

---

ICANN74 | Policy Forum – Plenary Session: Who Sets ICANN’s Priorities?  
Tuesday, June 14, 2022 – 10:30 to 12:00 AMS

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. Hello, and welcome to the ICANN74 Plenary Session: Who Sets ICANN's Priorities?

My name is Andrea Glandon, and I am the remote participation manager.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

Interpretation for this session includes Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, and Spanish. Click the "Interpretation" icon in the Zoom toolbar to select your preferred language output.

During this session, comments or questions submitted in the chat pod will only be read aloud if they are in the proper format, as we will note shortly in the chat, and during the designated discussion time.

If you wish to speak during the designated discussion time, for our virtual participants please click "raise hand" in the Zoom toolbar. Before speaking, please mute all devices and notifications.

---

***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.***

---

Please ensure that you have selected your preferred language input. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation. Once the moderator states your name, please unmute your microphone and state your name.

For in-person participants, if you would like to ask a question, please go to one of the standing microphones in the room.

There will be three polls conducted during the session. For our in-person participants, if you would like to participate, please log into Zoom to take the polls.

To view the real-time transcription click closed captioning in the Zoom toolbar.

Now please welcome session chair Jordan Carter. Please begin.

I'm sorry, we switched that, so Alejandra Reynoso, please begin.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Andrea, no problem at all. So I'm Alejandra Reynoso. I'm the ccNSO Council chair, and I would like to welcome all of you to this plenary session, and I am here as an aid to Jordan, who could not join us in person, but he will give us an introduction to this plenary.

Please, Jordan, go ahead.

---

Give me a couple ideas of what might be good for you for future gifts.

JORDAN CARTER:

Hi, Alejandro, and to everyone. I think we've got a bit of cross-talk going on with people who are not speaking are not muted, so if I get interrupted by that, my apologies and their apologies as well. And I also apologize for not being there in person. I got positive with COVID on Saturday, which is exactly the wrong time, but I'm not wearing a mask because I'm isolating myself.

So thank you, Alejandra as well for stepping in to chair this. And thank you all for being part of the session.

I've just got a few introductory comments to hopefully set us off in the scene here.

So why does this matter, I guess? And the purpose of this session is for us to say it's half a decade since we discussed this in plenary in Johannesburg in June 2017, and some things have changed. A pilot on the ICANN prioritization framework is under way, and there's a need as we improve the way we do this work to be really clear and agreed about an important question, which is who should be responsible for setting ICANN's priorities? And this plenary would like you to keep that question in mind, both in the general abstract sense with what we think should be the answer

---

and thinking about the lessons learned through the (indiscernible) of the prioritization framework.

Five years ago, there were sort of four observations that we captured from that session. The first one will be familiar, I think, to many of us: That there were too many things happening at once within the ICANN environment. We discerned a need to set priorities and to lower the learning curve for participation in ICANN work. We identified a pattern of volunteer burnout and the limits that we were pressing into in the volunteer community that does much of the ICANN work that gets done. And there was an identified possibility of the CEO, Board chair and SO/AC chairs getting together on a regular basis to discuss priorities and coordinate better.

And since 2017 some of those things have happened or changed. So there is a regular SO and AC chair roundtable in place. There's the work thread about evolving the ICANN multistakeholder model, and out of that there were topics identified that did include prioritization and how long some of our processes take.

There's been the reality of the pandemic, meaning that we went into remote-only work and did, in fact, force some prioritization on us simply due to a lack of capacity and a lack of meeting time in our virtual-only years. And there is the ICANN prioritization framework that has evolved that I mentioned already.

---

And so the hope with today's session, ably facilitated by the two lovely people on the stools on stage beside Alejandra, is to tease this out with you, to look ahead and say how can we avoid having another conversation about this in five years? Not avoid having another conversation about priorities, because that should be ongoing, but a essential that we aren't yet establishing and running them clearly enough, how can we avoid that. How can we do this work better?

And so it's a look ahead. It's not about blame. It's not about trying to disinter something that happened in the past. And we really want it to be very immersive on your part. And so please get ready with your questions and comments.

We've got a couple of discussants that we've lined up for this. One of those is Matthew Shears, who is on the Board of Directors. And the hat he's wearing in this context is as chair of the Strategic Planning Committee of the Board. That committee has responsibility for strategic planning and also the multistakeholder model evolution check. And he also leads the Board Caucus on budgeting and prioritization of community reviews. So he'll be bringing a Board perspective there.

And Xavier Calvez is in a similar role. He's the Senior Vice President and Planning and Chief Financial Officer for ICANN, and his team I know has been supporting the prioritization pilot that's been going on.

---

Those two are two discussant, sort of convener rapporteur type people. Everyone who is speaking, we'd love you to bring a perspective from your part of the ICANN community to this work rather than trying to feel that you're obliged to be a representative with an official line from your community. We want it to be an informal, engaging discussion that really gets some thinking on the ground about how it's going, how we can improve things in terms of prioritization and just continue evolving the way that we work together on this.

So once again, I apologize not to be there to do this in person and hand it back to the lovely Alejandra and look forward to where the conversation goes.

Have a great Tuesday.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan.

So now we will have one of our discussants first, and we invite Xavier to the microphone, please.

XAVIER CALVEZ: I struggle to speak with a lot of people behind me, so I'll try to...

Hello, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity be part of this session. Very exciting developments over the past few months and years to improve our overall planning process. This

---

community has been making the point for a long time that we need to be able to prioritize our work, and prioritizing is absolutely a part of how we plan, anyone plans. At some point, determining what we want to work on and focus our efforts on is a very important step and is a very helpful step to get more things done and faster.

So as part of the strategic plan that is currently in place, that's been developed by the Board and the community, there is an initiative called "planning," and that initiative includes how do we improve our ability to prioritize.

And as part of this initiative, the -- there's been a number of different events happening. Jordan just mentioned the fact that there is now, in the Board, a Strategic Planning Committee. That in itself is an illustration of an increased emphasis on planning. In the organization we also created a Planning Department that concentrates the various activities of planning that the organization carries out, and this department has initiated about a year and a half ago a process to create the ability to prioritize and to define priorities by the community as part of the overall planning process.

So to make it very simple, up to now, the planning process of ICANN was that the organization drafts a plan, writes it down, and then submits it to public comment in the December-to-March time frame. And then the community provides comments. Those

---

comments are taken into account. We finalize the plan. The Board adopts the plan.

Nowhere in this process was there up-front community input as to what the plan should contain. So the prioritization framework that Jordan mentioned is a new process that we are creating at the moment to enable community input up front in the plan, in the planning phase, so that the organization can receive and take into account community input as to what is urgent, what is important to get done, and that becomes an input into the draft plans that we develop.

So we have -- We are going to have for the first time, for this coming planning year, a new phase very up front in the process where the community can provide input to the organization as to what needs to get done.

