
MARRAKECH – ccNSO Review - Community Consultation on Draft Recommendations

Wednesday, June 26, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:00 WET

ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

LARS HOFFMANN:

Welcome, everybody. We are already seven minutes late. As the chairman, I feel anxious that we should start. My name is Lars Hoffmann. I'm ICANN support staff. I work for the Multi-Stakeholder Strategy and Strategic Initiatives department that supports the organizational as well as the specific reviews. My job, as you can gather, is to support the organizational reviews of which the ccNSO review is one of seven.

We have here today the independent examiners from the Meridian Institute, Kristy and Mallorie, who will be presenting the draft final report that is also out for public session today and I think Mallorie and Kristy will preface that in their presentation as well. But just to make sure, this is a public session, so for those of you who are on the ccNSO Review Working Party some of this information may have already been conveyed previously, but since this is a public ICANN meeting, this is usually a good time in the transparency of the review processes to also make sure that the wider community has an opportunity to hear and provide feedback as necessary.

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.

With that, I'm going to sit in the audience because I'm actually not presenting. If you have any questions, you can reach out anytime, and I'm going to hand it over to Mallorie and Kristy. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Thank you, Lars. Good afternoon everyone, and thank you for having us, and for those of you that returned after break, for what we hope is a riveting session. I'm Kristy Buckley, and this my colleague, Mallorie Bruns. As Lars mentioned, we're with a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization called Meridian Institute, which was selected as the independent examiner for the ccNSO organizational review. You may have seen us in Barcelona or Kobe, where we were collecting data and presenting the draft findings of the assessment.

Just as a quick reminder, the scope of the review is to provide an independent assessment of the supporting organization's continuing purpose, any changes to its structure or operations, and a review of its accountability to stakeholders and constituencies. Can somebody advance to the next slide?

For today, our objectives are to share the draft recommendations and the process that we went through for developing them, to provide examples of the suggestions and the rationale for including those, and to hear questions, comments, and feedback on the draft recommendations and suggestions from you all. And

then, we have a couple discussion questions at the end of the presentation, and we welcome any comments that you might have. Next slide. Thank you.

A quick reminder on the review process ... We observed sessions at ICANN 63 and 64. We conducted 45 respondent interviews, followed by an online survey. We did a document review, fact checking of what we heard and observed, and we had regular consultations with the ccNSO Review Working Party to hear feedback on the accuracy of our findings and on the relevance of our draft recommendations.

In this draft final report, we've classified actions for continuous improvement into two categories. The first is recommendations, which are numbered 1 through 14. And then, we also have included suggestions which are lettered—A, B, C, and D and so on. These are each embedded in the relevant sections of the report, but also they are aggregated into the full lists in the appendices one and two at the end of the report. Again, as Lars mentioned, this out for public comment until the fourth of August this year.

We understand that recommendations have a particular definition and status within the ICANN community. We wanted to indicate which continuous improvement actions fall under this category, based upon our independent review, fact checking, and to the extent feasible, testing against SMART, which is an

acronym that stands for specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-limited criteria.

In addition, respondents shared many ideas for continuous improvement that did not readily translate into recommendations. However, we think that they still hold value to share with the community. So, we have synthesized, fact checked, and classified those as suggestions in the report. We do not expect the ccNSO to readily commit to implementing suggestions. However, the independent review presents an opportunity to hold a mirror up to the community. In doing so, there may be ideas that resonate, and that are further explored by the ccNSO in the spirit of continuous improvement. Next slide. I'll now turn it over to Mallorie to present the next section, including the draft recommendations.

MALLORIE BRUNS:

Thank you, Kristy. Hi, everyone. Thank you for sticking with us through the day, and thanks to those of you who are participating remotely and listening in. Thank you, Kristy. I'm now going to go through the draft recommendations for the first two sections of the report, continuing purpose, and structure and operations. Next slide.

Overall, our findings confirm that the ccNSO has a continuing purpose. In the spirit of continuous improvement, there is one

recommendation for this section, and that is develop communications materials that clearly express the value of the ccNSO to newer and current members. We heard from many of you that participated, that your participation in the ccNSO is valuable, but sometimes it can be difficult to communicate that value to your colleagues and your organizations back at home. Therefore, it would be helpful to have some communications materials, such as talking points, to help justify ongoing participation in the ccNSO. Next slide.

This next set of recommendations pertain to the structure and operations. The first of these is regarding working groups and committees. In most cases, there are not limits on the number of people who can participate in working groups and committees. However, in some isolated cases, there are limits on the number of members. And many of our respondents indicated that there's a need to foster diverse participation and leadership.

