HELSINKI – Cross-Community Session: Workload Scheduling and Management
Thursday, June 30, 2016 – 15:15 to 16:45 EEST
ICANN56 | Helsinki, Finland

CHAIR SCHNEIDER: The next session that will take place here is the cross-community session about workload issues. I'm trying to lead that one. I would like to ask GAC members who have been sitting in this room before to maybe free some seats or indicate where there are free seats so that non-GAC members can also sit around the room so that we have a mixture of -- I try to avoid that we have the governments in the front and the rest in the back because this is not how we should look like or sit like. Thank you. We'll start in two minutes.

All right. Please take your seats. We are starting.

Okay. This next session is another cross-community session about an issue that is a challenge for many people in the GAC, but from what we hear also from other people, and I would like those who would like to talk to do that outside and let the others sit down and contribute to the session that we are about to begin. Thank you very much.

Thank you. Okay. So the goal of this session is to brainstorm about ideas to somehow make the workload at ICANN more

digestible and manageable for everybody who's suffering under the workload.

So there are some elements that we could think about and discuss, and ideas about what could be done to make this workload problem less of a challenge.

One of these elements -- these are just -- this is just food for thought, so I'll just throw it in and then I hope that we'll have a discussion on whatever we come up with.

And with regard to the microphones, they are -- the microphones that will be running around, normally they are muted, so if you get the microphone and then the sound does not come immediately, that doesn't mean that the microphone is not working. So just talk and then the sound will come up. So you don't have to hit the microphone or do things like that to see whether it's working. They are working, but they are muted unless the particular number will be turned on and then you will be heard.

This is just a logistical issue.

So some of the ideas that, in consultation with others, we have been able to come up with is questions like the following: Would it be helpful if there was a planning with annual objectives on certain key issues identified by the ICANN community, ideally

based on the longer-term planning tools that ICANN has developed and that are validated by the community, which is the multiyear strategic plan, the operating plans?

So would it be useful for people to be able to prioritize and plan their -- the distribution of their use of their resources if ICANN would do an annual planning of things that they would like to achieve or discussions that -- issues that they would like to have solved in a particular year, whether it's a calendar year or fiscal year, whatever, but to allow for people to be able to plan a little more?

And that may help also to estimate the necessary resources that one would think could be needed to discuss and decide on a particular issue. And this planning -- of course if this planning would be introduced, there would need to be feedback loops and reporting about where we are this year, to what extent we would have achieved the objectives of one year, to what extent things would need to be reported to next year and so on and so forth.

That is one element, one idea that would be interesting to hear your views on whether you think this would be useful.

That would be the precondition, to some extent, or go in line with prioritization of issues. Maybe we do not have to take all decisions at the same time. Maybe some decisions are more

urgent while others can wait a little longer, so if there's a feeling that there are not enough resources to diligently deal with all the issues that people in the community may want to discuss, that we would try and find a process in ICANN to agree on priorities for a particular year or for a particular time period or just a order that they should be first, and once we resolve that, we resolve something else.

So the question of reducing the parallel work streams that there are to some more urgent or more key ones compared to others that may come later is something that keeps coming up, at least in the GAC, as one potential solution to this workload problem.

And another element is of a slightly different kind but it's also something that keeps consuming unnecessary resources, in the view of many. It is that a better accessibility of the work streams and easier access on the Web site, better signaling of papers, in a sense, who is issuing a paper to whom, a clear reference to the process that this paper is part of a discussion, explanation of acronyms that you know if you see something that whether this is of relevance to you or not, whether this is the latest document because it has a date or a version number on it. All these small things and more user-friendly guidance on the Web site to find out what are the ongoing work streams throughout ICANN and also in each silo, so that attempts would be made to reduce the time, in particular, for the non-insiders, for those who have

limited resources, that they would more easily find access to a particular work stream that they are interested in.

That is another element that some people have brought up that should be discussed.

These are things that could be done on ICANN level.

Also, the question, can cross-constituency coordination and reporting be improved in order to facilitate and simplify interaction between the silos? We'll hear, probably in the next session, some of the experiences that people made with the discussions here where we had a lot more cross-constituency interaction, so this is also linked to this experience.

And then another element, of course, is the -- which is an ongoing discussion in several places in this organization, a lot of the work is based on volunteer resources that are also limited. They are -- there's a question of the sustainability of the volunteer model and so on and so forth.

I would propose that we do not concentrate on this because this has been and is being discussed in several other places. My proposal would be to concentrate more on the -- things like the issues that I mentioned at first, and the whole thing has two levels. One is planning prioritization and so on on ICANN level where all constituencies would need to agree that we focus on

this first and then that -- first that has priority -- this has priority over this. And the same could or should be applied also in the silos, that for those who suffer in their particular silos, that there can be annual planning in the silos and maybe a higher prioritization in the silos. But of course this is independent -- interdependent because if something is priority for ICANN, you somehow probably also need to deal with this in a silo.

I'll stop here for the time being. I hope that you will contribute with your thoughts and ideas.

Maybe you think there's no workload issue at all, that everything is smooth and easy. Maybe you share the concerns that I've expressed that have been articulated in the GAC and with others.

Yes. The floor is open.

I need a pen to do it. Let's take microphone number 4 first, please.

CHUCK GOMES: Hi. This is Chuck Gomes from the Registry Stakeholder Group. These are all good ideas on the screen but they're extremely difficult to do in a very, very diverse community. Let me just pick on one to start with, prioritization.