The organization is going to receive that input. It's going to develop a draft plan based on that input. And then it's going to, as we have in the past, provide that plan back for everyone to see how it looks based on that input from the community. And as you all know, or many of you know, at the end of the process, the community has the "final say," in quotes, to be able to reject or not the decision of the Board to accept the -- to adopt the plans that have been published and proposed.

We have, over the past two weeks, thanks to a group of 16 community members, two per each of the organizations that



---

decided to participate, we had a primary and a supplant person from each of those communities participating to a small working group who got together and prioritized the review recommendations implementation work. So just that scope of work. It's a subset of the work. But that group spent five meetings of an hour and a half each between April and May and looked at about 50 recommendations, a list of 50 recommendations, and assigned a level of priorities to each of those recommendations. That becomes an input that the organization is taking into account to develop an implementation plan that reflects those priorities.

It was a first. It was not a given success. It was not sure that this group would manage to do this. Not because this community is not used to developing compromise together but never on this topic. Never together agreeing on what we try to get done first.

And they were successful. It was amazing to see how this group, in those five meetings, managed to get to the end together agreeing on sorting out together that work of implementation. So congratulations to the participants. Several of you are here. Thank you for participating to that experiment. Congratulations for the successful outcome.

Now we're moving forward towards progress in our planning process. Now we have this input. Now we are going to be more efficient together.

---

I'm happy to answer any questions there may be from you or any questions from the panel. Thank you.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Xavier.

We will move forward with Matthew now, and afterwards we will open the floor for discussion.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you very much. It's delightful to be here.

I don't want to jump the gun and get to the answer to the question but I might hint at it in my comments. The question, of course, is who should be responsible for setting ICANN's priorities.

But let me -- let me talk about something else first. Let me talk about the strategic planning process. Xavier has given you a little bit of an introduction. And let me talk about why that's important for helping us set those priorities.

So the approach we take, as you well know, in setting strategic planning for ICANN is one that engages the entire community. We do so through the strategic planning process. Many of you who are here will have gone through that process when we developed the current strategic plan. And this is a process that involves Org and Board and the community and it takes place over a couple of

---

-- well it takes place more or less over 18 months. We're hoping we can shrink that down a little bit.

So in a way, without jumping the gun, we are all participating in the highest level of prioritization, which is the strategic plan for the organization.

Let me talk a little bit about what happens next, because we're coming to the end of this strategic plan.

So we'll be moving, at the end of this calendar year, into the next phase. We're hoping it won't take quite as much time because we've already got a very good and robust strategic plan, but the evaluation of that plan will occur with the community. We're also looking at this in a full holistic sense. So we'll be looking at the strategic plan in all its facets, and we'll be depending on the community to give us feedback just for that part of the process.

As a part of that process, and this is where we would welcome your thoughts and inputs, we are looking to increase its collaborative approach. So the more we can work together as a community in building that strategic plan, the better it will reflect priorities, the better it will be worked, and the better we'll be able to accomplish it.

We'll use the same process as we did before, five years ago, but we'll tweak it here and there. The strategic plan should be a living document. It's essential that it is. We have, as you know, every

---

year the strategic planning trends process, and that's an important way of getting your input into what those priorities should be and your input in terms of how you perceive the plan has changed or evolved or should change.

We're also trialing something a little bit different now, which I think we'll probably put into place and will open that up a little bit more, I think, which is we're going through now what we're calling the mid-cycle review between Org and Board of each of the priorities. So this will be as another possibility for evolving, making the plan more responsive, making it into a living document, which is essential.

So one of those particular priorities is the multistakeholder model priority. And in that there are specific references to prioritization. We talk about define prioritization mechanisms, we talk about ensure that the cumulative workload of the community is reasonable, and we talk about assuring that priorities reflect the communities' needs. So clearly this continues to be top of mind, it should remain top of mind, but it's something that we need to work together on. And as Xavier mentioned we have various initiatives now that are helping to develop and to contribute to that prioritization.

So lots of work to do, but I think we can say we're making progress, particularly in terms of prioritization, hopefully in terms

---

of workload reduction and addressing some of these other questions that going to be put to us.

So hopefully that helps as an intro. Thank you very much.

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Matthew.

Now I'm going to hand the floor to our moderators, Ashley and Chris.

Please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Alejandra. Hopefully everyone can hear me. It's really weird to be talking to you through this piece of white cloth. I'm Chris Disspain. I am an ex -- recovering board member and currently on the ccNSO Council.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: And I'm Ashley Heineman, and I don't like these masks because I can't recognize anybody. I'm surprised as how impactful that's been, but I know they're necessary.

Anyway, Ashley Heineman, now with GoDaddy, recovering government person, and I'm also the chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group. So looking forward to the conversation.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So this is really supposed to be one of those interactive thingies where everybody gets up and talks. We've heard a little bit from -- already from Xavier and from Matthew. We do have a small number of other people around the room who have already been "voluntold" that it would be helpful if they get up and say something, but really we want to hear from you. We want this to be as interactive as possible. And in that spirit we're going to start with a poll. Who doesn't love a poll?

So, Andrea, do you want to explain how this is going to work?

ANDREA GLANDON: Absolutely. So we will put the poll in Zoom. So if you are in person in the room and you want to participate in the poll, you do have to be logged in to Zoom, okay? So maybe we'll just give them a few seconds to get logged in if people want to participate in the poll.

And I will read the poll and then give everyone a few seconds to answer.

So poll number one: How would you describe your level of awareness of ICANN priorities? Very aware, somewhat aware, or not aware.

And we'll give 10 to 15 seconds for people to answer.

---

Again, the question is how would you describe your level of awareness of ICANN priorities? Very aware, somewhat aware, or not aware.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This is very exciting. Inter.

ANDREA GLANDON: Very exciting stuff going on here.

Okay, Kim, can you show the results?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So somewhat. Somewhat aware.

So very aware 24%, somewhat aware 59% and not aware 17%.

That's encouraging, I suppose.

So having asked that question, let's get into some discussion. We want to know who you think is responsible for prioritization, and we want to know who you think should be responsible for prioritization if you think that's different from who is currently responsible for prioritization. There are no wrong answers. There is only discussion. And in a minute I will stop talking and we will sit in silence until somebody walks to the microphone and says something.

---

ANDREA GLANDON: I actually have a question on Zoom, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Go ahead, Andrea.

ANDREA GLANDON: One second. Okay, from Dave Kissoondoyal: If I understand, while the prioritization framework has a time frame of 18 months, once the priority is set up, the strategic plan is developed. My question is whether, once the priority is set up, ICANN is bound to follow the set of priorities? How do you cater for unforeseen circumstances or force majeure?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Golly, that's starting with a fairly interesting question. Xavier, do you want to just briefly respond to that?

And for those of you who commented that the poll was too quick, we will fix that for the next one.

Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. Thank you, Dave, for the question. I'll try to be very brief.

