
KOBE - Joint Meeting - ICANN Board and NCSG
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 - 08:30 to 09:30 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

MATTHEW SHEARS: Good morning, everybody. My name is Matthew Shears with the ICANN Board. This is the first meeting, I believe, first meeting of constituency day. This is a meeting between NCSG and Board. We're delighted for everybody to be here. And I think we're going to jump right in. And I believe that NCSG is going to go with their questions first. Or -- Is that right?

So before we do that, though, let's do a tour of the table.

Kathy, if you could start.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Kathy Kleiman.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Sarah Deutsch.

JOAN KERR: Joan Kerr.

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.

AVRI DORIA: Avri Doria.

LEON SANCHEZ: Leon Sanchez.

BECKY BURR: Becky Burr.

GORAN MARBY: Goran Marby.

CHERINE CHALABY: Cherine Chalaby.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Matthew Shears.

MERIKE KAE0: Merike Kaeo.

AYDEN FERDELINE: Hi, I'm Ayden Ferdeline.

ELSA SAADE: Elsa Saade.

]

TATIANA TROPINA: Tatiana Tropina.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Rafik Dammak.

BRUNA SANTOS: Bruna Santos.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Stephanie Perrin.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Excellent. Stephanie, over to you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thank you very much. Stephanie Perrin, for the record.

This is early morning, so, you know, I'm not quite sure that we're all at our eloquent best, but we'd like this to be as interactive a discussion as we can manage given the -- given the shape of this, and we appreciate your shaping questions. It was very helpful.

Shall we just start with that first topic? We did want to raise this because, you know, often we are -- we are considered to be the folks that fight for freedom of speech and privacy, but we also care about security and cybercrime. We have put in for an additional budget request to see if we can actually do some outreach in our underserved areas because some of our members do education projects on a noncommercial basis in these areas, and, you know, we would like to improve that and increase it and make people more aware of the security issues. And we reached out to our colleagues in SSAC to see if they could give us a hand, because whenever they come to speak to us it's always very well received, good information. Hard to keep up. So that's kind of why we thought that was important.

Now, we often here the rhetoric of the balancing of security and privacy, and particularly in the recent discussions on the EPDP it's always we need to expose data because it's in the public interest for the fighting of cybercrime. We take a different view, but that doesn't mean that we're not concerned about cybercrime.

And it brings us to that whole question of what is the global public interest. How do we define it? We don't agree within our own stakeholder group necessarily on how to define it, but we do see it in your five-year plan. So it's important that we start figuring out what the various strands of that are.

So, that's enough from me.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Stephanie.

I think I turn this over to Merike.

MERIKE KAEAO: Great. Thank you. And I was actually quite happy to see this question because certainly security and cybercrime is that's top of mind for everybody.

So one of the things that ICANN org has been doing is they have been providing sessions called "How It Works" at the ICANN meetings and also globally, and these are intended to inform and educate the community members on all aspects of the Internet systems of identifiers, including DNS abuse and its mitigation topics.

So we agree that educating community members on cybercrime and, in particular, cyber hygiene; right? The best practices that everybody should be doing, is increasingly important, and the Board is broadly supportive of these initiatives.

The Board Technical Committee is tasked with coming up with a recommendation to the Board and to the ICANN CEO how ICANN org should be tackling this problem.

And then when it comes to the question on public interest and the balance between privacy and security, under the Articles of Incorporation in the ICANN bylaws, ICANN's purpose is to promote the global public interest in the operation of stability of the Internet by carrying out its mission. And these governing documents also specify that the determination of the public interest in any specific context is to be made by the multistakeholder community through an inclusive, bottoms-up multistakeholder community policy. So with respect to policy development within ICANN's mission, we look to the bottom-up multistakeholder policy development process to identify the global public interest.

But in the more technical areas, ICANN is part of an ecosystem, and our bylaws require us to collaborate and, in some cases, provide support for critical technical standard-setting bodies that play an important and critical role in the technical aspects of security and stability.