Prioritization assumes that we can all agree on the priority. Now, I think we had two examples recently where we did, the IANA transition and the stewardship -- excuse me, and the accountability. But that doesn't happen very often in our community. We all have different priorities, and that's legitimate. The ccNSO has different priorities than the GNSO. The ASO has different priorities. The GAC has different priorities.

The chances of us successfully prioritizing the average issues that we're dealing with is very low in my opinion, and I happened to go through that for a couple years in the GNSO. Even within the GNSO, we're so diverse that really coming up to an agreement on priorities is very difficult. That doesn't mean we shouldn't try because there will be times when we can, but let's just realize that these aren't easy solutions.

Even planning. Of course, we want to plan and we want to do that. But our environment is so dynamic and changing, and we set out work plans and we have to continually adjust them. That's part of the model that we're in. I'm not trying to be pessimistic.

The one thing I'll say that probably will help us more than anything else is to increase the number of volunteers. And that's not an easy task either. But our workload isn't declining, and we need more volunteers so we can spread out the workload. Now,

that's going to involve training, mentoring, et cetera. But in my opinion, that's probably the most effective thing we can do. That's still very challenging. Thanks.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Chuck. If it was easy, it probably would have been done. So I think we are all with you.

[Laughter]

That doesn't mean we need to try.

With regard to volunteers, that's difficult for governments, as you probably understand, because we can't just ask for people in the street to work for us. That needs a little bit of preparation.

Olga from Argentina.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chair. And fully agree with Chuck in his comments and the diversity.

I would like to make some comments about the work -- about the Web site, the ICANN Web site. I've been around ICANN for more than ten years. And I've been seeing different stages of the development of the Web site. I know it's a Web site with a lot of information, which is perfect.

There was a time that you could search for words and it worked perfectly. And for me that was fantastic. It was -- it made my life very easy to go through the Web site. I am fine. Thanks. That is gone. I don't know what happened. There was a time that it was restructured, rechanged, and I don't know. And that for me -- it takes a lot of time.

Another comment about the Web site is when we review the public comment documents, it is not easy. It's difficult to find it. And once you find them, then you have to open document by document to review all the comments that are being made. And that takes at least for me a lot of time.

So if that could be structured in perhaps in a Web form and also the Wikis are difficult to follow and to find the information in, that would help. ICANN is not my only activity in my work. So anything that makes my time easier and my life easier with the Web site, that could be extremely helpful. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Maybe we could do a straw poll interim. Who has a life outside of ICANN?

[Laughter]

This is a private issue. That was a joke.

I think, Michele, were you at microphone 2? You have the microphone in the room. Use microphone number 2, please, Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thank you. Michele Neylon for the record. I think it's -- first off, I think it's great that we're having this conversation because I think it's long overdue. There's been conversations in various parts of the different silos but not one engaging the GAC and others.

I'd also agree with you, Thomas. If it was easy, we'd probably have solved it by now. But just speaking both as the outgoing Chair of the registrars and just as an individual registrar, we suffer from the same challenges that GAC members suffer from. I can't just kind of go along and grab some random person to come along and represent my company's interests at ICANN.

As a business, you have to weigh up the cost of that person's time, the participation, whether they're able to actually deal with all the complexities of ICANN. And as Olga points out, trying to even navigate the Web site can be a challenge, trying to navigate comments, which some people submit as PDFs, some people submit as Word documents, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. I mean, there's a bunch of challenges.

Some of it comes back, I think, to how things are communicated. And this is something I've raised on various calls that you were on and other meetings which we've had at the level of the chairs of the various groups, the SOs, ACs, SGs, and whatever the other acronym is.

A lot of the time there are issues being discussed that have an impact on lots of different businesses and other, quote-unquote, stakeholders, yet they're framed using such anachronistic acronyms and language, that it's very, very hard for somebody to read it and go, "Oh, this impacts me. I should care about this. I need to find out more about this. This could screw up my business. This could have a negative impact on how I interact with the Internet." But, unfortunately, we don't see that.

What we see instead is tons and tons of acronyms. The running joke within ICANN is any work that we do, we have to come up with a new acronym for it or else it won't be considered valid. That's hilarious but it doesn't help.

So, I mean, I think part of it is around how these things are communicated. On the registrar side, we have a fairly active membership who are very vocal on some topics but trying to get engagement across many of the other topics is really, really hard. And in terms of prioritization, this is something that doesn't seem to happen. It just seems to be a case of here's, yes,

another work stream. Here's yet another cross-community PDP. Here's yet another project that simply has to happen.   But nobody seems to be looking at simple things like: How many people are interacting and engaged in different working groups at any given time? And are they the same people turning up in every single working group? Or is there actual diversity? So if you were to say persons A, B, and C, is every single working group going to have person A or B or C in each one or are we seeing D, E, F, G and the rest of the alphabet?

It seems a lot of the time that we're seeing the same people over and over again. So we're not getting fresh blood in, which means that those of us who are actively engaged are overworked and end up looking like Thomas does at the end of an ICANN meeting.

[Laughter]

So, I mean, I think the prioritization needs to be -- is something that needs to be looked at properly and the impact of different work products on others.

I mean, WHOIS is one I have raised in the past where there's multiple WHOIS-related activities. And it takes so long for some to finish that by the time you finished one, there's something that's come along behind it which has already changed it which seems just a little bit illogical. Thanks.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Michele. I have Indonesia. Please for those who -- present yourself quickly because not everybody may know you. Thank you. Microphone 2.

ASHWIN SASONGKO: Hello. Yes, thank you. Ashwin from Indonesia.

