BUENOS AIRES – ICANN Strategy Panels - An Introduction
Monday, November 18, 2013 – 15:15 to 16:45
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

FADI CHEHADE: Good afternoon. If you could please be seated. This is the session on the ICANN strategy panels, and I'm very happy we are doing this here live with the strategy panel chairs. So many of you who have been seeing information on the strategy panels and emails and press releases, et cetera, get a chance now to meet the team and to have a live discussion.

The strategy panels are part of ICANN's strategic planning process and that process will be described in a session later this afternoon in more detail.

As we did with the directory services side, we felt that some of the salient issues related to strategy could be addressed in these panels run with people who are not part of the board or the staff but rather people from the community as well as people from outside the community to give us a fresh look.

And I point you to the example of the EWG, the Expert Working Group. I will remind all of us that when we started this, everyone looked at the chair, Jean-Francois Baril, and no one recognized Jean-Francois. Who is this guy? He is not one of us. He is not part of our community. We've never heard about him before. He

was the number three executive at Nokia when we asked him to come and help us. So that added to the angst, you know. We need these high-level people to come and solve problems. We know how to solve problems.

Yesterday when Jean-Francois' executive working group presented their results, all of you will agree -- and I received many letters, in fact, from our biggest critics saying that this was immensely helpful -- that the outcome as an input to the ICANN processes is very helpful.

In the IETF, they have concepts called design teams that also help in the preparatory work towards their output. This is no different.

Our strategy panels are here to learn, to analyze, and to produce ideas that will inform our strategic planning process. It does not replace our strategic planning process. It does not replace our community's work to create a strategy for the next years. It simply informs it.

So with all due respect to the people on my left and their seniority and all the knowledge they have and their panelists, their distinguished panelists, their work is going to be here to inform, not to replace, usurp, or criticize what we do.

So with this, I invite us all to support them, to give them the support they need when they ask for it and even if they don't ask

for it. I know that they are open to listen and to be helpful in this process.

To my immediate left is Nii Quaynor. He shouldn't be a new person to this community. Nii has been involved in our community for many years. He's from Africa, from Ghana, and will be responsible for our strategy panel on public responsibility.

To his left is Vint Cerf. Vint is with Google now, but Vint has been with this community for a long time. And many of you know him. Vint will be leading our strategy panel on the place of ICANN in the Internet ecosystem and how do we make sure that the Internet ecosystem is clear with clear roles and responsibilities and ICANN's role specifically within it has clarity.

To his left is Professor Beth Simone Noveck. She is new to our community, so she adds the spice here to this discussion. And Beth is the director of the Governance Lab, the Gov Lab. She was also before that was deputy chief technology officer for the White House. And she was also an advisor to many other governments. She is an expert on governance and has done remarkable work described in her book of "Wiki Government" with the U.S. Patent Office reform. Beth is leading the panel on the evolution of the multistakeholder model.

And to her left is Paul Mockapetris, Dr. Mockapetris, who turns a bit older today -- it is his birthday -- is the --

[Applause]

-- is forever young because he's coming back to rejuvenate the DNS for the future again having created along with Jon Postel and others at the beginning of the DNS, having invented the DNS. He has agreed graciously to come back here and help us think about the future, not just of the DNS but of the identifiers.

So his panel, think of it as a panel that will look at the next ten years of identifier technology to enlighten us and help us chart the course forward as to where we're going.

And before I hand this to my colleague, Theresa Swinehart, who is now our vice president of strategy and came on board to help me with these panels, help me with the strategic plan and the reviews, but also anchor all of this effort in the community because Theresa has been with ICANN from the very start. She's also a board member of The Internet Society.

But before I do that, I also want to mention the fifth panel because we announced yesterday the birth of the fifth and last panel. If you recall in Durban, we talked about five panels. And the fifth one was a panel on the future of Internet governance and certainly ICANN's place in it. And this is a panel that is a bit

larger in size than these panels, and you can go online on the ICANN Web site to read about that panel, who will start its work a little later and finish maybe a little bit later than these current four panels.

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you, Fadi.

So thanks everybody for coming to this. Just to ensure that -- is that working okay -- to ensure that there is no confusion between this session and the session on strategic planning, I just want to be very clear this is about the strategy panels. And as Fadi said -- does this sound okay or is it just really bad? Okay. Closer. I should hug it, right?

So this is informing the strategic planning process, and it's one part of many inputs as we know.

So just to put it into context here, we have the five-year strategic plan process. Again, that session is this afternoon, later after this. And we'd really appreciate input on to that process and have really appreciated the input into the process leading up to where we are in that drafting.

That will inform the planning details, the annual operating plan, and then the annual budget. So that is part of the overall ICANN process. Again, more detail this afternoon after this session.

But just to reinforce how the dots are connected, the strategy panels will have a time frame which you can see on the slide here. We won't go into detail. The substance of their discussion will be touched upon by the chairs. Again, informing the strategic planning process with a timeline that ensures public comment and identification of which parts would be relevant for informing the strategic plan overall.

This is the lovely timeline of the strategy panels which you can all see online as well. That gives you an oversight.

Okay. And with this, we'll have everybody up here. We just have some short slides for each of the strategy panel members to go into their discussions of what they want to highlight. I think what we'll do, Paul, if it's okay with you, that we would start with you, if that's all right.

Okay. Well, your slide is next. So let me do that.

Your slide will include obviously who the members are, but I'll just put this up here. And if you want to go ahead and talk about it and what you're doing, that would be lovely.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: Sure. Thank you very much.