So the planning process that we currently carry out takes about 18 months to be completed for one year of planning, which is



---

already a little bit weird to begin with. As Matthew indicated, we are trying to find ways to reduce that time frame.

Within that 18 months, we are hoping that the prioritization phase that I described earlier would last only a few weeks and would not add to the total time but would actually happen in parallel of the beginning of the process today. So Matthew mentioned the strategic outlook trends exercises that you all participate into which happens in the current time frame, in the past few weeks and months, and we’re hoping that the prioritization phase of our overall planning process will happen at the same time, and basically now. And that these priorities would be taken into account about at this time of the year by the organization to then develop the plan that will be published in the December time frame. So between now and December, organization has input from the community, develops a draft plan, and then proposes that draft plan. That would be the intent.

Planning is just a tool. If -- to help manage the work. If there are circumstances that change and force -- it's difficult for me to say force majeure with an English action sent. If force majeure occurs, if events that we didn't plan happen, we need to be able to react to them and maybe change our plan. That's what the plan is for, is to be used when things are going according to plan and to be changed if things are not according to plan. So it's just a tool, and it shouldn't be preventing ourselves to take into

---

account events that were not planned that impact the work that we do.

I'll stop here. I hope that was helpful.

Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Xavier. And I'm going to ignore the fact that my boss is at the queue and go to who I think is Milton if I can see through that mask.

MILTON MUELLER: Thank you, Ashley. It's good to not see you again.

So I've just been noticing a pattern here for the last five years, which is that ICANN confronts a problem, and then it creates a new process that it adds on to all the other processes. And so in this case, we seem to be saying there's too many things going on, we don't know what our priorities are, and so what is our solution? We've created another process. We're going to have another process. And you have this very ponderous top-down notion of what priority setting should be like. It's this very corporate strategic planning mechanism.

And let me suggest, I think certainly ICANN Org, the corporation, the priorities for how that is managed should be set by the Board and the CEO. I think that the other stuff should all be done by the

---

responsible supporting organizations; that the GNSO should be setting priorities for gTLD policy-making and processes. The GNSO. Remember that? That's supposed to be in charge of policy-making. And the ccNSO should do the same for CCs and the ASO should do for RIRs. But I don't think the GNSO should be sitting there looking up to ICANN Org for what the priorities are for its policy-making activities.

And I think you really need to delegate the responsibility to solve this problem of too many things going on. I think the GNSO has to decide, you know, what it considers important and get that through. And then the organization should take that as, you know, its orders, its marching orders in terms of what they need to get done.

Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you, Milton. And I think something I've heard -- I'm not saying I attribute myself to this, but a process for a process has been developed.

So I think Matthew would like to respond. Please.

ANDREA GLANDON:

Briefly just a reminder to state your name for our remote participants. Thank you.

---

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, Milton, it's a great comment. It is.

The process really isn't as top-down as you seem to indicate. It actually is a process that's driven from the community. And all parts of the community have their own strategic planning processes, and they have their own strategic planning meetings and set their own priorities. So in many ways what we do when we start the prime process is we go out to the community to get their input. It's not dissimilar to the trends process that we go through every year where we go around, we get the communities' inputs on the various trends, how are they impacting ICANN. Should ICANN strategic plan change because of those new trends?

And when we go into the strategic plan process that we'll be going into at the end of this year, we'll be following the same process. So we'll be reaching out to the community, understand what those priorities are, and see how that will impact the next evolution of plan.

Can I take one minute?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Sure.

---

MATTHEW SHEARS:

So Fred asked a question about what the priorities are. So just in case everybody doesn't know what the priorities are I'm just going to refer you to the strategic plan. I'm just going to take 30 seconds to read them.

At the highest level, the five priorities: Strengthen the security of the Domain Name System and the DNS Root Server System; improve the effectiveness of ICANN's multistakeholder model of governance; evolve the Unique Identifier Systems in coordination and collaboration with relevant parties to continue to serve the needs of the global Internet user base; address geopolitical issues impacting ICANN's mission; and ensure ICANN's long-term sustainability.

If you go into the plan, each one of those has a significant level of detail below them, so you'll have a fuller sense of how those should be achieved.

Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Matthew. Before we go to James, I think what you've just done illustrates part of the problem. Not you, obviously. Which is that we're not -- we're not clear about necessarily what we're talking about. There's priorities at the strategic planning level. I don't think those -- unless I'm wrong, I don't think there's that

---

much concern about that. I think everybody seems to be relatively fine with that.

Where the problems arise is when you were talking about prioritizing the stuff. So Milton's point about the GNSO is responsible for the GNSO policy is completely correct. And the question then is it has to then go somewhere else because the GNSO itself isn't operational. And what happens then? And how do you prioritize X number of recommendations for policy against Y number of other things that are happening? And that's really the -- for me, the key issue here.

James.

JAMES BLADEL:

Hey, thanks, Chris. James Bladel from GoDaddy. I just wanted to agree with some of the points Milton made earlier, and just a semi-sarcastic answer to your original question of who sets ICANN's priorities. I think we all agree it's everyone and no one.

I think I wanted to flip that question on the head, and who has the authority within ICANN to say no, to say that we can't afford this, we can't -- we don't have the volunteers, we don't have the bandwidth, we just can't take on any new projects, new initiatives or build out new procedures right now?

I don't think anyone really either has a authority or is exercising it. I think the best indications recently would have been the time-

---

out that's been put on the SSAD development. Just kind of some of the eye-popping numbers that were associated with deploying that system as it was envisioned by the GNSO process and saying we should probably take a new look at this.

So in a way, that's -- more of that, please. More of that sort of taking a step back from just, you know, taking the outputs of the policy process and implementing them and subjecting them to some sort of feasibility test. Not a process, not an impact study; just actually having some people say can we actually do this? Do we have the resources? Or is it going to be at the exclusion of everything else that we're doing?

So I think that was -- We need to follow more of that model. I think Goran is probably going to build on that.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Oh, boy. The big guy came down (laughing).

Goran, would you like to say something?

GORAN MARBY: You would be very surprised if I didn't want to say something now when I'm standing in front of the microphone.

Hi, everybody. Goran Marby, for the record.

---

First of all, I think this is a really interesting discussion, and thank you for setting it up. It's such an important one. And I mean, it is a consideration of the discussion we had half a decade ago, or five years, in Johannesburg.

But I -- And I hear some of the comments. But it's we. It's us, is the answer.

I mean, take a -- Because you can't do anything in silos here, and I try to explain that. Let's take a thing like the next round. The next round takes -- yes, it's the GNSO who is responsible for coming up with the PDP, but everybody else is in -- you know, everybody else is interested. In comes the ccNSO, from At-Large, from the GAC, and everybody. So when that outcomes happens, it depends everybody else.

