But we’re really welcome to more input on that. We’re trying to, as Matthew said, reduce the workload and make sure that we have a manageable process and we can actually measure the outcomes at the end.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Mandla. I think we have some more questions. What’s next?

DIANA MIDDLETON: Yes. The next question is from Anne Aikman-Scalese: “A consensus playbook indicates that it’s important to limit the number of participants in the PDP Working Groups in order to enhance effectiveness and work more quickly and efficiently.”

“How does the work plan for the MSM model propose to address this issue when individuals have expressly been included as stakeholders and Internet policy apart from the existing constituencies and recognized stakeholder groups?”

MATTHEW SHEARS: Would anyone like to take that?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Well, simply, it’s not for us to limit participation. And also, the multi-stakeholder model evolution [paper] as it is doesn't have all the answers yet. This is one of the things that it really needs to look into. Our first point of attack is the GNSO’s PDP 3.0, which does allow alternate models of policy participation. But it’s really part of the evolution and this is what we need to go through together.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Maarten. Okay. What’s next?

DIANA MIDDLETON: The next question is from “Nouar Morocco”: “ICANN is mandated to act in accordance with its bylaws/principles, especially the diversity, like using multi-languages. Why has ICANN never tried to respect this principle within group activities? There is no initiative.”

MATTHEW SHEARS: Well, we certainly always act in accordance with our bylaws. And as you noted, one of the third of those top three is all about inclusivity. So, if you have suggestions or would like to raise that as an issue, please do bring it in as a part of the public comment. Sorry, Maarten. Go ahead.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I mean, inclusivity is a top priority and, of course, we tried to address it in the best possible ... But also, we’re limited in what we can do. It’s part of prioritization, as well. Language services do not come for free, but for sure, it’s the ultimate priority for this. More can be done.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten.

DIANA MIDDLETON: Sorry. The next question is from Donna Austin: “Given ICANN will not host another face-to-face meeting for at least nine months, how will this effort be prioritized and progressed?”

MATTHEW SHEARS:

The board is very committed to continuing this work and to progressing this work, and we’re very cognizant of the challenges that a virtual meeting format poses.

But at the same time, our desire to see the model evolve and to progress, I think, is something that has to be seen as a community priority, as well. So, despite the current situation that we’re in, we are really committed to making progress on this.

And certainly, the dynamic is slightly different now, but if there are ways that you believe that we can progress this work in more fully while living in this somewhat virtual world, we’d certainly welcome those inputs.

And I would note that there is a strategy for returning to face-to-face meetings, a phased strategy that has been shared with the SOAC leader, and there will be broader community discussion around that.

So hopefully, these things will start to gel and to make sense. I mean, I think it’s important that these priorities remain top of mind, and we’re committed to that. Certainly, it’s a part of the strategic plan. We’re committed to evolving of the multi-stakeholder model. So, that’s probably as good an assurance as I can give you. Maarten, you maybe want to add?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Indeed. Importantly ... Let’s see. Where were we? Sorry. So, yeah. I just wanted to point out that, next Thursday at, I think, 5 AM UTC, there will be a community-broad session on this, as well, where we talk about the phased strategy to return to face-to-face meetings.

It’s clear we need to work toward that. It will not be just from nothing to everything, virtual to fully face-to-face, with the virtual aspect. So, please join us for that one, as well. This is something we need to tackle together.

None of the reasons why we did go back to three priorities rather than the six was, actually, that we were already aware of these difficulties of being able to address this today under COVID circumstances.

So I think, by prioritizing and putting our focus on a few things, we can still progress things while we wait for things to clear up, and be able to address things in a broader community perspective. But for the face-to-face meeting development, returning to that, please join us on Thursday at 5 AM UTC next week.

So, the last thing is I would hope somebody would ask a question in one of the other languages by voice so we can hear how well this amazing linguistic system works.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten. Do we have any volunteers?

DIANA MIDDLETON: Hi. Just before we get to that, I wanted to read two more comments from the chat. One was from Marita Moll: “I think the community needs to know that all six priorities will stay in focus and on the table. There is no evolution if that does not happen.”

And the next comment is from Jeffrey Neuman: “Anne has pointed out an inherent conflict in the policy process in achieving consensus. On the one hand, we are striving to increase participation. On the other hand, too much participation makes it difficult to achieve consensus on anything. This also ties hand-in-hand to the incentives to compromise.”

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, both. Great comments. We’re actually running out of time so we’ll take them on board. Please do make them as a part of your input into the public comment. We’re still waiting for a volunteer to try the language services. It may not happen.

Maarten, just before I turn it back to you to close, I just wanted to say thank you very much to everybody who has participated and to the excellent questions. Please do bring your thoughts, proposals, suggestions to the public comment, and let’s keep this front of mind. Maarten, over to you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much for this, Matthew, and the whole team for preparing this. This work is ongoing in circumstances that [we weren’t expecting to be in] a half year ago. Let’s continue to work on this

together in the best possible way. Thank you, all, for your interest for one of the first ICANN68-related meetings, with more than 150 people.

Please do also benefit from the amazing translation service we have in future events. I really ask you to benefit from that to the fullest, because if you have the tools and they’re not used, that would be a shame, too, and I see there is a lot of interest in having this community supported by being able to use their own languages.

So, with that, I hope to see you all in some of the upcoming sessions this week or next week during ICANN68 virtual. Thank you, everybody. The meeting is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]