

---

SINGAPORE - SO/AC High-Interest Topic  
Monday, February 9, 2015 – 14:00 to 15:15  
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to introduce you to director of global media affairs, Mr. Brad White.

[ Applause ]

BRAD WHITE: Thanks, Nancy. Appreciate that. I have a personal note I need to get out of the way right away. Because my cell phone was causing a hum in the mic cable, it means my mother is not going to be able to text me in the middle of the presentation as she frequently does to tell me to fix my hair, my collar, et cetera, et cetera. So, mom, leave me alone. All right?

Now that we got that out of the way, welcome to the high-interest session. This session is a little bit different than some of the others that you may attend at an ICANN meeting. It is basically all of ICANN's supporting committees -- excuse me, advisory committees, supporting organizations, stakeholder groups coming together to try to find an issue that should be dealt with collectively as a community.

During this meeting, they collectively decided that we should deal with ICANN -- the way in which ICANN approaches its workload. And when I say "ICANN," we're talking about not just staff but the community as well.

---

*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.*

---

This session, another way it's going to be unique, is that we are not here identifying problems. These gentlemen who are representatives of their respective groups -- we'll get into that in just a second -- have done that. This session is all about finding solutions to some of the challenges that have been identified. It's about finding answers. It's about getting your ideas.

These guys are here to hear what you have to say. They want to hear your ideas for the issues that they've identified.

At the last meeting in Los Angeles, community leaders and some senior ICANN staff came together in a focused effort to try and generate some new ideas, think out of the box a little bit, come up with some clear goals in helping community volunteers and the staff deal with the workload. As we all know, ICANN is growing exponentially. Every meeting, more and more people. We are getting more and more interest around the world. We are in news headlines. The net result of that is the workload increases, increases for staff, increases for volunteers.

The group identified three opportunities to enhance the way ICANN approaches its work and, thus, improve the effectiveness of both the staff and the volunteers.

Identification of the three challenges gave way to some discussion questions. Work prioritization, how do we best prioritize ICANN's work? There's a lot to do every meeting. If you just look at the agenda, the schedule for ICANN52, it can sometimes be overwhelming. That is representative of the work that is being done at ICANN in between meetings, not just during meetings.



---

Information access, how do we best enable access to ICANN information and content? Those of you who are new to ICANN, who've been on the Web site, realize that if we're nothing else, we are pretty transparent. There is a lot of information there about just about everything we deal with. Sometimes the challenge is finding the information we want and finding it in a timely manner.

Stakeholder engagement. How do we best engage and retain ICANN's stakeholders? We talk a lot -- Fadi talks a lot about inclusivity. We want multiple voices from multiple arenas from all around the world. But once we get them, what's the best way of engaging them? How do we keep them?

Project teams were formed for each of these areas. These gentlemen represent those teams. Immediately to my left, Keith Drazek, who is the Chair of the Registry Stakeholders Group, represents the work prioritization group. To his left, Alan Greenberg, chair of the ALAC, our At-Large group is from the information access group. To his left, Bill Drake, Chair of the noncommercial stakeholders, represents the stakeholder engagement group.

These gentlemen are supported by some community leaders who are up here. Why don't you folks stand up and just turn around and let people see you. They may be reaching out to these chaps for additional information or help as issues arise. We want to keep this loose. This is not going to be a real structured, highly produced session. We want to keep the conversation going. We want to keep this a little bit on the unstructured side. So that's going to be the effort here.

Our hope is that they, too, will add to the dialogue.



---

Let me manage your expectations. This is a huge brainstorming session. So here's how you need to engage these gentlemen. We have two microphones right up here. We want to hear as much from you as possible. We want to hear from as many voices as possible. So we stole a page from the public forum. We are going to have a clock on you so when you make your comments, there will be a clock on you at two minutes. If you go over two minutes, we do have snipers in the rafters and you will be taken out.

You can also engage with Twitter. There is a Twitter account, #asksoac. Rob Hoggarth -- raise your hand, Rob. Rob is monitoring the Twitter feed. He'll signal me. He's the voice in my head. My ex is the other voice in my head except Rob doesn't want money.

We also have the Adobe chatroom where people can engage us. Benedetta is on there. She will alert us if there are some ideas, some comments, some questions that need to come up. And we will get to those as well.

These representatives are going to take what's developed in this session and they are going to take it back to their respective groups to develop it, to work it, to chat it out. What we are involved in here is very much a percolating process.

So with that, each of these gentlemen are going to explain what their respective groups have done to date and how they got to where we are today.

Keith, you're prioritization so I will prioritize you. You go first.



KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks very much, Brad. Is the microphone on?

Thanks very much, Brad. Thanks for the setup. Yeah, this is -- it is an honor to be here. I should take a note, I think, before we get started to thank Fadi for his efforts going back to Los Angeles where we brought the chairs of the SOs, ACs, SGs, and Cs together to start having some of these conversations about the concerns of sort of community volunteer overload. So just a note to Fadi, thanks for bringing this together. For giving us the time and the resources to have this type of a conversation. I think it is very important.

So as part of the work prioritization project team, it is myself as Brad said, Keith Drazek, chair of the registries; Elisa Cooper, chair of the business constituency; Rafik Dammak, NCSG chair; Patrik Faltstrom, SSAC chair; and Byron Holland from the ccNSO; and very ably supported by David, Rob, and Benedetta. So thank you very much for that as well.

The issue of community overload in the last 12 to 18 months I think has become a bigger issue, a bigger problem, a challenge. We as the ICANN community have tremendous amount of work underway and have for years and years. But it seems that the intensity and the introduction of new topics, sort of out of the blue has caused quite a bit of overload and a tremendous amount of work. For example, we had the new gTLD program underway in the GNSO. And then, of course, everybody knows last March the introduction of the IANA transition discussions. That sort of came out of nowhere. We had ongoing work that we were dealing with and had to add in really the capacity to be able to deal with something new.



---

Each of our individual communities have individual work streams. There are things that the registries are working on. There are things that the GNSO is working on, different things that different communities here at ICANN are engaged with.

But I think we're seeing more and more in the last year or so sort of cross-community work, work that is -- whether it is a cross-community working group or things like the IANA transition that have us all engaged.

I think the challenge before us is trying to figure out a way to prioritize both internally in our individual groups but also across all groups to make sure that we are not sacrificing quality because of the quantity of work. I think one of the things that I've seen just as a personal note in the registries group is that it's been -- it's become harder and harder this past 12 to 18 months to make sure that we're responding to all of the public comment periods that are out there. There are so many different public comment periods. And it's been a challenge just in terms of volunteer capabilities to make sure that we're both responding in a quality fashion and a timely fashion. And we really effort to do so, and I think we've done a pretty good job under the circumstances.

But, generally speaking, I think we as a community need to try to prioritize our work when it becomes extremely -- when the pipeline becomes overloaded, then it becomes a triage effort, I think, for the community to determine what is it that we can do in a 12-month period or a six-month period. And I think the more we can project ahead, the things that we are -- that we most care about as a community and make sure that we get to those first, the better off we'll be.



---

Why don't I stop there? I really want this to be a dialogue once we get to the Q&A period.