This is the overall charter, I think, that what we're trying to do is to think in terms of three deliverables. One of which is a technology roadmap that we said is over the next decade. In order to do that, I think you have to take a look at what the reality is today, a little bit about where you predict a bunch of the developments because the IETF, for example, is -- even though the Domain Extensions Working Group is closed there is a sea of activity regarding security, regarding auto-configuration and many other DNS developments that are going on. So you have to try and anticipate where those things are going to take us regardless.

Beyond that, I think that the research agenda that you see both in the U.S. with NSF and in Europe with all of their projects and in other parts of the world has realized that naming has a central importance in the next-generation architectures that are being discussed. So I would expect that that might have a very large influence in the second half of our ten-year framework.

So putting together the roadmap is kind of the executive overview, I think, of everything we're going to do. It is our prediction and our suggestions for efforts that could, in fact, produce benefits to ICANN and the general community.

We had our initial meeting in Vancouver at the IETF. We came up with a list of potential topics. And what we're going to do is, you know, having that list and contributions that I'm getting from a couple of the members that couldn't make it, we're discussing their ideas tomorrow and then we're having a Wednesday session for general community input, will give us our list of ideas to look at. And then we'll down-select into a few substantive ideas.

I think that some of those are pretty clear already, and there will be things like looking at trying to have sort of more consistency in the namespace and if we can motivate that but also practical things like: Is the structure that ICANN has for generating the root database the best? Is there a way to improve that? It's been suggested that we look into trusted computing hardware.

There's a large variety of topics here. We'll be posting that list probably Thursday or Friday this week after I get to talk to the other panel members and the community input.

I think next slide.

Here's the members of the community. Hugely varied. Jari is helping us out with the IETF and making sure that we understand the way the IETF works with it.

Rick Bolvie of IBM has a background in among other things the trusted computing platform. Anne-Marie, I hope she is in the

audience. She was just over -- oh, she's over there. She was just explaining the benefits of ISO certification to security, and that might well play into thinking about how to evolve the data processing architecture.

I think Geoff is probably known to everybody. He did a bunch of measurements recently that suggested that diversity in the browser community might account for -- diversity in the algorithms used in the browser community might account for an awful lot of what we see in name collisions.

James is here. He's going to be telling me about his interest tomorrow. We haven't had a chance to talk before. But he's going to be bring some of the IDN expertise that we need.

Dr. Vixie is a well-known proponent of DNS security and DNS Open Source solutions.

And Lixia is leading one of the NSF-sponsored future Internet architecture efforts at UCLA Name Data Networks. You may have heard of that.

So together they always intimidate me when I have my meetings, and so I'm hoping they will be gentle to me.

Elise Gerich is serving as our ICANN sort of adult supervision to make sure that we move things forward along with, you know,

Theresa. And so I'm looking forward to having a bunch of very interesting discussions.

The topic list is by no means closed. So feel free to come Wednesday or just catch me in the hall if you think there's particular issues we should be talking about. We have about 40 already, though. So we may have yours already. Thanks.

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Great. Thanks.

We're just going to run through these, everybody giving a introduction, who their panel members are, a little bit on timelines, and then we'll open up for questions and answers.

So, Vint, I think you're next, if that's okay with you.

There you go. Would you like to have the device?

VINT CERF: This is in a different order than I had anticipated, so -- but that's okay. And I'm not even sure that anyone can read -- anyone who is in the back of the room may have some trouble reading this, so let me just walk through this.

This is really a combined panel. Originally, we had one panel that was going to be looking at the Internet ecosystem in general and another one that was going to look at ICANN and its position in the governance space, and we've combined both of those panels.

So we now have something -- a panel which is going to look generally at the Internet ecosystem, the governance of that ecosystem, and the role that ICANN plays in those and how that might inform the strategic planning process for ICANN's five-year plan.

So our job is to facilitate the review of the assumptions, linkages and frameworks that underlie ICANN's responsibility in the current Internet ecosystem, looking for insights on how to maintain and enhance ICANN's stewardship in an evolving ecosystem.

And this is important to understand that over the course of the last 15 years of ICANN's existence, a lot of things have happened to the net and many things are still happening and so we have to be adaptive to that.

We also need to cultivate thought leadership in ways that ICANN can serve a very complex set of Internet constituencies, and I'll bring this up a little bit later, some of the observations that the panel has already made.

We finished our meeting just moments ago, our first meeting just moments ago.

We'd also like to provide some guiding principles to assure evolution -- the evolution of ICANN's transnational and multistakeholder model, in cooperation with national and international bodies.

And this part of our task will inform the fifth panel, which will be -- the first meeting for which will be convened on December 13th of this year in London.

We will attempt to propose a roadmap for how to evolve and globalize ICANN's role in the governance ecosystem of the Internet.

And finally, in coordination with the other players, ICANN stakeholders and the like will propose a framework for implementing this role and finding objectives and milestones for global Internet governance.

This is quite a large scope. I think that the reality will probably set in sometime around the middle of December when we will finally figure out what we're capable of doing.

Can I have the next slide, please.

So here's how we intend to operate.

Our task is advisory in nature, so we're making no decisions but we are trying to supply input to the strategic planning process which you'll hear more about in the next meeting.

I told the panelists that our job was to convene, confer, consult, advise, and expire. This -- essentially this is a kind of a one-shot thing. This is not a panel that's going to go on forever. It's not a self-sustaining group. It's a very targeted group.

Our modus operandi is that the public will be able to send to the ioepanel@icann.org. All of the members of the panel and the drafting team will receive anything on that mailing list, so please be thoughtful about that. But we absolutely welcome inputs from you and others who have an interest in Internet governance and ICANN's role in it.

We have a panel working list which I haven't given you the e-mail address to, for obvious reasons.

We expect to do at least one or two Webinars for the general public, probably in mid-January, in anticipation of finalizing our work at the end of January.