To do this, we recommend that all applicants submit biographies that will be anonymized by the ccNSO Secretariat before sharing it with the ccNSO Councilors for confidential ranking process for candidates. This would require an amendment to a section in Annex B of the ccNSO Working Group guideline document. Next slide.

In terms of working groups and committees, some people shared that they believe there is a lack of transparency and standardization for electing working group members, and chairs in particular. As such, our third recommendation is to update section 3.5 of the ccNSO Working Group’s guideline to standardize the process for nominating and appointing working group chairs.

The final recommendation regarding working groups and committees is that the ccNSO’s participation in the IANA Naming Function Review Team should not be hindered due to the number of changes in the number of ccNSO members or non-members. The bylaws currently require two members and one nonmember of the ccNSO to be on the IANA Naming Function Review Team, which the ccNSO has requested the ICANN board to change as of April of this year. We concur with this request, and recommend the three seats are geographically-diverse and membership-neutral.

In terms of structure and operations of the ccNSO Council, many respondents expressed interest in improving the diversity of councilors. Our fifth recommendation is to apply a term limit for councilors to involve more people. However, for regions with fewer people or countries, the term limit could be waived if it is not feasible to adhere to. And we will note that in the 2010 ccNSO organizational review, there was a more restrictive

recommendation on councilor term limits that did not take into account the diverse regional contexts, and therefore was not adopted, since it was not feasible to implement across the regions.

Our sixth and seventh recommendations relate to barriers to participation. It is important for a diversity of voices to participate in ccNSO meetings. To address this, we recommend the ccNSO Meetings Program Committee alter meeting formats to foster more interactive discussions and participation during ccNSO meetings. And I will note that our suggestion R in the report has several ideas for implementing this recommendation.

The other component is that we would like ICANN Org to provide real-time scribing of ccNSO Members Day meetings. We also recognize that this recommendation is outside the ability of the ccNSO alone to remedy.

Our final recommendations, in terms of structure and operations, relate to orientation and onboarding. We heard during the review that enhanced orientation and onboarding would be useful, not only for brand new ccNSO members, but also for members who have been around for a few years, but still feel somewhat new to the community, as well newly-elected leaders in the ccNSO. Therefore, our eighth recommendation is for ICANN to translate

the written ccNSO course that is on ICANN Learn into all ICANN languages.

Nine, we recommend that the ccNSO streamline the mentor/mentee program procedures to catalyze mentor-mentee relationships. And 10, we recommend that when the ccNSO website is updated, all newcomer resources are aggregated into a single location on the website, so that it is more of a one-stop shop, so to speak. I will now turn it back to Kristy to review the draft recommendations for accountability.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Thanks, Mallorie. So, under accountability, which is the third element of the independent review, many of the assessment findings related to accessibility and transparency of information, most of which resides in some way, shape, or form on the ccNSO website. Number 11 recommends that ICAAN prioritizes redoing the ccNSO website as soon as possible. Again, we recognize that this recommendation is beyond the ccNSO alone to remedy, but since the website related to so many of our findings, we think that a recommendation on this from the independent examiner may help the cause. It's also important from a transparency and accountability perspective.

There are two recommendations under accountability pertaining to the Council. The first is that the ccNSO Secretariat and Council

review the naming, filing, and uploading process for ccNSO documentation, to avoid observed challenges of not being able to locate documents on demand. The second related to the Council is that the Council adhere to the ccNSO Council Practices guideline, in term of publishing agendas seven days in advance, or making a change to this guideline if it is too restrictive or impractical to consistently follow.

Finally, the last recommendation, number 14, is that the independent examiner in the future have access to archived ccNSO mailing lists for the period of the review, in order to verify information received during interviews and through the survey. We also would note, to anyone interested, that the process of streamlining organizational reviews is out of public comment right now, in case you have input on the overall review process.

This next section provides just a few illustrative examples of the draft final report's suggestions. As noted in the beginning, suggestions do not have the same weight as recommendations, and we do not expect the ccNSO to readily commit to implementing them. However, there may be ideas the resonate, and that are further explored by the ccNSO in pursuit of continuous improvement.

Just to highlight a couple here. For continuing purpose, many of you that we interviewed and that conducted the survey

underscored the importance of institutional knowledge. So, suggestion F in the report provides ideas for systematically capturing, retaining, and sharing institutional knowledge. For example, this could include conducting interviews with past or founding leaders of the ccNSO, sharing ccNSO knowledge through interaction with other SO/ACs, and of course, many of you indicated that the website is a central platform and hub for collecting and ensuring information is systematically organized and available.