BRAD WHITE: Okay, thanks, Keith. Alan Greenberg, representing the information group.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. This -- the group that was doing this is much smaller. It is myself, Michele Neylon, the chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and Kristina Rosette who is the IPC past president, assisted by Chris Gift, Ashwin Rangan, and Theresa Swinehart.

Before I go into the details, I think it is worth noting that the three topics we have on the agenda today were developed effectively independently. Different people came up with them.

And it became obvious very quickly once we started talking about them, they weren't independent at all. They are tightly linked. And I would claim -- I don't think Keith would agree with me -- that if we could fix the second two, the first one isn't an issue. There are certain things that we're dealing with. And IANA transition and accountability is one of them right now, which essentially are thrust upon us and we can't do anything about them.

The background work, I think, in general we're able to sustain. Right now from an At-Large point of view, we've put other things on hold. They may not have been the ones we lowered the priority of six months ago. But when it became obvious the workload that was associated

---

with the transition and accountability, which for some of us, I think adds up to about 15 hours of conference calls a week, other things normally take a backseat. We don't have to do a prioritization exercise. They just don't get done. And that's the way life works sometimes.

But to go back to the specific topic I'm talking about, as Brad pointed out, we are a very open organization. We publish lots and lots of stuff. Anything that comes out any working group meeting, be it the transcripts, the transcriptions, the action items that come out of it, we publish. They're there somewhere. Finding them is a challenge.

I know in the last week, I have a couple of times tried to find something that I know I saw within the last few days. I know they're there. I think I remember how I found them. I can't find them again.

What one has to do if you don't even know they're there or don't know what quite the right buzz words are to do the search on or where it is on the Web is virtually impossible. That means anyone that we bring in as a newbie into the organization has a very hard time finding things. When they finally find them, they probably are couched in words they don't understand because we are not really good about doing precis and summaries that are understandable. If, heaven help you, that person does not have English as an native language, it just gets augmented. These things build on upon another.

We are not just talking about, oh, the Web site is horrible, we need to fix the Web site. It is much more structural than that. Very often when I'm looking for something associated with some policy process, I go to the Wiki site that I know is the home of all information. It is not there because it was stored somewhere else. Or I go to the GNSO Web site





---

and look up some generic topic like policy activities. Some of them are there. Some aren't. Sorry.

It becomes really a difficult issue to find things. We're not really good at tagging things so that the search engines internal or external can find them.

I will give you a current example. Up until a few weeks ago, maybe months but I think weeks ago, if you were looking for the information about the CWG IANA transition, anyone want to make a guess where you found it? You have to go to the GNSO Wiki and work your way down that hierarchy because that's where it happened to have been placed by someone who created that Wiki page.

Now, that group is a cross-constituency group. There's ccNSO. There's ALAC. There's a bunch of other groups. But if you don't know to look for it within the GNSO, you would never find it. But it is that kind of thing.

We need -- I hate to say this, we need a top-down ordered discipline and design of where to put things so people can find them. And then, of course, we need search engines and nice friendly Web pages and things like that. But it really is a more structural issue than just "I can't find the information I'm looking for." Thank you.

BRAD WHITE:

Thanks, Alan. Appreciate that.

Bill Drake representing the stakeholder engagement group.



---

BILL DRAKE: Thank you. So bottom-up is not the answer for information management you're saying?

ALAN GREENBERG: Bottom-up is not the right answer for getting people to do things in an organized manner.

BILL DRAKE: As my colleagues have said, these issues are all closely interplanetary and difficult to address individually. And they collectively have the impact of reducing our overall capacity as a community to work effectively. And so we were trying to parse things and split them out a little bit.

This project team was, again, a small one. It was me, Tony Holmes from the ISPC constituency, Rudi Vansnick from NPOC, and supported by Chris Mondini and Sally Costerton in the staff.

Basically what we're talking about is this. ICANN has developed all kinds programs now for outreach to try to draw more people in. We fly around the world. We have meetings in different places. We have staff tasked with doing outreach activities and trying to bring people to the tent.

The problem is you get people into the tent and then you can't get them from the doorway into a natural work process.

So the issue is really not so much outreach. I think we're doing okay with that. The numbers are growing. The community is growing. Every part of it I think is taking on more and more people.



---

The problem is inreach. The problem is getting the people who have come in, into a work stream, and sustaining their interest and engagement. And how do you do that? There is a real question and something that we haven't actually, I think, organizationally or as a community set up mechanisms that are specifically tasked to address those kinds of questions.

And, you know, we all see the results. I know that in my case, the NCUC, we have had lots of new members join. But many of them will end up just being on the mail list. And maybe they will participate in some discussions and some topics as they come up. And they'll vote the annual election and so on. But when you say, "If you really want to get into work in the GNSO context, you've got to join working groups" and dig down into the dirt and really engage in these things on an ongoing iterative basis.

Very often for newbies in particular, it is just really hard to figure out how you do that. So you end up with this dynamic -- and I think this cuts across all the community -- where we're expanding in numbers and, yet, you see the same -- relatively same set of hard-core people involved in the policy processes. You can go to meeting after meeting and see the same faces and not a lot of rotating in new skill sets and capabilities and so on. And that's a problem. It is a problem in terms of ensuring that we come up with solutions that are broadly supported by the global community. It is a problem in terms of mobilizing people's human skill sets and resources and talents and so on. It is a problem in just all kinds of ways.



---

So we have to think about ways to try to turn -- and I'm going to quote the great poet Greg Shatan, "lurkers into workers."

Is that copyrighted, by the way?

It is true. We have a lot of people in the community -- to say "lurkers" maybe sounds disparaging, but, you know, they look at these processes, some of which are very dense and time consuming and iterative and so on. There's lots of jargon. You come into a process that seems to have been going on for four years, and you are in the middle of it and you can't figure out how you get started. Who do you talk to? You know, how do you get into the flow of things? It's quite difficult.

So do we need then some kind of approach, whether it's some kind of a community engagement-type mechanism that would work across ICANN or a sherpa system to help buddy up with people, to guide them through, and help them get sustainably engaged. I mean, this the question we have been trying to think about.

So we did a little two-by-two matrix where we just kind of tried to differentiate -- and this is not actually because it doesn't differentiate what I was about to -- say, differentiating between issues that apply across community and then issues that apply within particular parts of the community just to try to get people throwing stuff on the wall and then thinking about both the barriers and the possible solutions.

And this is just two examples of possible barriers and solutions that we talked about the other day in a joint meeting. But there is many others as well. Making sure that we find ways to make the process attractive on a cross-cultural basis, accessible, open, and something that people

---

feel like they can find personal reward in engaging in, that they have the incentives on a volunteer basis. Particularly, if they are actors like civil society actors who don't have a financial skin in the game and are there because they believe in the issues, they are motivated by values and so on, it can be quite hard, I think, sometimes to keep those people really on board in serious hard-core extensive work.

So this is a challenge. How do we begin to do that? How can we think about that as a community? That's what our group is starting to do. And it fits in very closely in with what these guys are doing.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Brad. Just to note, I think we have set the stage here for a conversation in that we've identified the challenge and now it's up to us as a community, I think, to determine how we approach this challenge.