We will use things like Hangouts and conference calls or other sorts of mechanisms internally in order to work within the panel.

And technically, I think we're going to end up using the wiki as our way of keeping track of text of the final report.

And as -- in the great tradition of Wikipedia, one page will be what we've agreed to and the other page is what we're still arguing about, so that we'll have some stable view of where we are in the discussion.

Can I have the next slide, please.

So we are basically going to produce four different pieces of report, and here they are.

They mirror the questions that the panel was asked to address. So we will divide ourselves up into small groups to address each one of these topics, and again, I'm not going to repeat them because you can read.

Could I have the next slide.

Here are the panel members. We actually have two slides' worth of panel members. A number of them were already here in the room and others were with us on a telephone conference call for several -- three hours this morning and part of the afternoon.

I'm not going to introduce each one of them. I hope many of you recognize these faces and know and respect their contributions to

the Internet in the past. I consider this to be an incredibly capable group.

Could I have the next slide.

Here's the rest of our august group. It's a very diverse collection of people with a lot of insights into the way the Internet is used, and one name you may not recognize at all. Two of them really.

P.J. Narayanan is the president of ACM India. He is the president of IIIT, which is not the India Institutes of Technology but the International Institutes of Information Technology in India, an organization -- it's an educational institution and it has no departments. This is an experiment. You know, most academic institutions are divided up into departments. Instead, he has institutes that focus on particular problem areas and he draws expertise from a broad range of what we would call disciplines.

So it's a really interesting experiment. It's sort of like an academic multistakeholder experiment in -- within the context of specific problems.

Ismail Serageldin is the director of the Library of Alexandria, an extraordinarily accomplished man and one who is -- he's in Egypt coping with the situation there, but if ever there was a renaissance man, Ismail would fit that bill.

And Pindar, who is -- and Alejandro Pisanty -- Pindar is not here, Alex is here -- both of whom, along with Carlton and Alice, have made remarkable contributions already.

Could I have the next slide.

Now, this is how we will present our output to you.

We'll have a draft of our ideas by mid-January and there will be a Webinar probably the week of the 12th of January for the public and we'll do it in two time zones.

We expect to finalize our output at the end of the month and then there will commence a 60-day period for public comment on the final report.

There will be opportunity for additional commentary at the Singapore meeting, and the staff will integrate the public comment material together with our final report into material to go into the strategic planning program, and ultimately all of this will factor into the strategic plan.

Next slide.

That may be the last one. That is the last one.

So that's where we are.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you., Vint.

                            Beth?

BETH NOVECK: Thank you very much. -- (speaker is off microphone) --

                            There we go., Ahhh. Let me repeat that I am deeply honored to be here and grateful for this opportunity to serve in this important capacity and really humbled by the opportunity to be among the people who make it possible for us to enjoy the Internet that's so important to us today.

                            I want to introduce the panel with couple of just quick examples that I think will be instructive about where some of our thinking is.

                            Some of you may have read in the news last week that the Catholic church has opened up for the first time in its history input for how to craft its doctrine to the laity using an online crowdsourcing site. The European Union is doing the same thing, taking input about the future of Europe from the citizens of Europe. They are crowdsourcing widely trying to get input from a wide array of people into how they make policy and to how they govern. There are others who are doing experiments with what we might call crowdsourcing wisely. The Food and Drug

Administration in the United States is building an expert network, an open network of academics and government officials across multiple institutions to get the best ideas for who might serve doing the hard task of reviewing the safety of cutting-edge medical devices.

In Chicago, they are using real-time data to improve the delivery of services and to track where every car and truck that belongs to the city is going, to improve the flow of traffic.

In Lahore, Pakistan, they are gathering data in real time using government employees to collect the information about where mosquitoes are, and in one year have reduced the rate of death from Dengue fever from 400 to zero.

In Burkina Faso, they're now opening up the process of putting all of their contracts, particularly with the mining sector, online and inviting people to scrutinize and review those contracts and to improve how they get drafted.

1500 communities around the world are now undertaking participatory budgeting, giving a chunk of money that's traditionally spent by a centralized institution to the citizens and the members of that community in order to spend the money for them.

What do all these things have in common?

They're all new kinds of what we might call open governance strategies. They are more participatory, engaged, in bottom-up ways, often using technology but not always, to give everybody the right to participate and to contribute to how we govern.

Not simply to the end of making governance more accountable and more legitimate, but to really doing governance better. These are about strategies for doing the work of these institutions more effectively and, at the same time, in a way that's more participatory.

In short, what all of these are is examples of what in the ICANN community we would call multistakeholder governance.

So I would argue and I think our panel is coming from the perspective, as we -- as Fadi said this morning, we shouldn't beat ourselves up. Multistakeholder governance is as right now as it was 15 years ago, and the world has, not just in ICANN, but a lot to learn from how multistakeholder governance is done here.

But we can implement it and we can do it better in ways that will allow ICANN to be more effective and more legitimate in how it works.

ICANN, like the rest of the world, is still figuring out how to do this. How do we build these online practices that are going to help us to reach more people and also to reach the right people,

different kinds of experts and different kinds of stakeholders, at various points in the policymaking process when we need different voices to be part of the table, to be part of the conversation and to be at the table?

And so that's really the focus of our panel is to think about and to try to bring to this conversation ideas from the ICANN community, from the innovation and governance community, from the broader world concrete and implementable proposals for how to innovate in the multistakeholder model, if you will.

So I -- so for example, Fadi announced this morning that in order to bring greater transparency and efficiency to the way that ICANN works, in order to reduce the costs, ICANN would create a procurement office. But one of the things we're learning in the world is that creating new procurement bureaucracies or (indiscernible) procurement bureaucracies is actually a disincentive to innovation and a disincentive to cost savings. There's an open contracting partnership that has already eight countries signing to it and the World Bank leading it that is spearheading innovations in how we do procurement.