Thanks, Thomas.

Yes, there's a pile of work we have to do, especially in a country where the capabilities of all the stakeholders has to be strengthened again. It has to be strengthened. This is really a challenge for the person who represent the country in the ICANN. We have the GAC. We have the GNSO. We have the ccNSO. We have the ALAC and so on and so on and so on.

So, I think in this case, because of the diversity of the work, the depth of the work, and so many areas of the work, I think the help of ICANN at a regional level can be strengthened to brief or to facilitate for the country, for every country to unite, to integrate their capabilities, to respond to particular -- to some particular important activities. Just, for example, I mention a few -- an hour ago or so I mention about the I.P. version 4, I.P. version 6. It cannot communicate. That is important if the country doesn't finalize its transfer from I.P. Version 4 to I.P.

version 6 on time. That country might not be able to contact with other corporations that has only I.P. version 6 for contact, just an example.

If it is person, still it is okay. What about if it is machine to machine? The corporation is producing equipment, say, locomotive or planes where the machines can communicate only in I.P. version 6. Then me as the buyer cannot communicate with the machines that I buy because it's different. So that's kind of things that has to ring the bell. But it may happen that the local organization may not have the capabilities to recognize that this is important, we have to do this, this, and this.

So in this case, that's the -- hopefully the local ICANN hub can support this. Of course, you know the hub has to be strengthened, too. You cannot only rely on one guy only. So that's -- Thomas, thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Ashwin. The awareness raising and understanding is one important thing. The other thing in addition is the actual -- once you realize that something is important, then you need to engage. And I think that's important. So we have Number 4. Sebastien and then Kavouss from Iran.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sebastien Bachollet speaking. I will speak in French.

I am not representing France so I won't say "Sebastien from France."

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: No. But you can say that you are a French person, that you are in Finland.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, then. For me this is a fundamental issue, especially for Internet individual users representing At-Large because we do not work -- we do not make a living on that. And the time for our professional life and family life is not something infinite. So the fact of having a multiplication of working groups at any level within ICANN and also at a national level to prepare the meetings at a regional level, well, this, in fact, represents difficulty for us. And it is of vital importance that we find a way of dealing with this issue.

I believe that part of the response to this would be to begin by accepting that we cannot do everything. And we need to accept that we cannot be everywhere at any time, to know everything and verify that everything is working.   This means that

sometimes those who are not actively engaged should be able to express their points of view to provide input and without telling them you should be able to participate if you wanted to provide your input. So this is not working because, otherwise, we need to be everywhere at any time so that we can be taken into account.

So in our organization, within the working groups, within the different discussions and debates that are inside ICANN, we need to verify, we need to see that those that are engaged do participate. So meetings during the afternoon, these meetings, these committee meetings should enable us to improve the situation from now on. And I hope this would be the same in the future.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Sebastien. This reminds me of the double -- the CCWG and the CWG process because in these processes where people participating in teleconferences during five days a week and sometimes the discussion was open.   You were expecting to receive comments. And at that time, people who were not able to participate on a daily basis were able to participate.

So the real challenge would be that those people participating later would be able to receive the feedback from these people to

be able to do their best so that they can participate and so that they can understand and express themselves when it comes to different issues. That would be very important. And now I will give the floor to Kavouss from Iran.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Thank you very much. I'm speaking in my personal capacity. I would like to support people proposing this. I don't want to discourage them. We can discuss this. If there is a method to deal with this issue, that's fine. So let's talk about these. Let's add the text, but we need to begin at once.

Everything is difficult at the very beginning. The CCWG was impossible at the beginning in November 2014. It was really impossible to get organized, but we did it.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much, Kavouss.

Mic number 4. New Zealand please. You have the floor.

JEN THOMAS: Jen Thomas (phonetic) on behalf of the GAC and the broader community. New Zealand was one of the countries that talked about this a lot in the GAC and the benefit we could have from a discussion. It came out of an sense of something's got to give.

EN

Really? The intense workload we have had for the IANA transition, we are looking into the future and it doesn't actually look like it's going to reduce. So looking at the things we've got up on the slide, we give a big yes to plan prioritization. We think the community as a whole needs to discuss this, to think about how we shift the model and have a real discussion about the different things in each community and how we can pick up those priorities rather than battling each other out for who has got the most time on the schedule.

We could all try to agree as a start perhaps on the maximum number of policy development processes supporting organizations can run at the same time. Or possibly when you are setting up in your working group or cross-community working group that you identify other work streams that relate to it. So we are forced at the start to assist whether we are duplicating or if we are actually adding value.

The Web site structure the GAC has had a preview for also seems to be a very good start in facilitating better ways in engaging, getting through the acronyms, and really understanding what different groups are doing.

We would also just like to make a final comment on the sustainability of the volunteer model. I think support for the advisory committees is pretty critical in this. We've heard from a

couple of people that volunteers aren't an unlimited resource and also someone has got to pay for them or they have got to give up their own time, which is certainly not unlimited.

Looking at how ICANN can help all ACs to engage, for example, with the work, we have had a dedicated secretariat. We have had a really great way to get new people in and get them up to speed quickly so that they can pick up the issues they care about.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, New Zealand.

I have microphone Number 1.

NICK WOOD: Hello. My name is Nick. I am from the U.K -- on the GAC for the U.K.

Thank you very much to the people that sort of have convened this session. I have been here for a year, and I have just been astonished by the commitment of everyone in this community. The level of enthusiasm and drive and energy is astonishing. It really is. I have never known anything like it. So a big pat on the back to everyone for sure.