Under structure and operations, a suggestion, which is lettered J in this case, is that councilors pay greater attention on new, next generation leaders in the nomination and appointments process for working group members and chairs. As you may recall, we also provided a recommendation that working group nominations submit anonymized biographies, where there are limited seats available.

Then, for accountability, suggestion letter Z says that a few ideas for the new website that we heard from the interviews and the survey. There were a whole host of ideas for the next iteration of the website, how to improve it. It may be helpful, once a new process is actually underway, to convene some sort of working group to determine the priorities for the new website, recognizing that it probably can't do everything that you hope it can, but figuring out what those priorities might be would be helpful.

This concludes our presentation of the draft recommendations and suggestions. It would be great to hear if you have any questions for us that would help inform your review of the draft final report, which, again, is out for public comments until the fourth of August. Or if you've got any comments on the findings, the recommendations, or suggestions that we've presented so far. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS:

Hello, Pierre Bonis, .FR. I just have a question of some of your first recommendation. You ended your recommendation stating that it was difficult for you to find information. But your first recommendation seemed to be based on the survey that you did, and on the feedback that you received from members.

I take the working group example. I understood that some members think that it's not very transparent, and so your recommendation is to make it more transparent. But what in the current ccNSO rules, that are very easily available online on the ccNSO website, seems to you not transparent? What should we change, because to me, it's very clear. So, I think it's going to be difficult to implement something when we don't see where is the problem.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Was there a specific recommendation that you were referring to, just to make sure that I'm answering your question? So, in the beginning, with regards to working group nominations?

PIERRE BONIS: Yeah.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: This one? There's two different ones.

PIERRE BONIS: No, the one before. "Should update section 3.5 of the guidelines ccNSO working group to clearly articulate and standardize the process for nominating and appointing working group chairs." Where do you find that it is unclear?

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Based upon our review of the documentation, it seems like every working group has its own charter, and how it selects a chair. In some cases, it's nomination by the Council. In some cases, the nomination comes from the working group. Every working group has its own process, so this recommendation is to standardize that process across the working groups, rather than having it be by working group. Does that answer your question?

PIERRE BONIS: Maybe, Bart, can you help us with that? I was practically sure that most of the time, the working group are ... Whether this is proposed or this is from the working group proposing a chair, and the Council is validating it, so I don't see, even if in the charters ... The charters may be different. I think most of the time, it's the way it goes, so I don't see how it's not standardized.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, thank you for your comment. Perhaps we can clarify a bit of the language there to make that a little bit clearer. Yes, please.

LEONID TODOROV: Thank you. Leonid Todorov, APTLD. Basically, my comment and question will be about the same recommendation. Could you please elaborate a bit on this notion of the selection process for working group members? Pardon my ignorance. I believe that there is no selection process per se, because usually, participation in any working group under a ccNSO is a completely voluntary process. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: This is on recommendation number two. Is that right?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Correct, yes.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Yes, you're absolutely right. In almost all cases, there's no restriction on the number of seats or volunteers, and it's entirely open to whoever wants to volunteer. However, there are some cases where the number of seats is restricted, and in those very unusual, minor cases, we heard from the interviews and from the survey that people would like to see that a little bit more transparent, and that the selection of those members be based upon your biographies, and not necessarily just your names. And so, this was a way of anonymizing your biography. The Council is helping to select the members in those few cases, but it's not very often that the membership is restricted.

LEONID TODOROV:

Alright, I'll take it. My next question will be exactly about this anonymization. What you allude to is that some members surveyed have certain doubts about whatever ability of ... Let's put it like, selection board or whatever, or council, to pick right candidates for the job. So, do you believe in such a tiny community, and very close community as ccNSO, these biographies can be anonymized without people making mockery out of that? Let's put it such way.

MALLORIE BRUNS:

Sure, yeah. That's a fair point. I think the spirit of it was that in the effort to get next-generation leaders that may not have the same relationships or name recognition. So, if it's just a name being put forth, without a clear understanding of what that person's background or expertise is, sometimes there's a perception, anyway. We can't validate this, because I don't know what people are going through in their heads when they're making these decisions. But there was a perception that newer, or younger generation, or less-experienced people were not being selected because they didn't have the networks, the relationships, or the name recognition that people that are more experienced and have been involved for longer periods have.

Therefore, when councilors rank their votes in terms of who is selected, there was a perception that maybe this is done less on a person's experience, based upon their biography, and more on their name, and who knows them, or who knows what they've done or not. Therefore, if you're providing a bit more information about the person's background, and their credentials and expertise, then perhaps the ranking decisions could be more informed, rather than just looking at the names and making a decision. That's the spirit in which that was made.