We -- but I -- I want to -- There's one thing I also think. When I came into this six years ago, yes, there was a decision made, and during this decision there was a lot of checks and balances and things built into it, and some of them we are now actually testing. In Phase 1, for instance, when we talked about -- was it Recommendation 7? Where how can one new recommendation have an effect on all other recommendations and other PDPs. It took a while for us to sort that out.

And I think when it comes to (indiscernible) we have to sort of look at two things because this I agree with. Because of the fact we have to do together, we have to look on how we actually do



---

things. We have to come back. Like the discussion we are having with the GNSO right now about how to make implementation more effective, because it's a process issue. And we -- we do letters, because bylaw says that we have to do things in such (indiscernible). And I think we have to have that conversation. We can prioritize as much as we want. If the process is to set up for the organizations and afterwards doesn't support what we're supposed to do, we will just prioritize processes, and that's no good.

But also, I want to react a little bit negative on the word "process." ICANN multistakeholder model has to be bureaucratic. It has to, because it has to be predictable, it has to be transparent, and you need to know who makes the decisions. And that creates bureaucracy. And many of those things actually in the decision, it was very obvious that this is -- the community really wants this to be transparent, accountable, and predictable.

The problem I think we have is that we sort of forgot who makes the decisions, because you can have many, many iterations of decision-makings.

So I'm not here to tell you that everything is working fine, that it's perfect or anything else. I'm really here to say thank you for having this conversation, because the answer for me is all of us. We have to work together. What we're doing is not a new -- What

---

we're doing now is creating a square for a discussion, a framework for how we can coordinate things.

Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Goran. That's very helpful to continue the conversation.

I'm going to come to you in a second, Bruna, but I wanted to go ahead and just pose another question. Feel free to respond to that or the previous comments or previous questions. But what are the top five work items for ICANN? Do we all agree to those? Do they differ from where they were in 2017? Are there current bottlenecks? I think the answer is probably definitely to that. And are the timeframes appropriate?

But I think what we're trying to demonstrate here is perhaps we're not all on the same page. But I'll go ahead and turn it to you, Bruna, if you have a question or comment.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Yeah, a comment. Thank you so much, Ashley. So taking a look at some of the observations that were made on the plenary we had at ICANN 59, I guess one of the main, like, outtakes from the whole thing was that, a), there were too many things happening at once. At the time it was PDP reviews, IANA

---

transition, et cetera. But the second main outcome was that ICANN should lower, somehow, the threshold for participation in processes. And when we look at what's happening now-a-day and also like past these two pandemic -- three, two-and-a-half pandemic years, the feeling is that, maybe building up on what Milton has said, we should really be able to allow for the community to set its own priorities instead of remaking these processes.

In the past years, somehow PDP participation has been reviewed or been changed through a set of different reasons, such as allowing for less re-dispute with litigation, allowing for ACs to have a more concrete opinion throughout the processes, and also through the ODP. But the current NCC evaluation is that this tendency for revisiting or even allowing for new and less formal formats of PDP participation is one of the things that might be helping overload the community or helping like make the burden a little bit worse because, in the meantime, that we worked into participation, we also added way more to the burden.

So that was kind of just a short comment on participation and some of the things we have been feeling so far. Yeah. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON:

I'm sorry, Chris and Ashley before we go on, Ashley, can you speak closer to your mic? And on behalf of the interpreters, please slow down. Thank you.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Andrea.

And before we go to -- Thank you, Bruna.

Before I go to the gentleman at the microphone, Cheryl, I'm going to ask you in a second to talk about the ATRT3 recommendations' effect on prioritization and the dealing with reviewing ourselves to death.

Sir.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm (saying name) from Tunisia.

When I first joined or tried to join ICANN in the 2011, I have in mind that ICANN is a technical organization. So it's collaborating in order to make the Internet -- make secure and make (indiscernible) technically.

So the main scope or the main job of this organization is assume that -- or assure the security and the over (indiscernible) of the Internet.

In my opinion -- after that, and involving with activity with ICANN, I saw that ICANN is doing some policy and in order to manage those activity. But in my mind I have always the idea that ICANN

---

is a technical organization. So the priority is that the technical community follow the evolution of this technology.

So it depends on this -- the technical evolution. All the aspects and all the policy will be iterated or evolved. So my opinion.

The evolution of technology is the key work of any prioritization. So if you would like to prioritize, it depends on the current technology that you are using.

If the technology -- If you will start, for example, by evolving policy and technology is so far from your policy, it never works. So for me, technical is the keyword for prioritization.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks.

Cheryl.

CHERYL LANGDON ORR:

Thanks for the opportunity, Chris. Cheryl Langdon-Orr here, basically because I actually like strategic planning and get very excited about reviews and particularly find this a passionate area of interest.

But from a perspective of the ATRT3 recommendations, which is what Chris specifically wanted me to address, looking at just one

---

aspect of the array, and it was a huge array, of things approved and yet to be implemented just from the specific review teams, which I remind you all are broad-based community activities with all of ICANN community to them, and going through public comment, so I would call that really a solid piece of multistakeholderism development there, there was a, dare I say, bloody ridiculously large number just not gotten to yet. Each ATRT has had this discovery every time they've looked at the reviews that have gone on before they've been called in to order and do their service. And all that's happened is some have come off the list, some have been done, some have been misinterpreted, some have been said that they were complete and yet when you do the analysis not quite the way the review team had intended them to be. So there was communication problems. There was all sorts of reasons, but there wasn't a whole lot of solution, and the numbers just go up and up and up.

So ATRT3 made recommendations which particularly called for the following. And this is paraphrasing. It is not quoting at all. It's that some form of community input should be enacted that allowed us to look at, just from specific review team recommendations that were outstanding, what was still relevant, what's been overtaken by time -- things change. We just heard Chokra (phonetic) talk about, you know, technology. Stuff moves fast. What can no longer even be worked out, and even when you ask the people who wrote them they can't remember what they

---

were meant to do. All of these things have to be considered, and all of these things have to then be now what's important, what's vitally important, what would be really nice to have but can probably wait.

And that's exactly what this pilot did. And I was delighted when Org decided to look at that particular (indiscernible), although that was a fairly hefty one in my view, of outstanding matters -- sorry for the pause -- outstanding matters just on specific review teams. In response, therefore, also meeting the recommendation from ATRT3 to just try and clear, and in an absolutely accountable and transparent way, how we are putting what gets to the top of the pile and what may indeed be reviewed and decided to be removed from the pile totally, but with input from all the parts of the community. So that's what we did. Chris, you were there. It was part of it. But that's only one aspect of the whole picture. And that's where the planning from GNSO, the planning from ccNSO, and the planning from all of these other implementables some way has to come together and be looked at from a resourcing and what can be done faster, smarter, longer term plan, more urgent. That also needs community input. Well, at least in my very biased view.

Anything else, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

No. Thank you, as always.

---

So there's a question hanging out there, which is what are our top -- what should be our top priorities? Does no one have an opinion about that?

Nigel.

I'm sorry, are you walking to the microphone?