I really like the bullet points that you've got up here. I think they're sensible -- a sensible starting point. And one thing I found really interesting recently was I managed to pop along to the GDD Summit only for a day. Last month I didn't realize I was there. I was able to sneak in and sneak out and no one attacked me.

But what I really realized at that meeting was the issues that the various people in the GNSO have. There are business issues, which influence kind of their urgency to get on with certain tracks of work. And I didn't know that previously, and I didn't know that because I spent all my time at ICANN meetings in the GAC room.

And that kind of really, really hit home to me at that GDD Summit. I need to get out of the GAC room more and have more time to go and speak to people and sit in their sessions.

And I think so the idea of getting together, you know, maybe it's -- whether it's through chairs or groups, I think that's really, really positive. The more we can understand each other's -- sort of the way each other works and the pressures which drive the -- the broad spectrum of work that we're doing the better. And I know this will be a challenge certainly to -- you know, to the businesses within ICANN, but sometimes you don't have to go fast to be productive. And I think some of the issues, the

challenges that we have in the GAC is that it does take a long time to develop positions. We have to consult all of these other government departments and the machinations of government are very slow. I know it frustrates lots of people. It frustrates me.

But when I used to play sport and, you know, I used to play rugby and we'd have our sort of, you know, attack and defense and we would always say in defense you've got to go at the pace of the slowest man because otherwise you create dog legs and that creates weaknesses. And maybe there's an element of that kind of thinking that maybe if we sort of slowed down a little bit we might actually become more -- quicker in the long term because you won't sort of -- you might avoid these issues where you get sort of at the end of a -- a PDP then the government comes -- governments come in and say hold on, we're not sure, and this kind of slows things down. And it means you can't get on with the next thing so much. So yeah, there's just a couple of thoughts on that. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think your point is an extremely valid one, that if we try to get everybody on board from the beginning, which might take a little longer, make sure we more or less do understand what our hopes, expectations, concerns are in the

beginning, that allows us to go in the right direction from the start. That may end up with a consensus, which is somehow the -- the uniting element here, rather than everybody running in all directions for the first -- at high speed for the first half of the time and then realize that we -- that this will never work and then we have to go back. So I think -- and that meetings like this one, where people interact and make -- listen to each other and make each other understand, have an actually positive impact on this. So thank you very much for this. Any other views? Yes, microphone number 2.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Hello, my name is (saying name). I'm a next gen member from Indonesia. I'm currently studying Internet governance at the Oxford Internet Institute in the U.K., and I understand that there are now many education institutions actually providing formal lessons or courses on Internet governance. Like the next gen program, I find this to be very interesting and very useful for me to participate in forums like this, but it won't allow me to participate in the longer term. And I second the opinion that it will be great if more people can volunteer. I would like to suggest a formal like internship, perhaps like a six-month or one-year internship, especially for students who are studying Internet governance at the master's or the Ph.D. level. Like the Berkman Center have a lot of students there, OII, there's also

Internet governance. I think there's at least eight internet governance courses in the U.K. alone. And ISOC U.K. has been working on identifying these courses and actually reaching out to the conveners of the courses to get people involved into programs like the fellowship and the next gen. Thanks.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you very much. Further requests from the floor -- for the floor? Wanawit from Thailand. Yes.

WANAWIT AHKUPUTRA: Okay. Wanawit, GAC from Thailand. I do agree on the workloads, but I also like to point out some of the points since I start in the beginning with the GAC. I think the workload is not much but since Beijing if people are sitting in the room, you have to remember how difficult it is to go through. And with the current workload I do not know whether we have any room to put any single work more to the GAC. And if you talk about subsequent this round that's coming in within a year or two, I think maybe we -- we have to sleep here for the seven days. Not only 1:00 in the morning like it used to be. That what I worry most, that it's not only critical in the current workload of CCWG but work ahead. We don't have time. I remember we don't even have dinner. We ordered pizza at 1:00 in the morning. And we don't know the next round coming in how many strings are

going to coming in. And right now we don't have -- we have a lot of new members in. They need to know what is -- the procedure they need to go through. Maybe there will be a new procedure we need to study. We cannot prepare all the major roles that we have. I think -- and not only talk about the parities between the cross-communities but what the GAC role is is also very important, that we need to build the capacity internally. There's a lot of young generation in the GAC I see and I appreciate that will come. Sooner or later I will be gone because too old already and the new generation have to carry on the workload. And we have to know what is our roles of the governments in the -- the parities internally or so that we need to care internally into the GAC. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Wanawit. I think it is clear from those of who have spoken that the workload is an issue. So let's try and focus maybe on brainstorming a little more concretely. That although it is difficult but what can be done concretely. Let's get at some of the elements that we maybe can use if there's an attraction for a follow-up to the session on actually not just complaining but trying to do something, which is normally what I tend to prefer, so that we can go a little bit into thinking about elements. And the way I see it there's two aspects. One is somehow planning, prioritizing more, as difficult it is, in the