It's taking ideas from the broader world that we want to bring to the conversation about how you might create a 21st century version of a procurement office.

So we're lucky to have on the panel -- and I think we should have a slide with their faces -- thank you -- some very, very talented people with both deep ICANN expertise and also deep expertise in innovations and governance.

You should recognize Joi Ito, now the head of the MIT Media Lab, Alison Gillwald -- I don't have to -- I won't go through all of their bios because I think they're all up online and I don't want to take time away from questions, but all of these folks really I think are incredibly talented and incredibly dedicated and honored to have been asked and serve in this capacity.

We are supported very capably on the ICANN staff by Chris Gift, also by Alice Jansen, by Denise Michel, by Theresa, of course, who is managing this effort, and we're also supported on our panel by the staff and fellows of the Governance Lab at NYU. We have two of them here today -- if you wouldn't mind just waving -- Jill Raines and Antony DeClerk [phonetic] who are ICANN fellows who are providing research and input for the panel.

But even with all of that help, we do not have a monopoly on all of the good or best ideas and so we really see our role as stewards of a conversation where the goal in terms of output is at the end of this process for us to present to you, to the ICANN community, to the board, to the staff, to the CEO, concrete implementable proposals, real things that ICANN can do next. Not just principles,

but real practical things that can -- we can accomplish to bring innovation to the way that ICANN governs itself.

As everyone has said already -- and let me reiterate -- we are very clear that our role is not to decide. Our role is to inform and our role is to bring a wide array of voices to the table about how we do that.

So let me just finish by saying that there are three ways in which we want to help -- we want to run our panel, and we're open to more suggestions for what we should do.

First, our goal is to come to you. Again, we just started very recently, and so it was the first opportunity was to come here to Buenos Aires to come to the ICANN community, but we are also going to have Hangouts, Webinars. We want to schedule interviews. We want to schedule calls. We're lucky to be supported by some wonderful young people who can help us to reach more people so that we can hear from you about the many ideas that you have developed over the years and we can bring those to the strategy panel planning process.

Second is, and as we'll talk about in more detail tomorrow -- I hope you'll come to the session that we're organizing about the multistakeholder innovation panel -- we are running an online engagement process that will begin tomorrow with an online

brainstorm in which we will be soliciting proposals from people for what ICANN can do. Those could be some of the open innovation techniques I've mentioned. They could be legal innovations. They could be constitutional or structural innovations. Or they could be tech platforms. It could be anything in that space that can help ICANN to govern more effectively and more legitimately in how it works, recognizing, though, that we want to take a lot of input but we need to translate that into concrete proposals. We'll be having a second stage where we bucket and filter everything that we've heard and learned into a set of proposals that we'll comment on and take annotation on a blog. And then we'll move in a third stage onto a wiki, to get your help with editing those proposals, with drafting them before they get formally submitted, so it will be a process that runs throughout the length of the strategy panel to get and share input and to deliberate.

And let me just add that many of you blog actively, talk actively about ICANN in your own communities. It's really important that you please share with us, through this online conversation, so that we can create a deliberative process with comments and engagement back and forth, and can share the ideas with the wider world. And that's my last point is that I -- what we're going to ask of you -- and yes, here's the point in which I ask something of you and we'll go into more detail about this tomorrow -- is to

take the tools that we're creating, the online resources, the materials that we're developing, and to go out into your own communities -- the blogs, the networks, the organizations, the regional homes that you come from -- and to please help us steward this conversation. You should please go and ask people for the help that we need to get smarter about what we propose to ICANN.

So we will be asking for your help with this outreach, because again, we are seven people and we cannot possibly hope to cover the globe or hope to cover the range of innovations that we could bring to the process unless you can help us.

Everything we're doing is up at thegovlab.org/ICANN, thegovlab.org/ICANN, and will also be up on the ICANN site but I invite you to visit it and would welcome your comments and questions and suggestions.

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Thank you so much, Beth. Thank you.

So our last chair would be Nii Quaynor.

NII QUAYNOR:	Thank you very much. I'm just pleased to have a chance to work with you again. Ours is, of course, public responsibility and it requires your deep involvement for us to be successful.

We are to propose roles for ICANN and strategic objectives over five years that ICANN may follow in this area.

We also need to propose a framework for implementation of these roles and objectives and set up some milestones and so forth. And most important, we're supposed to provide advice on programs and initiatives that can help achieve these objectives.

Next, please.

Our members are very well-known. You can see Tim Berners-Lee is with us. Soumitra from Cornell. Bob Hinden, chair of ISOC. Blake Irving. We even have Raul Zambruno from UNDP, and Nevine Tewfik.

But I would like to make the following comments. We have yet to meet. We will meet Wednesday face to face, and then we'll come to you.

We believe while ICANN was working in public interest, it developed a wide range of programs of public responsibility ranging from capacity-building, language diversity, fellowships and so on, even JAS.

Now, these assisting programs should flourish in our opinion while we expand the public responsibility programs beyond ICANN's immediate interest, ICANN community's interest, Internet's interest, and where we can the global society's interest, especially helping the needy or those who are next deprived play a role.

We hope that this signal will co-subordinate or get others to do the same. In so doing, perhaps we shall leave a much bigger impact than we have. Of course, there are some constraints.

Working with, you know, public interest resources, we need to be balanced and responsible in the options we take regarding the strategic objectives while we remain within the core values of ICANN. That's important.

We believe that the committee has a broader view of the opportunities, and we require you to participate and share those opportunities so that we can take advantage and we also believe that the regions bring some rich diversity and, of course, rich when it comes to the implementation of the buildout. And so we really depend on the community and the regions to advance this work.