FIONA ASONGA: Yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Please go ahead.

FIONA ASONGA: Morning, everybody. My name is Fiona Asonga, and I'll speak in English.

I think the presenters who have come before and especially Goran have raised important issues, and Cheryl here stated something that is very critical that you need to remember as a community. One thing about ICANN that makes it very different and unique is the fact that we are a multistakeholder community. And that means that the priorities of the different stakeholders cannot all be handled by ICANN, the organization: the Board, the CEO, and the staff.



---

The different groups within ICANN also have a responsibility to have a set of priorities that are important and critical to the continuity of all those supporting organizations and entities that cannot be done by ICANN staff, Board, and CEO.

So we need to be able to have a way of prioritizing that clearly brings out the distinctions of the priorities of ICANN the organization and ICANN the community. Because it is the priorities of these two entities that make ICANN what it is.

There are priority issues that are raised by the community and move on to ICANN organization, ICANN Org, to implement, to accommodate within their strategic plans and priority issues. But there are those priority issues that must remain within the different supporting organizations and constituents of ICANN that the respective constituents and chairs and the structures they have there, really, which are the GNSO, the ASO, the ALAC, and all these have to work on. And some of them may require some financial assistance from ICANN Org because they are a priority of the communities, and others may just require the approval of ICANN as an organization, knowing this is happening, this is going to happen in this particular region of the world under the umbrella of ICANN and it is acceptable. It is something that alliance to our mission, and we can run with it. But it is not necessarily a priority of the organization to drive, because when we throw everything to the organization, it becomes too broad

---

and too large and stops making sense to the organization, and then it stops making sense to others, the community.

So how do we do it then in a way that is relevant both to the community and to the organization and become then synergized in certain areas and know that we're still diverse and have to work separately in other areas to achieve the one thing that makes ICANN what it is: A multistakeholder global organization.

Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hear hear. Very nice comments, Fiona. And I think that really highlights I think something that hasn't really been covered yet today. And I might be interpreting your words, but what I hear is a responsibility of the community as well; that we can't rely solely on ICANN. That we need to go back to being a community working towards the same goals, maybe with different perspectives. But I think we may have lost a bit of that along the way, and perhaps it's time that we accept a bit more responsibility as well.

Before asking the next question, I will turn it to Nigel. Please.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just before Nigel starts to speak, there is another microphone here if you want to form two queues. It's to stop you from having to demonstrate the distancing, you can actually use these.

Sorry, Nigel.

ANDREA GLANDON: Also, Chris, before Nigel speaks, we do have questions and comments when you're ready.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We'll get to them in one second.

Sorry, Nigel. Go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: That's all right. I don't mind. You know, I'm quite happy standing around nervous.

Nigel Hickson, UK government. I'm going to be very brief. I want to say three things, I think.

First of all, I think it's a testament to the openness of ICANN, to the Board and the community that we're actually having this discussion at all. For many organizations, this sort of discussion about how we set priorities just doesn't always take place. So I think it's an extremely useful discussion that we're having, and it's great that we've planned it for this sort of plenary session.

---

The second point is that the priorities of an organization like ICANN of course have to be global in the sense that people are looking at what ICANN does. ICANN does not exist in a vacuum. ICANN is part of the global multistakeholder Internet governance process. And therefore, the Board in developing the strategic plan from the inputs of the various constituency parts has to be aware that the world's -- the eyes of the world are looking at ICANN. It's not just what ICANN does; it's how effective ICANN works, how effective is the results of the Domain Name System and all the attributes of it.

In terms of setting priorities, then, clearly the Board and the organization have a vital role to play, because the constituency parts, the SOs and ACs, know so much, but we don't know everything. And therefore, the strategic framework that's developed with the input of the SOs and the ACs seems an excellent way forward.

But there's a second track to this. There's a second parallel track which Milton and the others have picked up, and that's what is the actual work that we can carry on? What is the work that we're capable of taking forward? What, within that strategic framework, should be our priorities? And I think that has to be set by the individual SOs and ACs, as we've heard.

From the GAC perspective, and I'm not talking on behalf of the GAC, but we as governments do feel that we have a public-policy

---

responsibility. We don't -- you know, we -- (indiscernible) than that in the sense of set in the direction of ICANN.

But we do reflect, to an extent, what other people are perhaps thinking of ICANN outside of our ecosystem.

Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Our first question was from Fred Baker: 59% of us are somewhat aware of the priorities of ICANN. Would someone please tell us what the current set of priorities are?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So I think Matthew actually did that in the -- when he stood up, because you were responding to Fred's question at the strategic level.

So anything else, Andrea?

ANDREA GLANDON: A comment from Susan Payne: I agree with Milton that the SOs/ACs should set their own priorities, but isn't that what they have done? The GNSO has demonstrated the priority of various pieces of work which have been put into PDPs but the GNSO has no control over them being taken forward and implemented. If

---

you ask the GNSO, they would say they are all -- they all should be implemented, and yet we see that they are not being at present.

I think that's all for now.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. Lori.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you, Chris. This is Lori Schulman, I am president of the IPC and I also represent the International Trademark Organization in my professional capacity.

I have a few ideas about answering this question. First of all, I agree with Goran. I agree that you do need process, particularly in an organization as diverse and spread out as ICANN. Without process, I don't know how anything moves forward. But the real danger is overprocess. And I think that might be really what the issue is inside the community. But absolutely there needs to be a baseline of process for transparency and predictability. No question.

That being said, I think we do need some guardrails in terms of if we have these processes and then we see clear indicators of staff overload and volunteer overload, that's telling you that the guardrails are not set in place, and I would focus on that in terms of when you set up planning and strategic committees. That's, I

---

believe, the number one pain point that we're seeing today at ICANN.

Secondly, I think in terms much how priorities are set, whatever process you put them into, whatever bucket you decide they go, we have to prioritize what we need to do to keep running, right? We have to take a very hard-headed business approach as to what keeps us running, always keeping in mind ICANN's public remit and its mission. But that being said, what do we need to keep it running? Absolutely, I would say that any recommendations that requires technical, technical implementation, that goes outside of the GNSO process, should absolutely be a priority. No question. You need to change a spec in order for the root system to continue to be reliable and working, you do it. End of story, in my view, if I were running the world the ICANN.

The other thing is what else is keeping ICANN from working? And I'm going to suggest one topic now. What's keeping ICANN from working in terms of a compliance perspective is ICANN doesn't know what it can legally access in terms of information. And the contracted parties don't know what they can legally disclose without being subject to fines, whether they be local jurisdictions, regional jurisdictions, without meaning any particular jurisdiction at this point.

But I am going to focus on the GDPR and the EU requirements, because right now, if I were to prioritize one thing, if I could ask

---

ICANN today to do one thing, it's please complete your negotiations for the data processing agreements. Nothing can move forward in terms of compliance, auditing, access. All the really pressure points that are in the GNSO right now are at a stand still because we don't understand how agreements could work. And please direct those resources there.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you very much, Lori.