silos, across the silos, and the other part is facilitating access to these things. So reducing people's -- the time that people take to find out whether something -- what something belongs to, what is important for me. So I see these two elements. Maybe you see others.   So I see Michele has some concrete ideas. Thank you. Micro 2, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Thomas. Michele Neylon, for the record.   Within the SO/AC leadership group there was a project being run by, I think it was Rob Hoggarth and his team, which I think was meant to kind of map out all of the concurrent activities being conducted across all groups and across the entire community.   Now that needs to be just kind of made -- risen up to a higher level, made more obvious, not buried, you know, 25 layers deep in the subdomain of a subdomain of icann.org. That -- that needs to be given some attention and focus so that we can all see quickly and easily everything that's going on now at this very moment in time. I remember, I think it was -- I don't know, maybe it was Durban or sometime around then that somebody did up a -- just a chart just looking at, you know, all the concurrent WHOIS activities. And the fact that you couldn't fit it on a single slide pretty much said everything you needed to know. If you can't fit it on a single slide, that simply says to me there's too much going on. So what -- just being able to visualize that easily, then

you know what you're dealing with, and then from that, you can then look at how do you prioritize those.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And maybe if you would look at these 20 processes related to WHOIS and would see this on one slide and then see the overlap, you could merge these into three processes where you would take less time to follow all the 20 and map them across each other and so on and so forth. By the way, before I give the floor to Olga, I think it was somewhere in -- some meetings room all look the same from the inside so you need to remember which carpet was where in the world, but it was Singapore or Buenos Aires or somewhere where there was one of these so-called SO/AC chair hot topic sessions where somebody -- I forget who it was or I may know but I won't -- I'm not sure, that there were work streams -- discussions about the volunteer issue, about how to simplify accessibility and have more structured way of documenting stuff, making it accessible. And everybody said that this is very important. Then we were all happy that we said this is very important and I haven't heard ever since of anything that has actually happened. And this is something that occurs quite often in this space, that we are swimming around and actually moving water around but we are not really sustainably advancing. So I think that there's good intentions spread across the community. But we need to make

sure that this is actually done, and I think Michele I'm happy to have you as a partner in pushing for more sustainability in these exercises. Olga. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chair. I would like to add another layer of complexity which is language. Imagine all of this that we are talking about when English is your second or your third language. So -- and also there are these webinars that the regional offices of ICANN organize which are good but in my modest opinion quite general. As for Latin America we usually have very few and Pedro and I end up talking about the same things to the -- to the audience, which is not very -- very big.

What I personally have done, especially in the process of the IANA transition, is conducting or informally coordinating with those that speak the same language in the same region. And it ended up being effective. That could be perhaps somehow a role of the regional office of ICANN, going beyond the -- the webinar, the general webinar saying ICANN is this and this or GNSO, GAC, blah, blah, blah. So that could be an idea to share with the regional offices. And I will stop here. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: So to recap what you're saying, so it may make sense that the regional offices and the vice presidents would help --

OLGA CAVALLI: Beyond the webinar.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Would help bringing for instance Latin America governments together with Latin America registries and registrars and civil society organizations to discuss the issues in Spanish without having to travel to Helsinki or Singapore but actually having that meeting in Buenos Aires or Montevideo or wherever so that that is an idea that may also help in fostering understanding and participation. Number 2. Thank you. Microphone number 2.

MARK CARVELL: Yes. Thank you very much, Chair. Mark Carvell, U.K. government rep on the GAC. First of all, I'm sorry for joining this important discussion late. I was at another meeting, which is probably an example actually of the kind of problem we're facing. You know, even with these important cross-community discussions, some of us are stressed out because we have to divert to other things going on. Hopefully that kind of problem will ease in the future. But it's -- it's kind of illustrative also of the fact that there's a very positive trend of working much more transversely. For

example, the GAC now is getting engaged in policy development at a very early stage through new processes and mechanisms that are being introduced. And we're having liaison people appointed. We've got a GNSO liaison. We've had that for a while now, but also we have an ALAC liaison. This is all very positive in terms of transverse or working connecting up. But there's a tension still there in terms of loading and workloads. You know, how are we going to connect up, work transversely when we've all got our own dossiers and so on to pursue and then engage with others. So I -- you're asking, Thomas, for ideas, brainstorming, and so on, how do we address that tension that still impairs our ability to ensure that all processes are -- are fair and inclusive and diverse in this same ICANN environment.

My only thought at the moment is that we have liaisons linking up. Maybe the liaisons could somehow centralize some oversight of what is happening that could then harmonize the prioritization so that you have some sense of direction for the whole community where the difference constituencies, the SOs and ACs, are going to have to work together on delivering on that particular priority, and that then, in -- influences the program scheduling, the agenda scheduling, and so on. So I don't know, is that one idea to explore. Through the connections provided by the liaisons, develop some kind of central oversight of how things are going in a direction that

involves us all and that we will find the right space, time, and resource to be able to contribute to delivering on that direction. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Mark. That's an interesting suggestion that may -- is worth looking into.

Maybe -- Seeing a few members of the Board here, knowing that -- Because I sit in with them from time to time or whenever I have the time to go to their meetings as a liaison, knowing that the Board is also not suffering from boredom but actually are also quite busy, maybe it would be interesting to hear some views from board members on how they deal with workload, whether they have ideas about what could be done, and also just brainstorming what the Board could do or whether the Board could have a role in helping the community to better prioritize, better plan, just as an idea to invite the board members to actively participate. Of course you're free to just listen. But it would be very interesting, I think, to hear from board members with this.

I'd like to continue. Who is next?

Ideas, thoughts about what could be done.

Microphone 2, please.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Michele for the record.

Just one thing I think we've left out from the various people and groups that we mentioned is ICANN staff, I think. So I think coordinating with ICANN staff and helping -- getting them to help coordinate is key.

Ultimately -- no offense to them, but they do this for their jobs, whereas the rest of us don't.