You know, we don't want anybody telling us how to approach it. It's really up to us now to identify the tools and the mechanisms and the processes we want to follow and that we think will work best for us as a community to determine ICANN's workload. I mean, certainly I think one of the things that Fadi mentioned to us on Friday when we had the conversation this week is that what we're talking about here, including the prioritization effort, can actually and should actually play into ICANN's budgeting process. And the strategic planning and the budgeting importantly.

So we actually have some opportunities, I think, here in the very near term, if we can handle it, if we can fit it into our existing workload, to try



---

to prioritize the things that we care about coming up over the next year to 18 months for 2016.

So taking it from the problem statement and sort of the challenge to us all to figure out how we want to address this, the work prioritization group in -- with the support of Rob Hoggarth and staff, started doing an inventory. We figure if we're going to prioritize our work then the logical first step is to actually do an inventory of existing and anticipated work streams. And to identify places where there may be overlap. There could be things, for example, WHOIS where there are probably half a dozen or more parallel or sequential work streams and implementations going on right now. You know, and to do an inventory and to try to identify the ways that we can say okay, this makes sense, this is applicable to the entire community or a subset of the community, so we can at least try to get a framework or a matrix developed that will inform our discussions so we -- it's not that we're just talking about the problem. The groups have actually started looking at possible solutions, but this is really about all of us. It's about the community, and so we want to hear from you.

BRAD WHITE:

I might add, building upon that point from Keith, this is a process again where we're -- we're reaching out to you, these folks are reaching out to you, for your ideas, your solutions, and your thoughts. As is often the case, you may dwell on this session afterwards and you may think well, geez, I wish I had said this. This is the beginning. When this session ends, it's not the end of the process. Our good friends from XPLANE, you may have seen their work from the Buenos Aires meeting, they're



---

going to capture in a visual sort of way what is going on in this session and this white board is going to be near the ICANN registration area. So if an idea comes up, if you're thinking back on this session and you want to add something or you're thinking geez, you know, this never came up, I think it should, here's your chance. Again, it's an ongoing process. These gents want to hear from you. And again, let me just give you our Twitter hashtag again. It's #asksoac. So if you're in the room and you want to ask the question by Twitter and you don't want to get up to the mic, that's fine, too.

We're now going to open it up -- if you want to line up at those two microphones, you can do so. While we're doing that -- yeah, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. Not wanting to lead the discussion of course, but when we had this earlier meeting last Friday in preparing for this, I had sort of an epiphany, a brilliant insight. If volunteers were employees of ICANN, this problem would not have gone on this long without trying to fix it. I think volunteers need to be treated more as employees from the point of view of being provided services and given the benefit of tools that if you were paying for our time you would not have let us go this long without them.

BRAD WHITE:

That -- that leads into an interesting question, while we're waiting for the group to line up or while we're waiting for questions to come in. You guys are here searching for solutions. You want to find some



---

answers. You want to hear some thinking. Have you determined what doesn't work?

**BILL DRAKE:** I can tell you one thing that I think doesn't work is for a few people to end up having to carry all the load because it's unsustainable.

**BRAD WHITE:** And Bill, what you're talking about here is what you said -- mentioned earlier, the same people tend to show up over and over again. Is that it?

**BILL DRAKE:** Yes. It's just simply a problem, lots of people, when an issue comes up, will express initial interest and then say yeah, that's something that should be done. When it comes time to actually get down and do the work, people kind of disappear. You end up with a few core people who are left holding it, and they can't do it. And they also can't very well manage the work processes and play the Sherpa buddy role of helping new people in at the same time because they're just maxed out. So you get people -- you get the hard-core people are completely maxed out and overwhelmed and the new people are a bit frustrated, they can't figure out how to get in. That's a really -- and it works on each other, you know.

**ALAN GREENBERG:** There's one other aspect. When we do get new people, they usually come once and don't come back.



---

UNKNWON SPEAKER: There's a message there.

BRAD WHITE: Yeah, absolutely. Michele, let's take you first and then we'll do Patrik.

MICHELE NEYLON: Well, Patrik was first. Come on.

BRAD WHITE: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see who lined up. I don't care. Patrik, go for it.

MICHELE NEYLON: Is that a snipe at his height?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Let's deal with that afterwards, Michele. So let me -- Alan, you triggered a couple of things which I think --

BRAD WHITE: Hey, Patrik, forgive my interruption. Just for the sake of the scribes and the record, can you give us your name?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Absolutely. Patrik Faltstrom. I'm chair of SSAC. I was part of the group that Keith just presented regarding priority.



---

You triggered a few issues when you said -- Alan, you compared employees with the volunteers and how we use the time. And I think that yes, it is true that it might be the case that if we were employees that we would not have the tools and we would not run the processes the way we do. And that might be true, but the fact is that we have volunteers and that is one of the few things that we cannot change here.

So regarding priorities, I think it's crystal clear that one of the reasons why we are here, which was the question from Brad that I started to think about, is that without prioritizing we have -- and what we see from SSAC's side is that all of us individually are spending an enormous amount of time on trying to produce good work which is then not used in an effective enough way, just because simply, for example, we write from SSAC a report that might be very important but it doesn't fit the schedule of DNSO or something else. So it's actually much, much worse than having a company wasting time of their employees because that's only money for that company. But we are volunteers and we are wasting each other's money, and that's why to me the prioritization is extremely important.

BRAD WHITE:

Thank you, Patrik. Michele.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Yeah, thanks. I've just got a follow-up. Michele Neylon for the record. I'm chair of the registrars. I think we had a very interesting conversation between the chairs on Friday afternoon. It's following on from a



conversation we kicked off, I think it was in LA. We went to ICANN, we said look, this is ridiculous. We can't find information on the Web site. We can't -- we know that the information is there, but if we -- you have to use Google to search and if you're really good at using all those extra search operands you mind find the data. You know, the thing around the number of volunteers who are actively engaged on things, it's actually quite scary. You know, ICANN in many areas is setting policy that impacts millions and millions of domain registrants. It impacts businesses varying in size from small one-man shows through to multi-billion dollar corporations, and obviously it impacts then users of the Internet in the broader sense. Yet a lot of that policy is being developed by a very, very small group of people. And that group has not been growing as the importance of this entire thing has grown. And that is a serious issue. And I don't have solutions for them. I'll put my hand up and say I can't solve it, but it's something that needs to be addressed. You know, you cannot expect these -- this relatively small group of people to take on this massive workload. And remember, for most people involved, they have day jobs. I mean, Alan said he -- he spends like 20 hours a week or something on conference calls. Most people, in Europe anyway, working week is 40 hours, so 50% of Alan's working week is spent on something which he doesn't receive any actual monetary compensation. In the case of Keith, it's a little bit different. Obviously he has a financial interest in it. I obviously have a financial interest as well. But, you know, not everybody has direct financial interests.

[Timer sounds]



---

BRAD WHITE: So it's basically, we talk a lot about a work-life balance. It sounds like there's an ICANN-life balance also.

MICHELE NEYLON: Yes.