One more question for everyone to consider, and that is more of a devil's advocate question. Is it possible, considering where we are today as a community, as we've grown as ICANN, as we've developed different communities and constituencies, is it possible to prioritize given the diversity of interest and views? Are we still working towards common goals, common overarching goals, or are we working at cross purposes?

ANDREA GLANDON: Ashley, Jordan has his hand up.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Jordan, please go ahead.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you, Ashley.



---

I wanted to just offer a view on that primary question about who should offer -- who should be making decisions on this. And it kind of comes in a partial agreement and disagreement with what Milton said a while ago. One part is that each SO and AC should be setting its own priorities, and probably does, about what it's working on, but the problem comes when all of that work comes to a resource constrained environment in the ICANN Board and so on.

So I think the only logical answer is that the ICANN Board has to take responsibility for the prioritization. And there are a couple of reasons for that. One is that they are a group composed of people who have been drawn from all parts of the community and people drawn from them, so it's a diverse group, and they have the fiduciary responsibilities to make sure that the organization functions effectively.

So other than trying to layer up, the hypothetical turn of the whole separate additional community process makes no sense to me.

And the thing that I guess concerns me is feeling a sense of timidity sometimes on the part of the Board or the executive, the sort of defensive, oh, no, the community has to tell us what we need to do. The community has to do its work, but I think the Org and the Board need to maybe consider taking on that challenge. And it doesn't mean it will be easy and it doesn't mean that a first

---

cut may not get a blow-back response and lead to some very intensive discussions, but I think that would be better than setting up any separate process to do the prioritization of the work that needs to be done together, needs to be done by the whole Org and community and can't just be deferred over to some SO/AC or separate PDP process or review process.

So this is trying to be gently provocative, I guess.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you, Jordan.

I don't know if you have any comments, Chris, or if I just go straight to the next --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Just go to Milton.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: All right, Milton. Please go ahead.

MILTON MUELLER: I don't think Jordan disagreed with what I was saying at all. I think I would like to second what he said. That when -- I said that the supporting organizations should set their own priorities in their own domain, and then as they pass things up to the Board, the Board has to be responsible for prioritizing them.

---

Let me give you a specific example. During Work Stream 2 in the transition, we fought very hard to have ICANN deal with the issue of sanctions and to apply for an OFAC general license. That passed. That went through the process. Clearly ICANN Org doesn't prioritize that because they haven't done it. We could debate about that, we could pressure them, but the point is they have to decide. They're in the command of their own resources. And what you're going to get from the community process is, a), another process which is going to waste everybody's time, and, b), you're going to get a bunch of general claims, like Lori thinks that, you know, GDPR is the top priority because that's something close to her constituency. Well, that should come up through the GNSO.

Let me give one specific suggestion, however. Perhaps when the GNSO does something, ICANN could create a standardized priority framework that the SOs and ACs could pass their things up in and say this is a high priority. That might end up being totally useless like those mail things that say -- you know, somebody that sends you -- every mail they send you is high priority, but it could be a way for the lower levels to signal to the Board how important they think something is rather than having another process.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Milton. It's interesting, isn't it, that you've got implementation -- what we're really talking about implementing stuff, and the order in which you do it, and then the resource questions which I know Xavier has got to deal with every day, the resources and how do we get the people to make this stuff happen. And it -- The concept that if -- just using the GNSO as an example. If the GNSO was it say here's a new piece of work that we've done, here's where we think it fits in the ladder of GNSO stuff that you've got to deal with, that's actually quite an interesting thought. You're still going to have the competition between the other supporting organization, although let's be frank, almost all of the policy work that comes up comes from the GNSO. Very little, some comes from the ccNSO, but not very often.

You're next.

JOSE GONTIJO: Good morning. I'm Jose Gontijo. I'm the Brazil Internet steering committee coordinator.

Well, the multistakeholder is not easy, right? We know that. And all this process, I guess I've forgotten his name, but it's bureaucratic but need to be for transparency, to be accountability -- to have accountability, and of course it's challenging. But who prioritize everything actually prioritize nothing.

---

And more than that, as she was saying, there are many implement -- recommendations that are not implemented yet. Maybe there are solutions that are looking for problems because if they were really a problem, there would have been implemented. So this is a challenge thing.

I agree that this is -- this must be transparent and this strategic plan framework should be -- have this in mind, how can we implement it. And I do agree of course we have to listen to the community and bring also the bottom-up but bottom-down. We from GAC look into, okay, you have to look into the government side. You have to help this happen, right? At the end of the day, the (indiscernible) everything that is needed in some cases have to start in some moments in the government. But to decide this to have also the government would like to have this and also the community, civil society or companies, they need some specific aspect. And if they agree, everyone, that it should be prioritized, so ICANN Board look in both perspectives, from the bottom-up, also from the other side. I guess it's challenging.

And I do believe that this aspect could be inserted -- could be inside this framework. Thank you.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN: Thank you very much.

I believe that's Greg Shatan over there. Correct me if I'm wrong.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. It is Greg Shatan for the record.

I'm a little concerned, and I would caution against overemphasizing the GNSO's role in setting priorities within gTLD policy. Clearly GNSO has the responsibility for policy development and the GNSO Council has the responsibility for managing that development, but it is not a silo away from all other stakeholders by which GNSO policy priorities and consideration should be taken.

I think further it should be emphasized that it's a responsibility and not a privilege to set -- to create and develop gTLD policy. Deciding which policies will be developed, which ones won't at all does not just come from within the semi-multistakeholder group that is the GNSO. GAC, ALAC, SSAC, larger parts of the community all, you know, need to be taken into consideration at the setting of prioritization.

Clearly when you come to the project management of GNSO, and GNSO has long done, I think, a very good job of project management, although, you know, sometimes there are just too many projects to manage. But that is a kind of lower level set of prioritizations in terms of looking at what ICANN does as an overall organization, community, ecosystem; in terms of what gTLD policies get developed, which ones don't, which ones become accepted, and so on, I think it's a mistake to look at the

---

GNSO as a self-contained, self-sufficient, maybe even self-absorbed body that has, you know, the unique responsibility of everything having to do with gTLD policy development.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Greg, can I ask, just to tease that out a little bit. So the policy that comes out of the GNSO is policy. It's gone through the agreed process to create policy, and those recommendations go to the Board and it's bylaw mandated how that gets dealt with. I don't mean how it gets prioritized but how it actually gets dealt with.

So what -- apart from questioning the legitimacy of the policy, which I know you're not doing, what are you saying? That there should be some kind of body in the middle that says this is how it should be prioritized?

GREG SHATAN:

Not a body in the middle but I think rather at the front end. Or once you decide which policies are being developed, then I think the priority really should be managed, you know, within ICANN. That's really a project management question. In deciding what policies will even be considered for development, that needs to be -- even if GNSO manages that process, they need to look well beyond GNSO. And, indeed, there are -- you know, there's actions by which the Board can initiate a PDP and other things like that.