So I think include -- having -- including them in any communication around prioritization is key because ultimately, they're the kind of -- they're the glue, they're the ones that can help bring it all together.

Another thing is, well, in relation to that, is making sure that everybody is aligned, that there is not a case of one particular department or one particular team pushing something harder than needs to happen. We've seen that to a certain degree over the last few years where there's a terrible sense of urgency about something. It was never particularly clear as to why.

And as you mentioned it would be good to hear from the board members since ultimately, they're the people meant to oversee us all.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

There's micro number 1.

JONNE SOININEN: Hello, I'm sorry Jonne Soininen, I'm the IETF liaison to the Board and as no one else from the Board wanted to speak up, I guess I have to.

Of course, for quite surprisingly, perhaps, for you guys is we don't have kind of a definitive answer to this and not a single solution how this works, but the thing is, like in any kind of organization, first of all, planning what to do, prioritization, these are things one should do, and they sometimes help, but I know that it sounds really silly when somebody has a lot of work to do and you say why don't you prioritize those, and why don't you do all of them at the same time still.

But the other thing that's maybe in the community as well but we started to use a little bit more in the Board is not everybody has to be involved in the time when something is prepared. That it's done in smaller group and then it's brought -- and then there's at least a proposal on the table that can be discussed with a bigger group.

There is, of course, the tradeoff here in what we've seen in ICANN that we've had some solution -- some areas where one group has done a complete proposal, thinks that they're ready, and that's when people jump in, and that is something that should be, of course, avoided.

But I think that there's a question always that does everybody have to be involved on everything in every single step or can some of the things be a little bit divided among people?

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Jonne. I think it's a fair point that has come up before.

That would raise the point of do you trust others to, let's call it, represent you or think of you? And the more that that is the case, the more you can actually share things. So that is linked.

Micro 2, Kavouss.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. You said something, do we trust others. We must, and we should. If we don't trust the people and have an environment of doubt and mistrust, we fail. So we should put our things for the trust unless otherwise we see something is not going well. Then go and clear that or correct that.

So apart from the trust, friendship, openness is important. But the reason I asked the floor was not this. Was that I don't see anything here talking about avoiding seriously workload created by multiple or parallel working or duplications.

In your meeting few minutes or half an hour ago, I was looking at something, I found that the five consecutive session, we are talking of the same thing. Repeating and repeating and repeating. This is workload.

So how we could avoid that? And also, how could avoid that the parallel working that people, they do things, because this is done by should be done by me, it should be done by you. So why not we could have a little bit more -- I come back to the issue of dividing the activities. I think it is a good way.

In Work Stream 2, we are going to divide nine activities to nine different group, provided that at the end, there is a possibility to comment on that.

So, yes, it is not possible that a single person or one people working everywhere. We should concentrate on the area that we are expert or supposed to be expert. But giving the others a division of the work or dividing of the work or sharing of the work.

But another important issue that I have not seen here is any information sharing in a more fair manner. In particular, for those who don't have the possibility to look into what has happened. Whether there will be some sort of a small resume or something, making easy for the people to follow up, it's possible.

So we have to also work on that. Parallel working should be avoided. Trust should be maintained. Friendship, so on and so forth. And this exclusivity that this is the world I must know, it should be avoided. We should work together collectively, and we should work together with trust.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Kavouss. I think there is already a challenge in what you say if you say parallel work should be avoided, at the same time thing should be broken up into group. Would that mean they would work after each other or in parallel?

So just to say that, in fact, there are no easy solutions but there are elements that we could identify or are identifying.

And there's a lot of government people talking here, so this is not meant to be a single or one and a half stakeholder discussion. So, really, I would like to invite all of you. You don't

have to agree with us, this is not the point, but you share your views and contribute to that discussion.

Michele, micro 2.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks, Thomas. Michele Neylon again.

Just picking up on the point from -- I'm going to get his name wrong. Nick. Sorry. I think it is something that I've noticed, you know, over the years, that, you know, a lot of people don't really understand where other people are coming from in terms of the kind of pressures that they're working on, the motivations, the drivers, the limitations.

I mean, this -- You mentioned the term silos. I've used it in the past as well.

Maybe something, just throwing it out there, maybe at some point, not necessarily at the next ICANN meeting but maybe at a future ICANN meeting, maybe there would be some way for, you know, different groups just to give kind of a quick elevator pitch as to where the hell they're coming from and why -- why they're here or what the problem is which might help. Or if there's some way for us to, you know, just interact in a way so that somebody like Nick can go back to the U.K. government and say, well, the registrars aren't being total and utter scumbags. It's just that,

realistically, what you've asked them to do would bankrupt them.

And, you know, we can then go back to our stakeholders and go, well, the GAC aren't being obstinate -- I was going to use a nasty expletive. Better not. They are coming under pressure because of, you know, some treaty negotiation that we don't know about.

I just think it's -- giving a little bit more color may be helping people to have better understanding of the motivations, because I think a lot of the time, when you have conversations with people, sometimes you're talking across each other because there's a lack of understanding of how we actually operate in our, you know, real jobs.

Thanks.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. And I think we've already experienced this in this meeting, at least in our case. For instance, we used to have meetings, bilaterals with the Board or with the GNSO in one hour. You try to raise ten issues. A GAC member presents an issue, and then the answer you get, yes, this is important, we need to look into it, or normally the answers are not very substantive. But this time with this cross-community session

but also with the fact that we were mutually inviting each other in our silos, and you deal with one issue for an hour or at least half an hour, you actually get much of what you said as background information for why people are asking for what they are in a much more holistic way that allows you actually to understand much better and to take the other situation into better account when you continue to work. So I think that's a fundamental point.