So our core values require ICANN to respect the roles of internal and external bodies with security expertise, and within ICANN, the SSAC, the RSSAC, and the TEG provide critical support for this mission and also help us to connect with the external bodies, such as the IETF and other technical bodies.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Merike.

Stephanie, before I come back to you, it may be helpful if Avri could just give us a quick update on where the discussion is on global public interest as you raised that in the context of this question.

AVRI DORIA: Yes. Thanks.

So in terms of this whole project that we've taken on in terms of the global public interest and how we weigh those and how we look at the different things, part of what we're trying to do is notice the fact that in our articles we talk about global public interest in any specific situation and any specific topic where we need to know it.

It's through our bottom-up multistakeholder process that we discover what that is, because we know that many different groups, many different perceptions bring to the global public interest. And it's only through our global -- I mean through our bottom-up multistakeholder process, the bump that gets talked about, that we actually know what it is for us at that point in time for that particular issue.

So -- And that's also repeated in our bylaws about how we find it. So it's nice to say that in those documents.

What we're now trying to do, and we'll be working with the community, is sort of to work on a framework for specifically in each of the -- in each of the topics, in each of the situations where we need to express the global public interest, we need to say did we meet it? How do we meet it? How do we effect it? That we take that kind of bottom-up process to discover it, to discuss it, and to come to some consensus on what it is now, you know, for this subject at this point of time. Because, you know, the previous exercises, as I said, we try to boil the ocean and sort of say, yes, for all things, this is the picture of the global public interest, then you end up with something that's "we know it when we see it" which is really not good enough because we all see it differently.

So that that's really the reason for always rooting the definition, the description, the picture of the public interest in that process or through that process. And that's what we're going to try to work on expressing and giving a framework this year.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Thanks very much for that explanation. I must say I'm one of these people who likes to define terms when I start drafting something, and my first reaction to the undefined term of the "public interest" when I encountered it in all ICANN's documents is why don't we define this. Well, then I discovered the nature of that multistakeholder discussion of the public interest. So I can

understand why we don't have a static definition. But if -- If what I'm hearing is that we're never going to have a static definition, what we're going to have is a process and a discussion and a common understanding, I feel a little better. Because right now I think we would lose a multistakeholder argument on what the public interest is because the understanding of privacy is so very thin here. It's better than it was a couple of years ago thanks to the EPDP, but we're not there yet. And that balancing the -- the depth of the activities of data commissioners in terms of privacy is not well understood. So, for instance, the international conference was voting back in about -- I think it was 2008 or 2009 about having a permanent liaison to ICANN so that they could explain privacy. This is after a couple of years of unsuccessful WHOIS discussions.

So that's the kind of really constructive dialogue that hasn't been happening in terms of the balancing of security and privacy, you know?

They have an IETF liaison, but they don't have an ICANN one.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

I just want to remind everybody if you want to ask a question on these subjects as we go through them, please feel free to go to the mic, which is over there. Thanks.

ELSA SAADE: Thank you. Elsa for the record.

I completely understand where Avri is coming from; however, I think the use of "global public interest" in those articles somehow sets a benchmark as to what it is. That context with which it's being used sets that benchmark, and it would be helpful to make a study on which context it was being used through so that we would make sure that we're talking on the same grounds.

Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Kathy.

AVRI DORIA: I'll go after everyone has gone. I didn't realize were you asking to speak, so I'll go later.

KATHY KLEIMAN: Kathy Kleiman. So question about the framework that's being developed and how we might include more parties, because almost by definition the global public interest will be more than the stakeholders that come to the ICANN meetings and participate actively. So how do we do -- is it part of the framework to do more than outreach when we're getting to these questions

that may affect much larger portions of the world than the Internet and the community?