BRAD WHITE: By the way, if you guys want to respond to any of these or make a comment, just speak up. Yes, ma'am.

FIONA ASONGA: My name is Fiona Asonga, and I'd just like to comment on the access of information of ICANN activities. You know, the biggest challenge is that there's a lot of material out there available but when a newcomer wants to know about ICANN, it's very easy for them to go to the ICANN main site and then get the link for newcomers and learning about ICANN. But when you look at the tools -- so what I'm saying, the tools are there, but you look at the content that we are putting, it gets very confusing because the learn.icann site has courses. Some of the courses are very relevant to what ICANN is doing. But what is lacking in that whole program is there is no information on the constituencies. So a newcomer comes and they go through all that material and they think oh, we just go and we sit and we discuss things related to Internet governance, to IP addresses, to a lot of other stuff that is -- domain names that is on the site. But they do not realize that all of that discussion happens in a certain structure. And I think there is where the broken link is. Because I've tried to get members from my particular country to come in for the ICANN meetings, I ran them through that.



---

When they come in, they realize the discussion is at a very different level so you have to spend time with them to help them understand how the discussion is happening for them to know -- see the value. However, those who see the value, they appreciate it and want to come for another ICANN meeting and they want to volunteer and they want to know how to get engaged. But they need to be able to understand what the different constituencies do, and that is information that is quite fragmented, that is not consolidated in sort of one portal somewhere. Thanks.

BILL DRAKE:

I'd like to respond to that. I absolutely agree with what you're saying, Fiona. And it seems to me like that problem has gotten worse. And it's not a criticism of anybody involved in developing the Web site or anything like that, but I mean, we've got lots of nice pictures of happy, shiny people on the Web site.

[ Laughter ]

Meetings together all looking up at boards and, you know, looking very engaged, but try to figure out actually which part of the community you're supposed to plug yourself into and what their respective roles and activities are and so on, it's -- you don't find the information well linked at all. A lot of it is off site and not really connected, and the silo structures that we've built up over time in ICANN where we've fragmented the community 130 different ways make people very uncertain as to exactly how they -- I mean, if you're a registry, you could probably figure out that you should figure out where the registries are. But I mean, if you're a civil society person, you might look in a number



---

of different places or a small business person or so on. So it's -- it's quite opaque. It's far more -- and for us, it's all obvious. We speak to each other in acronyms. Well, it's relatively obvious. We speak to each other in acronyms. We have the embedded history in our minds. If you look at this from the standpoint of a new person coming in, you know, I think it's just like wow. And some people don't make it past that first step because -- because of that. I mean, so something has to be done there.

BRAD WHITE:

So in -- getting back to our theme of searching for solutions, what's something to explore? You seem to be saying, Bill, and maybe I'm not understanding you so correct me. You seem to be saying if you're new to ICANN it's naturally a confusing world, but there might be multiple places to find where you fit in. Are you suggesting that maybe we need to simplify that or at least look into the possibility of simplifying that?

BILL DRAKE:

Some kind of visual aid that would help to give you the overview of the topography and then identify the relative bits, and then you drill down and you find yourself linked into the relevant --

[Timer sounds]

[ Laughter ]

The relevant parts. Yes. That would be helpful.



---

BRAD WHITE:

Yes, ma'am.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you. My name is Olga Cavalli. I'm from Argentina. I'm the GAC representative from Argentina. I'm one of the GAC vice chairs. Thank you for your comments and thank you for organizing this meeting. I've been hearing about the use of the resources and time of people in ICANN since many, many years. And I don't have a solution. What I can tell you is the experience from someone that is not a volunteer. I work for my government, and this is one of the many things that we do in our -- in our daily work. And we have to deal not only with our daily work but also we have to deal with things that happen in developing countries that sometimes when you talk about what we do here, they look at you and say, is that really relevant? Luckily we have the new gTLDs and we have the Snowden discussion about the -- I cannot find the word. Jet lag is killing my English. You know what I'm talking about. So that time came and said oh, that's something interesting that you do in ICANN. So suddenly, some developing countries started to think about this as an interesting process to get involved in.

And we have a workload of every day. We are not volunteers, and so for people coming from developing countries, it's a lot of work. Also, we have to try to engage our friends from the region. This is something that you know I do, and you have the language barrier, then you have the time barrier, then you have the time zones.

So it's not -- not all of us are volunteers. For some of us it's daily work and we have to deal with conference calls, with the language issues, and



---

also with priorities not in ICANN but also in our own administrations.  
Thank you very much.

BRAD WHITE:

Sir?

RUDI VANSNICK:

I'm Rudi Vansnick. I'm the chair of NPOC and I'm going to talk to Point 3, the stakeholder engagement.

I think it's -- we need to recognize that it's not ICANN steering Internet; it's, rather, the Internet steering ICANN and defining what ICANN has to work on. And that makes life already difficult, in the sense that when you think that -- when you know that today this is an issue, tomorrow it's something else that is an issue, and it's engaging other people.

When I'm looking back into my history in ICANN, and especially the last two, three years, I've seen many people coming to our community being very happy to be there, but at the end, it's, indeed, a question of participation and getting them involved in discussing in working groups and participating in the policy work.

At the end, there is another element that we cannot forget. Myself, not being an English native speaker, it takes time before I've put up my sentence in my head before I'm going to express myself so that I'm not coming out as an idiot. And I think that's one of the burdens also if we look into our community -- and as Bill was expressing, we are looking to volunteers that most often are working across the world in NGOs and civil society -- they don't have the possibility to speak every day in





---

English, and when they come to an ICANN meeting, which is most often just an English platform where everything happens, they have the difficulty that if they cannot speak in their language, they will not participate.

I think that's one of the elements that we need to take in consideration. How can we help people --

[ Timer sounds ]

-- that don't have this native language.

BRAD WHITE: One -- thank you very much.

One thing I would like to point out is the captive prisoners that we have in those booths over there are all intended to help deal with that situation. I'm not saying that's a solve-all. It's --

RUDI VANSNICK: It's good and it's, indeed, splendid that they are here in these aquariums, but when we do the work, they are not there.

BRAD WHITE: Right.

RUDI VANSNICK: When we are doing our work in our working groups and our conference calls, we don't have translation, and that's where you stop people working.

---

BRAD WHITE: So what you're suggesting is looking at expanding what we have in a meeting and taking it to the work that the various SOs and ACs are doing.

RUDI VANSNICK: Could help.

BRAD WHITE: Very good. Thank you, sir.

This raised an interesting question. Then George, we'll go right to you.

Are we searching for something -- I mean, ICANN, at the root of it, it's a volunteer -- it's heavily dependent upon volunteers. There are only certain people who have the time and the -- the schedules to actually do volunteer work.

Are we searching for a solution where there -- where none may exist? In other words, is it inherent in the type of organization -- the type of work that ICANN does that you're going to see the same people over and over again?

ALAN GREENBERG: I think there's no question that the subset of people who are candidates for working here is a limited subset. You know, it requires people who have a specific interest or interests who do have some time and probably have some facility in English, for most of what -- much of what we do. There's no question.



---

I think the problems we're talking about here are the problems that those people have. It's harder to grow that subset when the problem -- people who are already so dedicated and committed to it are having such a hard time.