---

So it's a caution against the GNSO sort of sealing itself off at the beginning rather than in terms of managing the workstream, which is -- I think is within their own remit to manage.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Now I understand. Thank you very much.

Andrea.

ANDREA GLANDON: Yes, we have a question, and then we also have a hand up in the Zoom. So I'll read the question first.

From Dave Kissoondoyal: Xavier already mentioned within the priority setting framework there are two members of the SO/AC. Is the GNSO not represented while setting the priority?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes.

ANDREA GLANDON: Okay. And then Paul McGrady has his under in Zoom. So, Paul, if you want to open your line.



---

PAUL McGRADY:

Thanks, everyone. And Paul McGrady here. Sorry to not be in the room. I went back to the Marriott and just didn't have time to get back before the session started. In fact, there goes my alarm.

I apologize for the background noise and my movement.

I wanted to respond to a question that I thought was really interesting and nobody responded to it, and that question is are we, as a community, working at cross purposes? And is that affecting prioritization and things like that?

And I wanted just to say that working at cross purposes is part of multistakeholderism; that each group will have its own priorities, its own activities, and simply by one group pushing for their priorities, that doesn't mean that we're working at cross purposes. We're just working in this messy multistakeholder system.

The only time I think we're working at cross purposes is if a group or a person has decided that they need an ICANN process to fail in order to accomplish something else. And if we go in wanting something to fail, then I think we are working at cross purposes, and that should give us a whole lot of pause, because as we all know, there is no better model out there. Multistakeholderism, much like democracy, is the worst thing except for everything else.

---

So I wanted to just address that question directly. I don't think there's anything wrong with each individual group and subgroup having their own point of view, their own priorities, but it's not a cross purpose unless the goal is failure of the multistakeholder model. And I hope that certainly hopefully no one here at this meeting has that point of view, but it does give me some concern from time to time.

And again, sorry for the noise and the movement. And I'll see you guys at the next thing.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks, Paul. Just a quick follow-up to that. And that's I think a really good comment that you made. Does that translate into you believing that the current prioritization within ICANN is effective and reflective of what your community wants and needs?

PAUL McGRADY:

So I guess the short answer is that we're all grappling -- I mean, that's the question we're grappling with, right? I do think that this latest effort is a good effort, even if it's not perfect, because it is an effort, right? And it's a way for us all to realize that there is no one group that has responsibility for everything from start to finish. There may be some opportunities for those groups to talk to each other, right? So that we're not saying things like, oh, that

---

PDP took five years. If we thought it was going to take five years and it takes five years, then that's on time, right?

So there are opportunities all along the way, through implementation, through the GNSO, through the ccNSO, through the Board, with inputs from the group that Greg was talking about, right? And those are -- those are matters of communication. And I don't think that any particular group or subgroup in the community is always going to believe that ICANN's got its priorities right because every group has its own priorities, and it's going to be messy.

My point is that that's not really the litmus test. Whether or not each group is happy can't be the litmus test. But the litmus test is, in terms of whether or not we're working at cross purposes, is do we all collectively want this to succeed even if somebody else who has a priority that we don't share maybe got in line slightly ahead of you. And if that answer is yes, then we're healthy. And if that answer is no, then we've got to do some thinking about, you know, some -- providing some additional background on what multistakeholderism means.

That's kind of wordy, but that's what I was trying to convey.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Paul.

Philippe?

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Chris. Philippe Fouquart, GNSO chair.

I just wanted to pick up on Greg's note and, to some extent, follow-up on Bruna's on how -- on the interplay between the prioritization that we're talking about here and those that are being made within the SO/ACs and, in particular, within the GNSO.

I think there's no expectation that these priorities would address policies. I think as you articulated earlier, Chris, I think they are addressed within the -- within the SO/ACs themselves -- SOs.

There certainly now -- Once those policies are approved, I think there's certainly a need to be totally transparent on how we engage -- "we" being, for example, the GNSO Council -- engage with the various parties, whether that's staff through the ODPs or the Board, in making sure that those recommendations get implemented down the road. We've taken a number of different initiatives in that direction, either through the work on the SSAD Light -- or various other initiatives. But there's certainly a challenge there in terms of being transparent. So that's my takeaway.

And on a different topic, as to the -- the prioritization itself within the GNSO, there's certainly no sort of overarching grand committee who would be in charge of that within the GNSO;

---

however, in practice, if you look at how we work on DNS abuse, reaching out to various other SOs, I think that's exactly the question that we're asking: Is it a priority for you? How much is that? What is it that you want to address in this particular topic?

The same would apply on co-generics, for example, with our GAC colleagues, or will apply in a few weeks on this, and with ALAC. So two comments on these. I hope this is helpful.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Philippe. And yes, I think it is, and you're right. I mean, there are -- There's an awful lot of work that goes on that has nothing to do with specific policy. There's cooperation, there's discussion, et cetera. And that stuff just happens. Sometimes it might lead to something that then leads to a policy. But once that policy is made, then it becomes -- there's two sets of priorities, it seems to me. The first set is the Board needs to deal with it; i.e., they need to look at it, they need to discuss it, and they need to say yes or no. Let's just say yes. And then there's another set of priorities which is, right, we've said yes now; how does it happen? And that's the Implementation Review Team and all of that stuff going on. And that's where I think the general feeling is that's where we need some work to make sure that is dealt with and prioritized so that everyone knows.

And the transparency point you made is exactly we know, then it's okay. We might complain, but at least we know.

---

Susan.

SUSAN PAYNE:

Hi. Get a bit closer. Hello, I'm Susan Payne. I'm a member of the IPC, so -- obviously I'm in my personal capacity here, but I was one of the participants in the prioritization pilot on behalf of the Commercial Stakeholder Group.

So I thought I'd make a couple of comments about the experience of that group, and start by saying it was a more positive experience than I had anticipated going into it. The group was very collaborative. We did work well together. We did, you know, genuinely try in a really short time frame to do the best job that we could. And I think, to some extent, it did work, and we did prioritize the recommendations. We obviously had the assistance of staff who had given us the starting point, and that was very important. But I have some reservations about putting all our confidence in that process going forward, however, for a few reasons. One is that we did pick the strategic recommendations to prioritize in that pilot, and to some extent that was a sort of easy list, if you like. They were -- they were all recommendations that had been approved by the Board, of course, but ultimately they were cross-community recommendations from review teams for improvements to how the organization operates in -- you know, in the (indiscernible) sense.

---

And so, you know, generally speaking, we were not particularly at odds with each other or we didn't particularly have differences of opinion, albeit there were a few examples where we did. But generally speaking, we were kind of on the same page.