We hope to be very open to receive these objectives from you. Of course, if we get more than we need, then we'll try and figure out how to aggregate them and make them work for us. So far we've

been well-supported by ICANN, and we look forward to creating a very good program for us as a group. Thank you.

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Nii.

This is a special request from me for the public responsibility panel. So to ensure that the outcome of the panel -- I mean, I'm sharing with you advice I need and I think we need as a community. It's not just telling us -- giving us a framework on how we can develop programs and develop initiatives for public responsibility but also to make sure you guide us as to how we imbue all of our decision-making processes with a public responsibility angle, that as decisions come to the board, as decisions come to the staff, to the community, how do we make sure this decision-making process is also rooted in our public responsibility commitment. That would be appreciated.

I think with this, you have heard from all the panelists. We propose to open it up for questions. Please queue up. The microphone is right here. We'd love to hear from you. I'm sure the panelists would like to hear from you as well.

So, please, don't be shy.

EN

VINT CERF: (speaker off microphone).

PAUL TWOMEY: I'm Paul Twomey. I'm the former CEO of ICANN and former GAC chair. I first wanted to congratulate you on the formation of the panels. Having been involved in similar processes in the past, I know how difficult it is to get that started.

A couple of observations perhaps from lessons learned, if you'd like. One, I'm very glad Theresa is supporting the panels because there is actually a lot of material on the subjects you're looking at in the history of ICANN. Unfortunately, the Web site which used to be a history of that process has been somewhat changed, not just recently. And a lot of the documentation is not easy to find anymore. But I think reference to the process of the ICANN community asking these questions for 15 years is relevant.

To take the example of the public interest, I don't think it is your intention to end up with a drawn conclusion that the public interest is not in the present nor past decision-making of ICANN. So I think it's important that there needs to see a continuity of the tasking.

And just one final observation for the group dealing with multistakeholder innovation. I would just ask for two specific things to be kept in mind. One is a careful part of the structuring

of the ICANN multistakeholder model is directed towards antitrust law, and that's an aspect that ICANN has to deal with that many other multistakeholder bodies do not have to deal with.

The second part is that it has to attract all government -- the aim was to attract all governments to participate in the GAC and to be part of the ICANN process. Many of the multistakeholder models that exist elsewhere tend to succeed because they select the governments they want to do business with. But if you've got to do business with all governments, it does influence what you have to do.

>>   I have got two questions if I may. One is sort of procedural, and I'm trying to understand how the output from the panels is going to fit into the draft operating plan and budget. Are we looking at FY16 or FY15 or unless something very special comes out that fit it? That's my first question.

THERESA SWINEHART: Do you want me to take them individually? So that one will be discussed this afternoon in the strategic planning session.

>>   I thought you might throw it out.

So my second question, I spoke to Fadi earlier in the week because I noticed from the ICANN Web site that in the last 12 months despite the terrific amount of work that's gone on, there's only one RFP that's been published at all on the ICANN Web site. The previous 12 months, I think there was about 12 or 15.

So Fadi told me quite proudly that he was addressing this, and we're going to engage a procurement officer which is great.

Beth actually just said to us how inefficient this is. So I thought I'd just throw that one into the sort of elation and now disappointment perhaps.

[Laughter]

FADI CHEHADE: I wouldn't call it elation and disappointment. I think as Beth said, we need to find -- we need to be cognizant that there are smarter ways to do things. It doesn't mean we don't do them. We do them smarter, and the smarter way possible is what you want us to do.

So we will listen obviously to the input. And I took notes of what Beth said. And as you know, I very much welcome this kind of critical thought around what we're doing. We'll take that input.

But we'll move. We have to move. We cannot delay this important function, but we will do it in the smartest possible way. That's my commitment.

VINT CERF: I'd like to jump in. Actually, I took notes while the other folks were speaking, so I have a question for Paul.

Here's an interesting scenario. You all understand that domain names are bound to Internet addresses by the Domain Name System. There are other things that the Domain Name System is also capable of binding. At some point, we might find cryptographic certificates and other sorts of things embedded in it.

What happens if someone comes along with a scheme for identifiers that associate those identifiers with Internet addresses but the identifiers are not classic domain names?

You hint at this when you go from -- in the worldwide Web, you have URLs which do have embedded domain names. There are also URNs, which are uniform resource names. Those names are not domain names. They are essentially undefined until they are translated into something.

So the question I have is how we should think about a possible future in which domain names themselves are not a primary or sole means by which things are bound to target addresses. And I don't know whether that's part of the scope of what the technology team might look at, Paul, but maybe you could respond.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: You know, one of the things that happens is whenever somebody invents a new naming system, the first step is to figure out how to encapsulate the DNS in it. So the DNS has been encapsulated within such systems as X500 and handles and several others. And eventually, you know, the DNS will be replaced. I'm not sure when that's going to happen.

So I think it's a normal thing to have happen. If you take a look at other identifiers like just bar codes, bar codes started out in the U.S. as being, I think it was, 11 digits. And the Europeans wanted to join the party and they said, "Please give us some codes." And the U.S. authority said, "Well, you will have to pay for them." And they said nevermind, we'll make 13-digit codes and we will encapsulate you in the bottom of that.

And if you look at RFIDs, this whole business about encapsulating layers within layers has been a natural evolutionary step. So I

think that we should expect that to happen, and it's completely normal.

VINT CERF: May I continue?

FADI CHEHADE: Please.

VINT CERF: Here, I'm listening to myself. So, Paul, the critical question is not so much a technical one but I do appreciate your response. It is a policy question. Will this be ICANN's responsibility or not, if there are new bindings, identifiers to I.P. addresses?   This is an interesting question that will have to be addressed should this evolution take place.