BILL DRAKE:

Right. I would just make a different point that builds on what Rudi was saying beyond the question of language. We have an organizational culture, and that organizational culture -- I mean, I'm sorry to say -- is not the most internationalized I've seen. I've spent a lot of time around United Nations organizations, and the ways in which people operate when they're in a setting that is inherently multicultural, multinational, is just different from the way we do things here. There's the style in which people debate points, the ways in which people frame propositions. There's a lot of, like, deeply embedded cultural stuff in our way of operating that goes beyond whether you have a facility in English, which I think is, for people coming from other cultures and other settings, quite difficult to penetrate --

BRAD WHITE:

Very much so.

BILL DRAKE:

-- and to get really comfortable if you're not used to arguing.

BRAD WHITE:

Right.



---

BILL DRAKE: If you're not used -- you know, if you're not used to somebody calling you on a point and saying, "This makes no sense to me" --

BRAD WHITE: And that concern must be a cultural thing.

BILL DRAKE: Yeah. And that's hard.

BRAD WHITE: Yeah. Very much so. George.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. George Sadowsky.

First, a personal note. I take a somewhat perverse pleasure in being in this meeting because you've verified that I'm not the only person who, when I get bombarded with emails and files and all these things, that I find I can't prioritize, I can't keep up, I can't find information, and so on.

It's a community problem.

I'd like to address the third point, the stakeholder engagement.

This is a tough organization to penetrate. The learning curve is steep. The threshold to get to the point where you really understand at least some of what's going on is very high. And I loved the Sherpa analogy because the Sherpas help people to climb the really tall and dangerous



---

mountains that they accompany them on, and I think that -- but I think that also provides a clue as to how we might make this penetration more -- easier for newcomers.

I think we need a mentoring, an active mentoring program, where those of us who have been in the organization and understand something about it are willing to take someone for a day, a newcomer for a day, and have them shadow them, introduce them to people, explain what's going on, and otherwise acclimatize them to what's happening here.

If you walk out in the -- in the main room, you'll find a lot of people who seem not to be connected to anyone or anything. They're wondering what to do. They don't automatically go up and introduce themselves to people. We need a way of personalizing the introduction to ICANN. I think that lots of us would be willing to do it for a day, and I think it would really help the newcomers who come in and make them excited about entering the community, joining it, participating in it, and looking forward to coming back and working with the colleagues that they have been introduced to while they've been here. Thank you.

BRAD WHITE:

George, thank you.

That's the sort of thing -- and George hit it on the head. Coming up with a solution, assigning someone -- maybe someone taking -- being willing to take a newcomer around. It's an idea. We do that, in part, already, but maybe develop that. But I like the idea that that's solution-based. I think that's what you guys are after, right? Some ideas like that?



---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Brad. Evan Leibovitch, chair of the North American region. And I wanted to take advantage of the Twitter facility, and then I realized that I couldn't think of a possible question that would fit under 140 characters.

[ Laughter ]

I haven't heard one yet. And that actually to me is part of the problem, is because of the verbiage, because of the volume.

And so take a look at, you know, this meeting's squirrel moment, right? Everyone is focused on IANA. You know, you need -- I subscribed to the lists and very quickly got absolutely deluged to the moment.

BILL DRAKE: The squirrel moment?

ALAN GREENBERG: That is what he said.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: And -- Alan, do you need interpretation from me?

[ Laughter ]

BILL DRAKE: Is a squirrel moment a Canadian reference that I don't understand?



---

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No. "Oh, look, squirrel!" You know? That kind of --

BILL DRAKE: All right.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: All right. Anyway, but the point I was getting partially is just the deluge of information and specifically you want a concrete example, concrete solution, at least as an idea for the IANA thing.

I can't explain IANA to somebody not bathed in this culture in a way that takes less than five minutes. Elevator pitch? It's got to be a really big elevator. And that won't do it.

The sheer volume. Some of it is an information issue, but some of it also is an accessibility issue.

And in terms of solutions, right? Does there exist anywhere, whether it's provided by ICANN or anyone, that says, you know, "This week in IANA," that making took as a matter of bullet points: "We received a submission from this and this is a couple of lines abstract, this is the point they were trying to put across." And so you had communities that were putting together and trying to summarize this in a way that becomes accessible at least for even people that are even insiders that have been around this but are not so immersed in this stuff to be able to understand what's going on on a day-to-day basis.

The sheer number of volume of submissions, conference calls, whatever, easily swamp people --



---

[ Timer sounds ]

-- and so the idea of some kind of summary, some kind of editorial -- not analysis but at least the ability to summarize this might make it just a little bit more accessible and get people to understand from the outside what the heck's going on.

BRAD WHITE: And I seem to be hearing you say also: In plain speak. Not just a summary, but plain speak summary.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: That's implied.

BRAD WHITE: Yeah.

KEITH DRAZEK: Could I jump in there?

Yeah, I'd like to build on what Evan and both George talked about and I think it -- you know, Evan's point about accessible, and I think George referred to basically the same thing, is, you know, we bring people in. We have newcomers. There's a newcomer program. There's -- there are structures that are actually bringing people to ICANN. I think the comment that was made earlier is that we have people who show up once and then don't come back and that's our challenge.





---

So to be able to make this community and these meetings, like in-person meetings, accessible, you know, I think the point that Rudi made earlier, to make the conference calls and sort of the out-of-band work accessible is really a key question and really the key challenge because - - and I think that would lead us to be able to take the newcomers and the first timers and actually bring them into the -- sort of fill the pipeline of our talent and of our volunteers so we look ahead two years and five years down the road, that we've got new people coming in who are able to gradually build up their expertise but that we're not losing people.

So I think that's a really important point.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you. Tijani Ben Jemaa. I'm from the ALAC.

Those -- all those issues are very difficult, very hard to answer those questions, but I think the most difficult question is the stakeholder engagement.

This is something that we are working on from -- for a certain time and we didn't have any solution, any real solution for it.

But I think that for the information access or information finding, Ashwin was working on the knowledge management and information management for a certain time and I think there might be solutions. One of the solutions I think about is to set a strategy, an agreed-on strategy, of housing the right information in the right place. Something -- rules that have to be shared for everyone. And if everyone respect those rules, I think that this problem can be not solved, but we -- we may have better means to find the right information. Thank you.



ALAN GREENBERG:

Yeah. I think Tijani is right and that's something akin to what I said in my top-down direction of someone making some decisions that we can then follow and have a pattern.

I think the Problem Number 2, information access, is at some level the easiest one to solve because throwing people and technology at it can do it.

The other ones are a lot harder. You know, George's suggestion of one day of introduction I think underestimates the problem somewhat. It's certainly a good start, but look at the amount of effort that goes into our fellowship program and these people get a lot of handholding and briefings, and some percentage of them keep on, stay on.

We can't -- we've never thought we could afford to do that on a wider scale with a thousand new people in a meeting.

BRAD WHITE:

I forgot who is next. Go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Thank you. Greg Shatan, president of the intellectual property constituency.