And I am concerned that that process would be much more difficult once we have recommendations on matters of policy that are also in that mix where we very definitely have differences of opinions even within an SO like the GNSO, let alone across the SOs and ACs. And I am not convinced, even having been a part of that collaborative process, that we can genuinely do that task once we have the harder topics in the mix. If that's the path that we take, I would obviously commit to trying to do it, but I think it will be very challenging.

And I do have a great deal of sympathy, and, indeed, I think I'm in agreement with Jordan in what he said earlier, that at some point it's the job of the Board and Org to be making those hard decisions for the community because you cannot keep throwing everything back at the community and saying, like, oh, you guys must decide, and if you can't, then that's the reason why nothing is going forward. Ultimately -- You know, the Board has recently identified the perception outside of ICANN that ICANN is not getting anything done as being a strategic risk for the organization, and it's the job of the Board and Org to address that risk. And part of that addressing that risk is getting some stuff done.

---

And so Board and Org have visibility on what the resources are, what the staffing is, what the budget is. You know, we were doing our prioritization pilot exercise without having any of that resource or -- information. So we were just saying yes, no, yes, no, but we didn't know if something was going to cost a million dollars or five dollars. And that work piece hasn't even been done yet on those recommendations we prioritized.

I think at some point it's the job of the Board and Org to just do it.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you.

Chris, just to note we have ten minutes left. Okay?

And we have Sebastien Bachollet who had his hand up, so he's going to come up to the mic. He's in the room.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: (No English translation).

It says no English translation. That's a pity.

Seriously, there is no English translation?

INTERPRETER: Yes, there is here. I am here. I am here interpreting in English. Now Sebastien on the mic.



---

Yes, there is interpretation.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay. This is such a discussion. Thank you. Thank you for the interpreters.

And we spoke about each SO and AC, how they could prioritize their decision, their elements. We have to take account the first element. There are works that are done in collaboration, and it is true for each revision, and this is true also for what is called group -- Cross-Community Working Group, and this is not a specific organization inside of ICANN each who will decide on each or each priorities. That has to be done in collaboration.

If it is a collective work, is it the role of the community or is it the role of the Board? Well, this is interesting what we heard today. It seems that we are coming back to a goodwill saying that the Board will have some power in this organization, the Board has lost a lot of power after the transition, the IANA transition. Again, it's time to ask ourselves the same question: What are the points on which the Board should have more responsibilities? Because we are the only organization -- Oh, sorry. We are -- This is the only elected structure in our organization which represents us all, all of us, the community. So we have to be very cautious not to remove all their responsibilities.

---

At the same time, we the community, we should give our opinion on what the most important elements are, point of views are. And sorry, but because the GNSO puts elaborate policies, it doesn't have to be the organization that prioritize what has to be developed. We, the users, also have a point of view on what is done within this structure. No, it's not because it's not in my group that I am the one who has to decide.

Thank you very much for letting me speak.

ALYSSA QUINN:

Alyssa Quinn from the Canadian Internet Registration Authority.

My question is with a lot of recent work being driven by or impacted or influenced by, at the very least, external -- or regulation and legislation, I'm wondering how Org and Board currently takes that into consideration when prioritizing those external factors and how a prioritization framework would take that into consideration as well.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

That's a really great question to ask when there's three minutes left. (Laughing) So if it's okay --

ALYSSA QUINN:

Sorry.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No; no; it's okay. So we'll -- But I think everyone has heard the question, and I think I can say that someone will get back to you on that, if that's okay.

We're wrapping up time-wise.

Xavier, would you like to say something? You said you were there, so -- very, very, very briefly, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Chris.

I just wanted, for clarity, to mention as well as recognize the participants to the prioritization pilot. We've talked a lot about it. And just so that you know who that is, for At-Large, Cheryl Langdon-Orr and Jonathan Zuck. For the ccNSO, Chris Disspain and Irina Danelia. For the GAC, Susan Chalmers, and Manal Ismail. For the GNSO, the CPH, Donna Austin and Jothan Frakes. For the CSG, Susan Payne and Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, Rafik Dammak and Sudhakara. For the RSSAC, Ken Renard here, no alternate member. And for the SSAC Barry Leiba and Chris Roosenraad. And that's the group that worked and got it done.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Very quickly, Susan brought up a number of very important points. She said, and I'm glad to hear that, that it was a relatively "easy lift," in quotes, to work on those recommendations and that the work would be more complicated as we bring in policies into the mix. This is the next stage. Over the next few weeks the prioritization framework will incorporate the policy implementation work that the organization has in front of it into the framework for the community members who will participate to the next iteration of the prioritization framework to prioritize. So the next group, and hopefully some of the participants, I'm looking at them now, will continue participating in that framework, will now look not only at recommendations but also at policies. So we're going to make it one step more complicated for the group to work, but of course we need to be able to prioritize policies.

Susan also mentioned another point which is the community can only provide input. This is how the framework was set up. The output of this framework and the pilot is that the Org received from the group a list of prioritized recommendation. That becomes an input into the Org's planning work.

We are now responsible to take that input into account and make it happen. And Milton was making the point earlier, and I know Maxim in the chat as well --

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                   Xavier, I'm going to cut you off in a second.

XAVIER CALVEZ:                   Thank you. We need to now show this prioritization was effective by actually taking these priorities into account and getting the job done. There's a team in the Org who is working exactly on that now. As Susan was saying, it's not happened yet. It's in the works. In a few weeks we will come back to the entire community with the work plan that gets that work done.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                   Thanks, Xavier.

Okay. This is what's going to happen. Matthew is going to say a couple of small -- short points. I'm going to go to Jordan, and then to Alejandra, and then we're done.

Matt.

MATTHEW SHEARS:               On the last question, let's chat after the session about prioritization and geopolitics.

Susan, you said "just do it." I love the idea. Let's talk about how we can do that, but I don't think "just do it" captures it because

---

we're still a multistakeholder model. We still need to take all those inputs. But let's work on getting those processes more streamlined, more fully engaged, and I think we can move towards just doing it.

Finally, I just want to say thank you very much, everyone. This has been an incredibly useful session. Really appreciate all the inputs. And we will be taking them on board, and looking forward to progressing this discussion together. Thanks. Thank you.

ANDREA GLANDON: Jordan, please.

JORDAN CARTER: Thanks, everyone, for a very productive and interesting discussion. The main thing I've drawn is we're still in the sense-making and exploring phase of the discussion. We didn't get agreement on anything about what the decision-makers should be. We have different views on that question.

We did have a lot of discussion about simple processes, if anything is needed, and that there needs to be a way to say no. But arriving at a comfort level about who will do that I think is something that we've got a lot of work to do.

So I'll hand it back to Alejandra with that. Thanks again.

---

ALEJANDRA REYNOSO: Thank you very much, Jordan. So I think that summarizes what we have discussed. We still -- we need to have a conversation among all the ICANN community to get the priorities in order.

And thank you all for attending. This meeting is adjourned.

Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**