Paul?

I am also Paul. (inaudible)

For something like the DNS to take off, first it had to work. Then it had to be widely deployed. And then later we asked the question: How shall this thing that works, that is widely deployed be governed?

So what I would say is -- let's say URNs take off. I think that would be surprise in some sense that the W3C has not already tried to supplant DNS. Let's say that URNs or some other system takes off, if it is hierarchical, then it will ultimately draw the question who is going to govern it. Perhaps ICANN is seen as a particularly functional organization, and someone will come to ICANN and say, We have this new system. We would like you to govern it for us.

On the other hand, if ICANN is seen as perhaps a little bit of an inefficient body for that, then I think it will sprout a new governance function. It's also possible that some of your ideological competitors in the world, the ITU, could bid for that business.

But ultimately step one is it has to work. Step two is it has to become widely deployed.

So asking how to govern it, it is an interesting academic question, but we're not there.

FADI CHEHADE: The people who are supposed to be questioned are going to ask you questions or ask each other questions because you are not asking questions.

So go ahead, Vint.

VINT CERF: Okay. Here's another one. This came up in our discussions today in the working group on policy and governance.

The way that ICANN works today in terms of policy development, they have a very elaborate development model and process. Entities that participate in this process have to sort of self-select into one of the supporting organizations or constituencies within those supporting organizations and then engage in whatever the process is for producing policy proposals.

The IETF works differently. You all know that the IETF is a place that you can't join. All you can do is show up with your ideas. And if your ideas gain traction, then you become an effective participant. If nobody cares about your ideas, then nothing happens.

So here's an interesting experiment that ICANN could consider. Instead of having these constituency structures and supporting organizations for policy development, what would happen if you picked a problem and said: Anybody who is interested in trying to figure out a solution to this problem or policy problem is free to join the working group that surrounds that particular problem.

This is what happens in the IETF. You have what's called a BOF, a birds of a feather session. It is determined whether or not the -- some significant fraction of the IETF wishes to engage in working on that problem. The Internet engineering steering group eventually blesses the proposal for the working group which typically has a work statement and a schedule and the like, and then the working group is convened and goes about its work. And then it disbands.

So although I'm not advocating, and I don't think anybody on my panel specifically advocated this. But it would be interesting if we thought that would be an alternative to the current way in which policy is developed. It could be an experiment that could be performed by picking a problem and allowing this alternative mechanism to proceed.

The other thing that I observed is that in the IETF, since it's a technical body, there is a really strict rule -- let's see, criterion for success. It's what Paul Vixie mentioned. It has to work. And if it works, it works for everybody. If it doesn't work, it doesn't work for anybody. And so there is a really strong criterion for success. Either it works or it doesn't work.

In the policy world, it's not quite so clear because policy might be something that works well for some groups and not so well for others. And so then you get into this tension of which policy is

acceptable broadly enough that everyone will accept it even if they didn't get their most favorite outcome or if it doesn't provide their -- maximize their interest.

So whatever works for the IETF may not necessarily work in the policy context. But it's an interesting kind of thought experiment to consider.

FADI CHEHADE: Did you want to say something?

BETH NOVECK: So I think I just want to say right on in this to emphasize the word "experiment" in what you said. So I think for our panel also as we're thinking about what ICANN can do, I should have been explicit to say that could and should include pilot projects and experiments because the notion that in governance there is, to your point, a right answer and that we -- and obviously the right answer depends on the metrics that you apply.

What we're learning, though, is to get away from the notion that the institutions we have today are inviolable and unchangeable.

In the U.K., they have a division of -- at 10 Downing Street that they call "the nudge unit."

Thank you.

It has been so nicknamed based on a known well-known book by Richard Thaler and Cass Sunstein, two behavioral economists -- or two intellectuals who have been very good at summarizing the literature in behavioral in economics.

And what the Nudge Unit does is to come up with policy experiments based on the academic literature, based on insights in what they're reading and hearing from around the world and they try something and they see what works.

So they've done an experiment, for example, in job centers in the U.K. to make the simple change in this case of shifting from asking someone unemployed, "What did you do for the last two weeks?" and then punishing them if they didn't do a good job looking for a job and instead asked them: "What are you going to do for the next two weeks?" That simple change, when applied, turns out to increase the likelihood of finding a job to 25% over a 13-week period. It is just one example of what they do. Then they try it at one job center. And then they try it at ten with the aim of moving it across the whole country. And it is just one example of the range of places that they are trying to do experiments, not just experiments in the type of policies we choose but experiments in how we make policy.

And I think that's really the big difference here, is that we are going to have to be somewhat experimental. So as we think

about the right way to do procurement, there may not be one answer where this is the right way for ICANN to do it. Maybe we need to try an experiment of putting up RFPs online. Maybe we need to try another experiment that involves engaging people and collaborating around drafting those RFPs. Maybe we need to have the procurements be recorded on video, on YouTube in the way that Washington, D.C. has done.

We should identify things that we can do concretely, test them against real world circumstances.

David, I hope you are not going to shoot me for suggesting this.

Test them against the really hard work and decisions that David Olive and his team have to do on a day-to-day basis because -- and I think the goal is to measure across a variety of criteria including what works to make a decision that solves the problem and doesn't create more problems that is perceived as being more legitimate, that's more efficient.

There might be a range of criteria and in the end there will have to be a decision about which one of these criteria we want to promote.

But I just want to continue to emphasize the point you made. It can't be made strongly enough that experiments are important.

>>   (saying name) What you just said resonates a lot. The IETF works on meritocracy.   I have a little bit of a background in that environment.