We talk a lot about stakeholder engagement, and on the other hand, we have stakeholder groups and constituencies, but by and large, they've been left to their own devices. At least speaking from my own constituency, there's very little support that we get to do what we do



---

from ICANN in a very tangible way. And I can't speak for other constituencies and stakeholder groups, but it seems to be, you know -- I'm assuming it's fairly similar.

For instance, toolkits to help us manage membership lists and dues, some sort of common Web site template, something that provided a -- more of a checklist for the constituencies themselves. I believe that we have a wiki page as a constituency in the ICANN page but I don't think we populate it and there's nobody there to populate it for us.

I contrast this with working groups, which are very well supported by ICANN staff, ICANN policy staff.

If I could have, for instance, Marika Konings or Grace or Mary as a support of my constituency, our lives would be so much easier and it would allow those of us in there to do our highest and best work and not have to be clerical workers along with policy workers all for free. Thanks.

BRAD WHITE:

That cuts to an interesting thing which I think all -- all three areas are going to have to deal with.

In an organization that is very dependent on volunteers with a limited resource, it comes down to prioritization. And stop me if you think I'm misstating the problem.

There are -- there's only so much money, there's only so many people, there's only so many staff members.



---

When you're trying to prioritize, is it one size fits all? It can -- if you come up with a qualitative system after your study and analysis of prioritization, will that work community-wide?

KEITH DRAZEK:

So I think there's a couple of components to that.

I think if we're talking about support, you know, sort of resource support for the constituency -- you know, the constituent parts of the ICANN community, then that's one kind of, you know, sort of resource or allocation or prioritization.

But then it's also a question of sort of the work that we do, as opposed to the specific support.

So, you know, I think, you know, if we're talking about work prioritization, that's one concept, but I think what Greg is talking about is, you know, like we could all use more support or resources to facilitate the work that we do, as opposed to the work itself.

So I'm not sure if I answered the question adequately or well, but that's sort of my take on that.

BRAD WHITE:

Please, Bill.

BILL DRAKE:

What Greg is saying is absolutely true, though. I mean, as a chair -- as a constituency chair, I spend a lot of stuff -- time on like people's hotel arrangements, managing --



---

Rafik, who is the chair of the noncommercial stakeholder group, and I spend time on managing the database of the members when we add new members, and then double-checking to make sure that they're still current members when we're going to do an election and whether they should get ballots and managing all that.

I mean, this is a lot of administrative stuff that volunteers are doing that makes it very difficult for them to allocate their time to being Sherpas for people as well.

So if there was some kind of mechanism of support for those kinds of activities and I think some mechanism, as Fadi was kind of half suggesting the other day, of a community engagement program or something where we could steer people, new people, into instead of simply saying, "People from within our community will drop what they're doing on IANA and accountability and everything else and spend days trying to help you get into the basic levels of engagement," if there was an organized systemwide solution to that that was a bit customized to the different communities' needs, that would be good.

BRAD WHITE:

So you're talking about a systemic approach across the board.

KEITH DRAZEK:

So maybe coming back specifically to Greg's point, I'll give you an example.

The registry stakeholder group, of which I am the chair, we have a secretariat. We have an individual -- actually now two individuals



---

because of the growth that we've seen in our stakeholder group over the last year due to the new gTLD program -- that we fund. It comes out of the membership dues of the registry stakeholder group. So we have our own assets and resources and personnel who have done a fantastic job for many years.

But that's just our example. I mean, that's just how the registries have chosen to do it over time.

Now, we are in the business of registering and resolving domain names, and so we have, you know, financial interests and resources that allow us to be able to pay for that type of thing.

Other groups may not have that same capability. In that instance, having secretariat support for those stakeholder groups and constituencies with the support of ICANN I think, you know, is something that would be worth considering.

BRAD WHITE:

Sir.

THOMAS SCHNEIDER:

Thank you. My name is Thomas Schneider, chair of the GAC currently.

I'd like to make a few points for all of this.

With regard to work prioritization, this is a huge issue, a growing issue for governments. I'd just say I support Olga and I will try to work with you if I find the time to get this somehow organized.



---

With regard to 2, this is another of course important issue and it has several easy fixes that could be done if there were awareness that there's a problem and that is easy to fix.

If you take the acronyms, this is not really inviting. Everybody is talking about CWG, CCWG. Then if you knew, yes, what does CWG mean, well, that means cross-constituency or cross-community working group. Great. About what? And then what is the CCWG? Ah, that's a cross-community working group. So it's the same -- it's completely unstructured, un-accessible.

You could also reflect that on the Web site if you have like a link to working groups and so on and so forth in order not to find it.

Also, the way documents are drafted, there should be a date and an author and maybe also to where it belongs to in information on the headline or in the back that you don't have to see is this the latest document, where does this belong to, and so on and so forth.

And just the last point with regard to stakeholder engagement, it's a structural problem that some stakeholders are overrepresented and underrepresented. This is -- this is normally -- in my country, we have a (indiscernible) Parliament because people feel that parliamentarians should have a foot in their real life and not be professional parliamentarians. That makes that you have too little people from small and medium businesses because they have no time. There are teachers and retired people and lobbyists from different areas that are overrepresented because they are paid for that.



---

And then for once you need to be aware of this, and you might try to find targeted help for underrepresented stakeholders. So give them a special treatment which is accepted because everybody knows that they are underrepresented. So thank you.

BRAD WHITE:

Thank you. At least some ideas to chew on there.

TONY HOLMES:

Tony Holmes, Chair of the ISPCP. And I worked with Bill on the stakeholder engagement thread. It was only today when we were working through this, Bill showed the matrix that we pulled together. And there was a remark in there saying that newcomers find discussions repetitive and complex. And I am suddenly left thinking, I have suffered from the same thing during this meeting as a long-timer in ICANN.

In the GNSO Council, we were talking about effective ways of using our time. We were talking about the new meeting strategy. And I made the point there that I have been to three sessions on IANA and I have sat through the same presentation three times. And I was suggesting that once should be enough, and maybe when we talk about rearranging meetings, then at the start of the meeting, you could have a presentation on a particular issue. And then when you get into sessions with different groups, they can go straight to the topic. You have had the briefing. Let's talk about the issues and have the dialogue that we need.

And then I was left thinking, well, not everyone turns up at an ICANN meeting at the same time. So what about those that don't come for the





---

first couple of days? The easy answer to that is that we use Internet tools, so you record these things and you have a link from the ICANN Web site. You can put it to YouTube or whatever. And I think that fits as well for newcomers, that you could actually use those tools and make it easy to follow.

In terms of getting involved in the work, some of the problems there come with getting up to speed. And, again, for instance, with the IANA issues at the moment, there's a set of questions out there. We could actually have a link that gives a little bit of background to those questions and maybe says a little bit about each question. And it's there not only when you want to look at it.

[ Timer sounds. ]

But you can go back to it at any time if you have that link.

And just a quick word about the language issue because in the ISPs, we have published newsletters. And we actually have published links to those from our Web site in both French and Spanish because we've got French and Spanish members. But I never thought until it came up today that that's pretty useless if you can't find our Web site. So maybe we need those links through in different languages. And I think maybe using interpretation at the front end of the ICANN Web site to point to various things would also be a great benefit.