I understand we have Chuck again on mic 4.

Thank you, Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: Thank you, Thomas. Chuck Gomes again. And I want to add something to the list. I think we should be continually looking for new tools that make collaboration easier.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you. I think that's a good sum up to a lot of what we discussed.

Two. Mark, I think.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thank you. Mark Carvell, U.K. government. I think the last three interventions, Kavouss started it, really, with the issue of

trust, and then communication, and new tools. I think these are all linked up because they enhance transparency. If there's effective communication of what role everybody has and what work they're engaged on and what their forward look is, then people have a better understanding.

So -- And to be able to be armed with that when you -- before you go to a meeting. When I first turned up at ICANN meetings, I was in total disorientation. I just couldn't work out what the hell was going on, you know, and it took about three meetings, really, to settle down with some real understanding.

I think it's better now, but I think this -- taking this discussion forward should look at the communication strategy, how that enhances transparency, and in turn, fosters trust so you know what else is going on and what you don't need to get involved in and what you do need to get involved in. And that will, I think, help.

I think there's work to be done to enhance all of that. And that's my thought.

Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Mark.

Maybe we have a few minutes left.

Should we brainstorm a little bit on how we may -- before I give the floor to Olof, how we may organize ourselves in a way that we capture these elements that we've been gathering? I mean, this is all in the transcript and Tracey has been taking notes, but do we need another process to simplify the other processes; i.e., should we somehow get together those who are willing to actually improve this? And then where and what, on what level, how to include the Board in these deliberations; maybe the SO, AC, RALO, and whatever there is in terms of chairs and co-chairs. Or should we just -- I'm not talking about the new CCWG, although it may -- So how should we drive this forward with a view to maximize coming up with the simplest solution possible or things that could be implemented and tested in the near future? Building on this meeting, which I think has been a big insight in many ways. That for -- And hope that we get some ideas on this.

Olof from ICANN staff, supporting the GAC.

OLOF NORDLING: Thank you, Chair. And while you all are thinking about that -- well, I'm Olof Nordling, ICANN staff. I don't know if you're allowed to chip in here, but know --

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Actually, we need to censor you, so please stop.

OLOF NORDLING: I thought so.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Very sorry.

[Laughter]

Olof, go ahead.

OLOF NORDLING: But I think it has been mentioned recently by many that trust is a key element when working together. And trust is something you have to earn, and that takes time. And that's a difficult part of it. And you would see it -- Looking back at my experience.

And that's an difficult part of it. You would see it -- looking back at my experience and not only within ICANN in all sort of associations and groupings and such, well, it takes time before that trust is established in a particular group.

Once that is established, then you can start to rationalize and you can start to distribute work and you can start to use other approaches than sitting all together and keeping a close tab on

what everybody else is trying to get away with, which you don't like. Try, for example, to use rapporteurs and also to use -- and that's really something that should be considered, like Chuck mentioned, better collaboration tools, yes.

And more importantly to use more and better collaboration tools that enables remote participation because it's not in everybody's ability to physically come to all these meetings. And we need to do work in between the meetings as well.

And in order to do that, we need to have trust, yes. And we need to have good tools. And, well, something to look for but in the very beginning, we need to have trust.

And then I would like to get back to Michele's proposal. I think it is almost like, all right, let's have speed dating.

Well, a registrar meets a GAC representative for five minutes and exchange things across the border. And then you change and the registrar meets someone from the ccNSO and so on and so forth.

So, well, at least that's one of the means. I mean, it's very much on the -- how to socialize with each other in order to promote and actually to gain trust because that has to be deserved. It doesn't come automatically.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Olof. I like the speed dating idea. We'll set up a matrix where people can put themselves in and then we'll mix it randomly, of course.

You're right. Trust takes time. But we won't get better human beings just with time passing. And as you say, we need tools. We need to implement structures that actually create incentives for people to trust each other or are (indiscernible).

If you take the GAC, I think it's easier to trust governments if they don't lock their doors and you don't know what they're talking but if they can actually check what they are saying, how they are argumenting. So opening up doors is one of the elements that leads to trust.

The other one is providing for space to interact, not just to listen but to be listened mutually and understand which is normally the basis of -- in the U.N., this is called confidence-building measures in other context. But I think that term is not too wrong and so on and so on.

So we need to develop tools, find tools, ideally easy tools, low-hanging fruit first, and then other things maybe later where we can improve trust because, as we've heard, it helps in many ways and being more efficient if you trust people. But if you have to check everything somebody is doing for what may have

been the reasons or is there a hidden agenda and so on and so forth?

We have a little bit of time, ten minutes. But we can also, of course, enjoy our coffee break, which at least the GAC people didn't have. But I would still continue to invite people to take the floor.

I see Nigel with a great color of a tie. Microphone number 3.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. Nigel Hickson, ICANN staff. It's a great pleasure actually to talk as staff in this session. And that's one of the themes I wanted to put across because I think someone said it earlier.

I mean, staff have a particular role. Actually, I don't particularly like the word "staff." But us that are employed at ICANN have a role. And, of course, we are not volunteers. We are paid for what we do. I think the majority of staff -- or all the staff work incredibly hard and as you've seen during the transition and in preparation for these meetings.

But I think what we've learned from this meeting is something which is relevant to the, if you like, the volunteer effort and the amount of time we will spend on these issues. And that's the breaking down of silos and the more informal work -- the more

informal ways of working because I think one of the problems of this sort of community staff relation thing is the formality of the process.