IRINA DANELIA:

Hi, my name is Irina Danelia. I'm with dot-RU. May I ask to have a look at recommendation number one? Okay, no. It's regarding number two, surprisingly. There are many comments regarding this first part of the recommendations. We have mentioned today and yesterday that ICANN, as a whole community, but also ccNSO as a part of it, actually suffers from the lack of good candidates and of the volunteers to do the amount of work we have to do.

In this situation, recommendation number two would be absolutely great if we have like 10 volunteers per seat. But the reality is that we have probably one per one, or probably even less sometimes. So, my concern is that putting additional requirements, like even write a biography, may put additional restrictions to those who would probably might volunteer, but, "Writing a biography? I just better do my everyday job."

I'm really concerned that implementation of this recommendation at this stage my create additional barriers, and so we would probably rather postpone its implementation until we have a really good bank of volunteers to choose from, but not before. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

That's helpful, and that's definitely one of the findings that we heard in the review. That's helpful for us to take into

consideration, in thinking about any revisions or refinements to this recommendation. Thanks for raising that. Please?

PETER KOCH:

On the very same recommendation. As many people in the room, I'm a computer scientist by education, so anonymous has a very strong meaning to me. Leonid already mentioned that the community's rather small. It also would mean that anybody with an experience within this community would probably not be allowed to mention that, or it would be struck out of the application because people would no longer be anonymous to the inside or to the outside.

So, I really urge you ... I understand where you're coming from. I understand that there might be a problem—not only a perceived problem—but I really urge you to adjust that language so that it is technically possible to implement it.

On the other recommendation, where I think you were mentioning either next generation or the ... Yeah, the next generation part. No, it was the ... Sorry. The perceived lack of transparency and standardization in working group charters, or selection of working group chairs. I'm not completely sure that the recommendation follows from the finding, because the finding says it's a perceived lack of transparency. Well, a

perceived lack of transparency probably is a lack of transparency, because the perception matters.

For the standardization, the perception doesn't matter so much. It's, again, a communication issue. So, the recommendation should rather read that ... clearly articulate. It's fine, but then the question of standardization doesn't really follow from the finding. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Thank you. Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Byron Holland, dot-CA. I just want to reinforce the points made by the last two speakers, and fully support them. If you go back to the previous recommendation, I'm going to posit that perhaps you've actually missed what we need here. And there is certainly, I'm going to say, a current trend to do what you're recommending here. But I'm going to suggest that over my time here, which has been a reasonable while now, we've had numerous drives, and working groups, and committees to try to generate more interest and participation of next gen, or quite frankly anybody—any age, any person, anybody. You're willing to come and do the work? Come on in.

It strikes me that over the years, that's been the issue, not that there's a glut of old timers hogging up all the good spots. I think any of us who might fit into that category—and perhaps I'm one, so here's my bias. I would love it if there was more people who'd step up and do it, and I would welcome them, and I would mentor them as I could, as I'm sure that every colleague in a similar spot to me would probably also do. So, anything that puts a hurdle in front of people ... Even if it's something as simple as a short bio, it is a hurdle, and we already have enough trouble getting people to show up, let alone putting more hurdles in front of them. So, I just ask you to think about that.

The other thing is, maybe anonymizing isn't as important as, in the charter or in the early going, understanding what the required skills are, because a lot of what is being referred to here, some people would call experience. Experience is needed in some of these subjects, which can be complicated, or to put it charitably, arcane. And that experience, background, and knowledge does matter.

That doesn't mean newer should be involved. They absolutely should be. That's how they're going to get experience and knowledge. But you need some of those folks who have it and bring it. So, some kind of skills matrix might be the helpful solution, as opposed to anonymizing, and some of those skills may be new and fresh thinking. Insert here with new, young

blood. I think that's an entirely legitimate thing to do, but I'm not sure you've actually hit the mark on this particular recommendation, given this finding and perhaps the next finding. So, I'd ask you to consider those things as you work through the next iteration of your draft.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Great. Thanks, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY: Okay, any other questions, comments? Yes, Giovanni. Please, yeah, always.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: First of all, we should thank you for the time you spent reviewing the ccNSO family, the ccNSO procedures. I believe it was not easy. I believe it was ... In a world that is representing a variety of businesses, a variety of people, culture, social habits, and much, much more. The ccNSO, probably, we spoke about, was not born under a lucky star when ICANN was created. It took a while for the first ccNSO meeting to take place at ICANN, and that was 2004, the first formal ccNSO meeting.