BRAD WHITE:

I think one possible solution might be to make the interpreters work 24/7 all around the world. I think that might help out a lot.



---

Rob, you mentioned we've got some tweets?

ROB HOGGARTH:

Brad, thanks. I would like to read a couple for you. Someone who runs the NCUC account tweeted that the group has started a travel support policy.

Claudia Ximena tweets that the language barrier could be diminished by translating documents in advance of meetings.

And Samantha Dickinson suggests: Regular summaries might make the IANA stewardship process accessible and help people understand what the heck is going on.

Thanks.

BRAD WHITE:

It's interesting because I think that's the second or third time that we're hearing the idea of summaries and plain-speak summaries and not just the documents, not just the raw material, but some way of condensing that or bringing that down to a focal point.

KLAUS STOLL:

Klaus Stoll, NCSG and NPOC. I have a very concrete suggestion of how we reframe and present the things we are actually doing. A few weeks ago, we had a Webinar in the Washington ICANN office and we asked David Olive and Theresa to speak on the IANA. And they were not speaking about the IANA. They were speaking about why the IANA is relevant to the not-for-profit sector.



---

I was really surprised how much reply we get back from the participants in the Webinar saying, "Oh, now we know why it is relevant for us." That's -- I think it is a small thing but it makes, in my opinion, a hell of a lot of difference.

BRAD WHITE: In other words, here's why it counts.

KLAUS STOLL: Yes. That brings me back to the point of relevance. I heard: How do we integrate people into ICANN? Maybe it is the other way around. It seems to be sometimes we are telling our customers what they need and what is important. Maybe we should listen more what is important as a customer and integrate that into ICANN. And with that, the customers would come to us.

BRAD WHITE: Hopefully we are going down that road with this session. That's the intent.

KLAUS STOLL: It is a simple change of attitude.

WALID AL-SAQAF: Walid Al-Saqaf. Currently helping out with members -- membership affairs at NCUC.



---

And I come from Yemen, a country that's been suffering a lot recently. And I understand why many volunteers might not come from my own country. I myself was an ICANN fellow at the very beginning. And I can tell you that being welcomed by the fellowship program was a really good start because it helps introduce you to the world of ICANN, but I also realize that it actually would be the pivotal moment where you either continue or not continue. So I would say, first, pay more attention to the fellows. Lend them a hand.

One thing that really struck me a lot throughout the discussion so far, we missed a fundamental question. I mean, we've been theorizing, hypothesizing why and how and what reasons are holding back members and inreach efforts. But we never asked. Just go ahead and ask a person: Why haven't you been able to do this and that? I mean, we're trying to be more systematic and several of us here are academics, including myself and Bill. So we understand that we need to do the research to understand that fundamental problem that's underlying here.

And one thing that we are trying to do in NCUC -- maybe this is a marketing pitch for our constituency day. We are trying to put up a survey and trying to get the feedback of those members.

We have over about 400, right? 400 members already? And if a portion of that just answers us transparently and openly and tells us, these are the reasons. Perhaps we weren't felt welcome. There is the jargon. Perhaps it is incentive because oftentimes we fail to foresee that a small incentive, even a travel support grant, could actually make a whole big difference for someone coming from abroad.



---

So let us take these into account and, furthermore, have this discussion go further.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Brad, maybe I can respond to that. Bill, go ahead.

BILL DRAKE:

The things Walid mentions are both the things we are doing at the constituency level without any support of anyone else through volunteer effort: Calling people, asking them what holds them back, or what makes it possible, and providing microgrants out of our own piggyback to get people to meetings. Because my experience at least is when people actually come to the meetings and interact with others, those are the folks that get the bug. We've had a number of people who have gotten much more engaged over the past two years. And I know a number of them came through the fellows program, and they got integrated into the feel -- the touch and feel and the, quote, excitement, the buzz of being in ICANN that way.

And I think those things should be expanded on a systemwide basis.

KEITH DRAZEK:

I was just going to say I think that was a great comment. And the idea of quantifying or capturing sort of the challenges, I think, is really important. And it is something that we discussed at the Friday session with the ICANN staff as maybe something we ought to be looking at. So thank you.



---

BRAD WHITE:

Great.

Chris, I would like to say to everyone in the room, that if you have any problem at all with the ICANN Web site, Chris is here to give us his home number. Feel free to call him at any time, and he'll be happy to help you out.

CHRIS GIFT:

And email address. This is Chris Gift, ICANN staff. I'm also on the information access group. I apologize for jumping in the community queue. But I did want to speak in support of what Alan was saying and also what Mr. Thomas Schneider was talking about.

Something I think very feasible and concrete we can work on is cross-community documentation and publication standards. If we had a unique document numbering scheme for all of our documents across the community, same titling, versioning standards, a publication methodologies and processes and metadata, all of that would greatly help our tools and would really help people in terms of just absorbing some of the content that's there. And I think that's something very feasible that we can work on as a community.

BRAD WHITE:

Chris raises an interesting point. I think sometimes it's interesting because we should always reach out to the community for solutions or for possible solutions or for things to weigh. I wish staff would be more involved also because they see a different side to the problems and should be elemental in the search for solutions.



---

We've got about six minutes left. I'm going to cut the line. We are going to finish the people who are up there now, and then we're out of here.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Hi, Brad. Evan Leibovitch again. I already said my peace once. But something that was said -- I think it was Tony -- about coming to the same thing, same sessions, and hearing the same thing over and over and over. So perhaps one idea is that when you have a topic of significant interest, that perhaps you could have multiple tracks, a beginning, an intermediate, and an advanced talking about the same issue but that could be addressed at different audiences.

So if you want to know WHOIS, you want to know IANA, you want to know new gTLDs, if you're just coming in, here's a session and it assumes nothing. Here's the other session, and it assumes you've already made it through here. And the third session is for the heavy hitters that know their stuff and can sit and toss the jargon around at each other. That might be one approach that could help. So when you have an important topic, you can have multiple -- you know, you've got enough meeting rooms to be able to say here's the advanced track, here's the intermediate track, here's the beginner's track. And that can also apply to the documentation as well. Here's a certain document. It assumes a certain level of knowledge of the jargon, culture, or whatever. And here's something that will take you -- here's your sort of WHOIS 101 kind of thing at least and maybe have a standard way of flagging them and saying, Here's where you go if you have beginner's



---

documentation if you are just into it, both at a level of documentation and also at a level of the meetings as they happen here.

Knowing the audience obviously makes it a lot easier to make a good conversation that doesn't waste people's time.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Michele Neylon again for the record. Couple of quick things. I think we've heard some really interesting and really good ideas from people. But some of them, I think, are ones worth repeating. The summaries idea, I really like that because none of us have time to read every single bloody document that this organization and community produces. Never mind all the tertiary entities that like to throw stuff into the ring.

On the language point, while I can appreciate that the push for multilingualism is always a very easy attractive and very easy route to take, I would push back a little bit and push more on using plainer, simpler language.

The acronym thing, the CWG, the CCWG, and I can't remember the third one is -- and I deal with this stuff a lot -- using terms that people can understand would be helpful.