I think in the future, as someone said earlier, we need to sort of break that down. We need to have a sort of system whereby -- where if the GAC want advice from staff or if the GAC want to talk to staff or the GNSO wants to talk to staff or if anyone wants to interact, there can be more interaction because some of the structures we have are far too formal where a staff member will just start off a session and then the community take it over from there.

We as staff feel a bit reluctant to get involved because it's your -- it's your session and, of course, it's your session. But in this way of working to reduce the amount of effort that everyone has to put in, I think this breaking down of barriers has to occur. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Nigel. And thank you for coming in.

I think it is crucial what you say because that's also an element, the more you trust each other, the less you have to rely on formalities that protect you from fears of being abused or taken wrong or whatever. So this is also linked to trust. But not

everything is a question of life and death and needs ten formula and five page of legal advice in how to give a simple answer to a simple question. So I'm fully with you, and I think there's room for improvement there.

I know people in the countryside, for instance, in my country, they do contracts about buying and selling houses with handshakes. And if there's a problem, they sort it out later. It doesn't mean that everything is so simple as maybe in the valleys where I grew up. But sometimes you can really ask yourself whether all these formalities are really necessary. That also reduces workload for everybody. Thank you.

Yes, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you, Chair. About staff, apart from the facts that we know which staff do what, sometimes when we move away from our usual activity within ICANN, it is difficult to know who to contact with. For example, we wanted to organize a workshop in Dublin and I contacted, like, three different persons. And then Jeanne came to me after the meeting and said, You should have contacted me before because I am the one.

So sometimes it's difficult for us. The organization has been growing in number of staff, which is good because it shows that

there are more things being done. But sometimes at least for me it's difficult to know who should I -- and so I talk to different people and then I -- it takes some time to realize who to talk with. So I don't know how to solve that, but it's something that happened to me two or three times. Thank you.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Olga. I think that's another element that we would like to retain.

Further comments? Questions? Ideas? Illusions? Mic -- Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON: Thanks. Next time just give me a seat up there. It will be easier.

[Laughter]

Just picking up again on this entire thing of the speed dating, I think maybe -- maybe something like that, maybe some kind of format along that could help. But I think there should definitely be alcohol involved.

[Laughter]

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Or tea for those who don't.

MICHELE NEYLON: Tea for the teetotalers. Coffee for the coffee drinkers.

If you look at the meeting here in Helsinki, every evening there was an ICANN-organized cocktail. So, you know, repurpose something like that. It's not -- there's obviously a budget available to provide the drinks. Repurpose it slightly. So it doesn't have to be an expensive, complicated, over--overengineered thing.

I mean, I found it amusing that at some point there this afternoon you spoke about discussing coming up with a process to improve the process. And while I know that as a lifetime civil servant and diplomat this might suit you, it's just so ICANN-esque. I just thought to myself, my God, you are trying to improve things by making them worse. Congratulations.

We don't need to overengineer every single thing. I mean, I could be quite flippant about it. But at the same time, I think sometimes simple things are probably the best. And, again, from Nigel's perspective, I'm not sure -- I don't think it's that far -- that formal definitely on the GNSO side for us to engage with staff because we engage with them on a regular basis, because we have a very different relationship with them as we're contracted parties -- well, speaking on the registrars and registries side.

But, I mean, to Olga's point, it can get confusing knowing who to speak to at times because people move around, people move on. So maybe that could help, too. Maybe just making that clearer as to who's in charge of what and when because the organization has evolved.

And, luckily, we got rid of global leaders so now we have executives, which I think is a wonderful improvement.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Michele.

Just a few replies. First, I would have loved you to sit next to me and many others as well. Those who know me, I'm a team player. I don't like standing somewhere alone normally. The problem is I was so overloaded with work, I didn't even have the time to write you an email or give you a phone call. Next time just join in voluntarily.

And with regard to social events and alcohol, I think social events are an important element. We had once dinner in the GAC because we had a sponsor in Buenos Aires. And that was proved to be extremely helpful also for new people to get to know who knows what and so on. We may have, like, events or forms of events that take care of cultural diversity for those who prefer a sport event, like -- I don't know -- playing a football

game somewhere or drinking a beer or doing something else. The idea of social events that help you connect is definitely another thing that I'm very happy to take.

And the thing about processes, that was slightly ironic because this is -- in the past years whenever a problem came up, somebody hired a new expert group and they created a new super team of super people to discuss something. And I didn't mean to do that.

But actually the problem is that sometimes if you don't create a shell for something to be tracked -- and I'm referring in particular to these discussions. We've had these discussions before but nothing happened. So either you need people that you can trust that they will take it up, then you don't need a process; you need people. And if that is not there, you need to find the easiest possible process to actually put some, let's say, public pressure on somebody who signs up to a process that he would actually or she would actually deliver. So we don't need a process if we get people to take this on without a process, all the better. If not, we would have to think about a process.

But I'm fully with you. The simpler the better, the less -- the less -- go ahead. Take the mic and say --

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

THOMAS SCHNEIDER: Thank you.

[Laughter]

We have two minutes left. Is there anybody who wants to take the floor? If not, I think we can use these two minutes to have a little bit of break. I hope that this is the beginning -- I hope that this is the beginning of a sustainable way forward on this, and I invite everybody to continue to brainstorm whether or not we have a process. I don't really care. I would like to see things improving. That's my concern.

Thank you all very much. And the next session will be here at 5:00. So don't go too far away. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]