When it comes to ethics and to aesthetics, there are no true values. Policy often has aspects of ethics and that makes it maybe hard to determine what the best outcome is. And even if you do experiment, what is it you measure against? And I guess that in cases of procurement, for instance, getting the best or cheapest outcome is probably easier to measure than if it comes to fundamental policy aspects.   I think that is where the hard questions are going to be if it comes to decision or not.

VINT CERF: That's a terrifically useful observation. It does suggest one thing that my prove very important.

My committee is responsible for looking at various principles that we might apply in a very general way and sometimes principles are a way of getting at the ethics and, you know, similar kinds of values that we would like this institution to observe.

And although it doesn't solve the problem of which metrics you apply to see whether or not a particular policy worked better than any other alternative, I think at least we can go after the first part of your observation.

The second one is a little harder.

Figuring out how to assess how well a policy has worked or is working is, in fact, part of the self-examination process that ICANN has incorporated into its structure, and although it might not be looking at every single -- specifically looking at and evaluating each policy, if it turns out that the policy development process itself is producing unhappiness, it will be very apparent because our community has no problem at all expressing unhappiness.

And that should trigger re-examination of whatever processes have been adopted.

So your points are well taken. I certainly will take them on board in my panel, but I do hope, as Beth suggests, that we can experiment with some of these ideas to explore a solution space that we haven't permitted ourselves to look at in the past.

THERESA SWINEHART: So are there any other questions in the audience? No?

>>   (Speaker is off microphone.)

THERESA SWINEHART: That was going to be my next question, whether the chairs had any questions for the audience.

VINT CERF: This -- I hope I will be driven for this one.

There was a comment that Beth made in this compendium of people using crowdsourcing and other sorts of processes.

You know, you mentioned that the Catholic church was doing this.

BETH NOVECK: Yes.

VINT CERF: I'm not deeply familiar with church doctrine or anything, but couldn't they just ask God?

[Laughter]

>>   (Speaker is off microphone.)

VINT CERF: You want to respond to that?

BETH NOVECK: That's the ultimate in top-down strategy, Vint.

[Laughter]

Sorry. I will tweet the link to the Catholic church crowdsourcing project, for those who are interested, but if the Pope can do it, we can do it.

[Laughter]

VINT CERF: Good.

STEVE METALITZ: Hi. I'm Steve Metalitz. I participate here as a member of the intellectual property constituency.

First, welcome back, Vint. It's great to see you here again.

I think my question is mostly to Professor Noveck. A lot of the examples that you gave that I'm sure ICANN can learn a lot from in terms of governance were public sector examples. Obviously the Catholic church was not, so maybe that's sui generis. But ICANN, being a multistakeholder body, has some similarities to government and has some similarities to nonprofit corporations. It's governed by the laws of not-for-profit corporations. But it also stands in a very unusual relationship with its funders. All of

ICANN's money comes from domain name registrants, but it's channeled through entities that are under contract to ICANN and that, I think it's not too much of a stretch to say, are accredited to do business by ICANN.

ICANN, it's not too much of a stretch to say, regulates these businesses and it depends on these businesses for funding.

How do you think that would play into your discussion about governance innovation?

In this institution, which is not a government and is not private-sector business, exactly, it has some elements of both and it depends for its funding on entities whose behavior it is supposed to regulate.

With that, do you think -- have you thought about how that will fit into how it can innovate in governance?

BETH NOVECK: So first of all, let me say that the question is itself -- you have just volunteered yourself to be useful, as is everybody by virtue of being in the room, so I think the -- you know, we can take -- we can get smarter about what some of these other models are, whether they come from governments or NGOs or business organizations, all of which are experimenting with new forms of

governance, and then we have to adapt and adopt them to this context which is a very special and unique context of being the only organization -- can I venture to say the only organization of its kind in the world, or a handful of organizations in the world, before I get myself in trouble -- that are global stewards of a shared public resource in this very -- as you point out, that have on the one hand responsibility to the global public and to the planet, and on the other hand, responsibility to the people that it does business with.

So I think we need -- there are three thoughts that come to mind.

One is -- and this is a point that I'm going to steal from Bertrand de la Chapelle, who has written very compellingly about the importance of thinking about the different layers in the policymaking process -- that there are different things that ICANN or any institution of governance or that any decision-making institution does, whether it ranges from the contracts that it enacts with those it does business with to the regulations that it creates to the broader policy principles, and we have to look at different strategies that work at different points in the process and it's sometimes multiple strategies.

In other words, there may be a decision-making process where we both want to try to pinpoint the most expert input and we also want to get the broadest possible input for reasons of legitimacy

where the advantage of new technology is that we can bring down the cost of trying multiple things.

I think the second point is -- which I've already forgotten.

And the third point is that this is a really helpful comment that I think we have to take this under consideration. You know, the work of the strategy panel, though, is much too short and we may be able to do the first part of this, which is to suggest some alternatives which then have to be hashed out. We'll do as best a job as we can at trying to suggest things that are very concrete, but how those get taken forward -- you know, if we make a proposal around what it means to do procurement innovation and come up with 10 strategies for how to do that, it may still take some work to marry those suggestions to the actual work that ICANN does on a day-to-day basis.

So hence, we're going to need that input and that feedback, but I think this is incredibly important advice.

It's also the reason that the members of the strategy panel are people who have expertise in public and private, in municipal and in national and in international sort of governance innovations, because I think we have to look at different models and to look broadly to get the best ideas and inspiration and then adapt them to this very unique environment.

VINT CERF: Steve, come back. Since you asked the question, is there any relationship between what -- in the sporting world, where you have somebody overseeing basketball or football or baseball -- I don't know what the money flow is. If it's the case that the parties that oversee those sports are paid by the people who play the sports and if the people who play the sports agree to be bound by decisions, including fines and other kinds of things, is that similar to this kind of common agreement that ICANN establishes with its registrars and registries?