I've raised this several times in the past. Making it relevant. How does this impact you if you are a registrant? How does it impact you if you are a registrar? How does it impact you if you are, I don't know, a whatever. The answer might be in some cases it doesn't. You don't need to care about this. It is not important to you. Or it could be: This is really, really, really important. This could be put you out of business or this could help you make a fortune.





---

On Chris' point around the documentation again, don't forget people land on documents from search engines or from links somewhere else or God knows what else. And sometimes it is impossible to know whether the document you are looking at is the most current thinking on the topic or whether it's current, whether it's a rough-thought paper that somebody threw together in five minutes, or an academically researched, fully approved policy or something else.

And I think we've also got some interesting resources now within the organization to help make some of these things more accessible.

I mean, the schedule even for the meetings, it's impossible to decipher. You can't work out what a topic or a session is about at times.

[ Timer sounds. ]

And so on.

BRAD WHITE: Thanks, Michele.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom, Chair of SSAC. I think the information overload is something that we have to work with and it is not the same thing as Keith and I have been talking about priority. That was work priority. But also we need to talk also about the information overload, the number of documents that we produce and also the difference between documents that we actually finalize in each one of our processes compared to the working documents.



---

Let me give an example. We have -- we in SSAC produce around six documents a year. And nowadays we translate all the documents to multiple languages. And the documents on IANA is actually translated to not only the U.N. languages but also Turkish and Portuguese.

I have been looking at the number of times those documents have been downloaded, and they are almost zero compared to the number of people I have been forced personally to explain here at ICANN what IANA actually is doing when they actually could have read that document and they could be done with it. That's one thing that we just must do a little bit better. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just a very quick comment on what Patrik said and it is goes back to standardization and things like that, a good number of times, and certainly more than two or three over the last year, I have looked for something and found a draft document.

There was a public comment period. There was an analysis. But the actual finalized document was never issued or perhaps never published. That makes life very difficult because what they can find out there may or may not be the current one. And it is not even possible to know. And usually there is no idea of who to ask.

JONNE SOININEN:

Hello. I'm Jonne Soininen. I'm the IETF liaison to the ICANN board. First of all, I would like to echo what Patrik just said and what was said before --



---

[ Timer sounds. ]

[ Laughter ]

Oh, thank you.

I really got to the point really fast.

Anyways...

It's not just information overload. It is information structure. And that is something that we are missing here. I already thought about that a long time ago, that we should have a numbering scheme for our documents and some sort of way of tracking the documents through that we know really, to find the kind of like the drafts and then find the actual documents that when they are actually published and when they're agreed upon.

But that wasn't actually the main point that I came here. I came here for two things that was discussed earlier. And that was getting new volunteers in and volunteer fatigue.

It is quite normal in any organization basically that there's a small core of people that do most of the work. But that's maybe a little bit stronger in this organization than in other organizations. So, therefore, we have to see how we can get new people in.

Looking at the problem what Alan said, that people come here, look at it once, and go away, one question is there: Have we looked at that, that basically how they could be effective from the first meeting on? How can they find something small that they can contribute to and influence so that they find that they can do actually something



---

worthwhile, that it doesn't take them a lot of time to just walk -- work through but where they can find their interest.

The other thing is to look at a framework where people can donate a little of their time because not everybody can donate as much as Alan into this.

And if it's impossible to donate two or three or four hours of their week and you always have to donate basically half of your week just for conference calls, people won't only -- a very small subset of people actually have the time to do that. So that is a little bit looking at the framework there that we're --

[ Timer sounds. ]

This is not a charity where the minimum amount you can give is a million dollars but you can give \$5 as well. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Just a quick comment and clarification. When I said people do something once, there are plenty of people I'm sure who come to one meeting and don't come back. I was referring to people who participate in a working group, an intense effort, and then we never see them again. And there is a bigger, more important message there that either they feel they have wasted their time or they tried once and aren't going to bother doing it again.

Those are the ones that really worry me because they show the intent to be a real contributor, and then we don't -- and then we lose them again.



---

BRAD WHITE: Bill.

BILL DRAKE: Just further to what he said, it also ties back in a way to what Evan was saying about having different levels of sessions. We have to recognize the need for differentiated levels of engagement. You can't have one-size-fits-all expectations for everybody. Not everybody is going to dive into this and spend \$30 a week pro bono. They're just not.

So you have to have a system that makes it clear how you can engage at this level and get involved and track sessions to this point, et cetera, without having to necessarily go all the way and still be doing something productive and useful to you.

And I think in order to do that, again, we have to have the systematic framework for this. You can't do it all, hodgepodge, willy-nilly, pick your term. It has to be elaborated in a way that is logical.

BRAD WHITE: We're already pastime. So, Keith?

KEITH DRAZEK: Patrik wanted to respond to that, and then I will have a wrapup.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I want to give one comment that I forgot to say. I heard a lot of words that people think that fellows and other sort of newcomer programs we



---

have is pretty low. I think we should look at the lack of rotation. We have a lot of people like us that have been around for a very long time.

But among the new people that are arriving, I see a very high percentage of the new people are coming from the fellowship. So we need to measure the other way around as well.

KEITH DRAZEK:

Thanks, Brad.

Again, Keith Drazek for the transcript.

This has been a really, really effective session, and I think we've had really good conversation. Just a couple of wrapup thoughts from my perspective.

I think in response to Alan's question -- or point to me at the beginning saying I might not agree that if the 2 and 3 were resolved, information access and stakeholder engagement, that maybe work prioritization wouldn't be necessary, I think I do agree with you actually.

If I were to go back and suggest maybe a reordering of this for the discussion sake in that if you have effective stakeholder engagement, making the community and the work accessible, and if you have information access, basically the tools to make sure those that participate can do so in an efficient and an effective manner, then I think you're probably right. I think then the work prioritization becomes a lesser issue.

But hearing this conversation today, we obviously have a lot of work to do on 2 and 3. And we still have the problem of overload today. And I



---

think on that work prioritization question, going back to the original question, I think, from Brad is: What doesn't work?

From my perspective, what doesn't work is trying to do too much in too short a time frame because then you end up either with sort of incomplete work or sloppiness because there's just too much going on.

Look at the questions of policy and implementation. I mean, certainly in the GNSO and the new gTLD program and compressed I think even further because of all of the discussions around the IANA transition, I mean, there are things that could have been done better I think or more thoroughly if there hadn't been such a time crunch. And I think that we need to deal with that in the immediate future while we're working on the other issues of access and engagement.

BRAD WHITE:

Thanks, Keith. Good points. We're going to wrap this up. Again, this is not the end of the discussion. The discussion's ongoing. If something comes to mind -- there were some great ideas that came up here today. And it is nice to see a session build around a search for a solution rather than identification of a problem. There is examples of the problem. But, again, these gents want to find solutions. They are going to go back to their teams for what has been drawn from this session and other outreach and search for solutions. So if something comes to mind, again, the whiteboard is going to be near the ICANN registration area. Throw a note up there. #asksoac. Shoot us a tweet. It is ongoing.

Let's thank these gentlemen and the groups they represent. Guys, thanks.

---

[ Applause ]

Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