I don't want to comment on the specific recommendations or suggestions, or advices, or tips, or tricks, or whatever. I like to, again, to thank you, but also to invite you, in light of what Byron or [Peter] just said, to eventually have a further look at the recommendation and the suggestions, and think that we are an incredibly broad community—much broader than other constituencies at ICANN—and that is reflected in the way we operate, and is reflected also in the way we manage the different working group, the way we manage, let's say, the fatigue of the multi-stakeholder model, as I said yesterday.

I think it would be quite important for us, not only to follow up on some of the recommendations and suggestions, but again, to make sure that we focus on real priorities for this community. And there are quite a lot of priorities, so sometimes ... I'm going, currently, through five audits, and that is what the European Commission is making us entertain with. It's really like, you just go through five audits, and that's okay, and then in September, you've got one more, because that's the bonus one if you finish.

I think audits are useful whenever they help you to improve constructively. I'm seeing that many of those recommendations are meant to constructively improve our working methods. At the same time, I think it would be also nice for you to have a further look, and think about how to make those recommendations

livable, and implementable, and deployable, considering the variety of the ccNSO community. So, thank you again.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Thanks, Giovanni. Just a word on that, actually, before we close. I'll just go to the end here. Lars, jump in if you're in the room and I get this wrong. The draft final report is out for public comment. We've taken notes of your comments and questions, your suggestions on revising, revisiting, refining some of the language that we have in the draft recommendations. We would encourage you to submit any additional thoughts for the public comment period.

As I understand it correctly—and I'm just briefly summarizing here—once the report is finalized, it goes through a feasibility assessment from the ccNSO's perspective, looking at the recommendations, and providing a report on: are they feasible? Are they appropriate? Are they implementable from your perspective?

So, of course, we'd love to hear from you now about whether or not they are feasible, or whether or not they could be improved, or strengthened, or they're just not appropriate, so that we're not ultimately submitting recommendations that you say, "No, we can't do this." But just so you know, there is this additional layer of going through feasibility assessment. If you deem it not

feasible, then you have the opportunity to do that. I see one last comment or question. Yep.

JORG SCHWEIGER:

Jörg Schweiger, DENIC. Sorry for running late with my question. I was wondering about the process. As I understand, you've been interviewing a substantial number of ccNSO members. I was wondering whether you did ask them, not only what could be improved, but what is already running really good, so that we do not only get input from some that may perceive that something is wrong, but that we also get a strong voting on those things that are really good and that should not be dropped. Thank you.

KRISTY BUCKLEY:

Sure. In the report itself you'll see the bulk of the report is findings. So, for every section of the report, we summarize what we heard. We summarize where we've had to fact check. In some cases, "Here's what we heard, and it's actually not factually correct, or doesn't line up with the documentation." That's all in the findings. A lot of what we heard, especially under continuing purpose, was all of the roles and values that the ccNSO provides to its members, to the community—the important role that it has within ICANN.

That’s all there, and so it’s not just about it, “Here are the problems, and here’s what you should do about them.” It’s a lot of what we heard from the community in terms of what is working well, what they value, what they want to see more of. So, that’s in the findings section of the report, and I encourage you to look at that. Where things are going well, we say things are going well. We don’t have any recommendations. On continuing purpose, there’s only one recommendation for the whole section.

Okay, any final questions, comments? Okay, I think that’s it. Thank you all for staying with us. I think this is the last session, but I’ll turn it over, maybe, to Katrina. Okay, thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI:

Thank you. Thank you very much for this session, and thank you very much for staying with us until the very end. This actually concludes our meeting—our two-day ccNSO Members Meeting. I really would like to stress again the importance of feedback from you. There are two ways for us to learn what you think, and what you want to be improved about ccNSO meetings. One way is that you tell us, and the other way is that you just leave the room because you don’t like what we have for you.

We really would like you to choose the first option, meaning that you fill in the survey, you talk to us, you email us. Wherever you have an idea, wherever you have a topic you’d like to discuss, just

let us know, because we're not good mind readers, I must say—at least, I definitely am not.

So, thank you very much for being here. I'd like to thank, now unofficially ... At the end of the Council meeting, we'll do that officially. I'd like to thank, unofficially, our host, dot MA. I'd like to thank all of you for being here. Thanks a lot to Secretariat, to Members Meeting Program Committee, and to all of you. I hope to see you all in Montreal, where dot CA will happily welcome us to their land. So, thank you very much, and safe travels back home. Bye. See you next time.

Yes, sorry. Forgot to mention that we have a Council meeting, which will take place in another room—not in this room, but another room. It's going to be warm there, at least. That's a promise.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]