They agree, under the contract, to be bound by these things. It -- so it doesn't sound too weird to me.

STEVE METALITZ: There might be some similarities, but -- and a lot of this is going to vary from country to country.

In the United States, there are some particular aspects of that. In many sports, actually, all the different -- they're not really paid by the athletes. The teams are owned or totally controlled by the leagues and so forth, and there's -- there's antitrust exemptions, there's labor agreements that apply. A lot of things that don't apply in our environment, some that do. But it may have some value as an analogy to what we're talking about.

BECKY BURR: Hello. Becky Burr. This is actually -- I'm going to follow up on Mike's comment and Vint's -- Steve's comment and Mike -- Steve and Vint's comment. Whatever.

I actually think that it's really important -- I'm glad you used the word "legitimacy," Beth, because that is the critical underpinning here, and I think that ICANN needs different kinds of legitimacy, depending on the role that it's playing.

So when it is entering into contract negotiations with the business people, there's a clear give-and-take bargain legitimacy that goes with it that we're familiar with.

When ICANN's regulating, there's another kind of legitimacy that's needed.

So in looking at the models, I think it would help us a lot if we could contribute to the vocabulary of what ICANN is at any particular moment in time in its role, and what kind of legitimacy it needs in the context of that role, because I think it differs a lot and I think that one of the things that we have not achieved yet is precision about what we are at any moment in time.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Hi. I am Bertrand de la Chapelle. For a few more days, a member of the ICANN board.

And I just wanted to piggyback on the connection between some of the work that will be done by Vint's panel and Beth. And by the way, thanks for the kind quote.

One point of connection is precisely in the workflow of elaborating any kind of policy.

One of the things that we often overlook is the first stage that goes to the birds of a feather type of thing that Vint was mentioning.

One of the elements of connection between the two panels that you're running is that in Vint's panel, there is a connection with the rest of the ecosystem dealing with the governance of the logical layer, and particularly the standards organization, which as you said have a complete different criteria from what ICANN does, because a standards organization, it needs to work but it also needs to be accepted by the actors.

If people don't apply the standards, you're toast.

In the case of ICANN, it has never happened, of course, but the process allows to take decisions and enforce them even when the decision may be bad. Of course it never happened, but...

[Laughter]

ICANN is the only multistakeholder international organization that does have enforcement capacity, and it is very unique in this landscape.

The connection with Beth's panel is that you will be looking at a lot of practices outside of the Internet governance landscape and the traditional multistakeholder model to businesses, innovations, and so on, and I think it's very interesting to have the connection between the two because you are going to compare practices and innovations in the different environments.

Thank you.

THERESA SWINEHART: Okay.

BRIAN: Hello. At the beginning, Fadi you addressed the fifth panel but didn't provide very much additional information. Do you have any additional information you can provide about this fifth panel and what your role in that panel will be?

FADI CHEHADE: Thank you, Brian.

The fifth panel announcement is on the front of our Web site. It has a list of the panelists. There's, I think, 18 of them at the moment.

We may be short two more that have not confirmed.

The panel will look at the issue of the future of Internet governance in broader terms than the panels here and in terms that embrace the entire ecosystem rather than in terms of that are very, if I could say, ICANN-centric or ICANN-focused.

And therefore, the panel, the fifth panel, has obviously people from government, people from business, people from broad civil society groups, technical organizations including ISOC, ICANN, et cetera.

And I think the work of that panel will be important to feed into the fora of next year, and in fact, they are timing their output to be right when the conference just announced this morning by the Brazilian ministers is asking for input.

And therefore, it is likely that that -- the output of this panel will be aligned with the input that is needed from Brazil. Of course it will not be the only source of input for Brazil or for conferences later after Brazil. It will be just one other panel that will do that.

And if -- if that's the case, then I can tell you that the output will focus on two areas.

It will focus on principles of Internet governance, and secondly, it will focus on the institutional framework that is necessary for the future Internet governance. And within that -- and this is very important -- I think as we assembled this panel, we agreed that there are two fundamental tenets to that work, and this is in discussion with President Toomas Ilves who will lead this panel.

One is that the focus of this panel is to indeed explore multistakeholder institutional frameworks through multistakeholder -- equal multistakeholder institutional frameworks.

The second key tenet is that nothing that we're aiming to do here will call for the creation of, you know, large centralized institutions. We believe the model of a distributed, agile set of institutions that as we've seen over the last 15 years, for example, has served the Internet extremely well should be the model we would embrace.

So in general, the panel chair, in discussions with us, agrees that this should be the framework and the tenets that support that framework.

BRIAN: Thank you. A quick follow-up.

                        Do you have a time line that is similar to what Vint walked us through where there will be a public comment period and a draft before anything gets finalized?

FADI CHEHADE: Yes. Similarly, that panel will be transparent and open. They are meeting for the first time on the 13th of December in London, and Vint Cerf is one of the members of that panel. So is, for example, Olaf Kolkman, who is sitting behind you. Myself and many here are members of that panel.

                        But we will be meeting on the 13th to start setting the time lines, but what I can tell you is, the intent is to finish the work of that panel on the 28th of February next year. Because the deadline that I believe the Brazil conference will be announcing next week is to submit everything by March 1st, so we'd like to get our work done so it is useful to the Brazil conference but also other conferences later in the year. Public comment period, listening period, all the same as these panels.

BRIAN: Thank you very much.

FADI CHEHADE: You're welcome, Brian.

THERESA SWINEHART: So no other questions? I wonder if the chairs have any closing remarks they want to give or we may actually be ending on time.

Are we good? Okay. Great. Well, thank you so much, everybody, please, for coming here. Thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]