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. The framework is actually what we're going to talk about building now. So, yes, I would answer that, yes, it should be. And, yes, you know -- this almost feeds into the topic 3 that we're getting in on how do we include more of the people, more of the scholars, more of the academics and such from, you know, civil society and elsewhere. But -- And -- and so -- so I think that putting in that -- that kind of how do we reach out further into that framework, how do we do those, how do we -- how do we take that survey of what are the various perceptions that are contributing to the global public interest from the various entities is, indeed, part of building that framework. It's how do we do it, and how do we discuss it. And I really just did want to point out that part of it does reflect back to how we bring in those people that spend their time living, thinking, breathing the understanding of public interest, whether it's liaisons or other participants or making sure that when we ask for comments we direct those requests to people that might not be paying attention but we need the comments from and things like -- but we really still, we're talking about building the framework now. So hopefully by Marrakech, I can do a little better than just hand wave on what a framework would, could include.

And Sarah had her finger.

SARAH DEUTSCH: Yeah, I just wanted to add on the difficulty of defining it. One thought is that sometimes it's easier to understand what it's not. So to the extent we can take little bites away at it by at least agreeing on what it isn't, that can help.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Sarah.

Anybody else on this question?

I did want to mention that David Conrad is here in the room and has -- he's over there, and if anybody wants to talk more about the education part of this question, which was the first part, feel free to talk to him.

Okay. Stephanie. Question. Next question.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Excuse me. I'm going to turn the mic over to Bruna to discuss the anti-harassment.

BRUNA SANTOS: Bruna Santos, for the record. It's just more of a comment about the recently formed Board working group on anti-harassment.

Just to mention that we really appreciate the initiative, and this was naturally a follow-up from one statement that we issued and read during the public forum back in Puerto Rico.

So we have been -- so far, we received this initiative very well and we're looking forward to hearing back from you about the plan and how the Board working group will be talking to the community and relying back on us from now on.

So thank you very much.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thank you I think Sarah wanted to comment on that.

SARAH DEUTSCH:

Yes, thank you. First of all, just to thank this stakeholder group for -- you know, if not for your persistence, we wouldn't have this working group. I thought we had a very productive first meeting since the formation of the Board working group. We met yesterday. We came out. Everyone is really committed and, you know, working, you know, with amazing energy to get something done. And a couple of things at least from our end came across. One was that we're not going to just wait to study this issue and see what happens a long time from now. We're going to go for the low-hanging fruit now. I think everyone was very committed to doing whatever process improvements could be done now, and

even before Marrakech. So hopefully before the Marrakech meeting we'll already be seeing little steps that could improve awareness on sexual harassment. And long-term we're going to be doing benchmarking and best practices from other organizations that have volunteers. There is no other organization that's ICANN, per se, but we can learn from what other organizations are doing. We already have the good ideas you guys have submitted. We're going to take everything and move from. There so thank you again.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Thanks very much. I take it you haven't told Goran about his starring role in the movie yet, hey?

SARAH DEUTSCH: No, I forgot. There's a singing role, we forgot to tell you, too.

GORAN MARBY: I, don't, sing.

[Laughter]

>> Dance?

>>CHRIS DISSPAIN: He, is, correct.

>> Do you lip sync?

I can sing for you, but would you lip sync?

GORAN MARBY: I don't dance.

[Laughter]

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Goran for that. I have taken note.

GORAN MARBY: I have absolutely no idea what you're talking about, and I feel harassed.

[Laughter]

Is the ombudsman here? Herb, I need a cookie.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Elsa, you want to follow-up?

ELSA SAADE:

Yes, I really want to echo what Bruna mentioned, and thank you, Sarah, and all the working group and all the Board, obviously.

I just wanted to point out, though, that although I appreciate wholeheartedly what's happening right now that some certain issues or certain instances are still happening in parallel. So just being aware of that fact is also very important for us going forward, and that's why I completely appreciate the fact that we're being proactive and we're not waiting for a survey.

So just having a three-month focused plan so that we can at least be aware of all those instances that are happening as we speak right now, for instance, is extremely important. And I'm really happy that all of us are on the same footing here.

Yeah, and I just take this chance to thank you again.

SARAH DEUTSCH:

Thank you for that comment. That's a great idea.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

If you hear rustling in the background, Goran is distributing cookies or something.

Any more discussion on topic 2?

Okay. Shall we move on? Stephanie.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: All right. Now, the third topic, I think you have heard us in the past discussing this sort of perennial challenge of how do we reach out, do global outreach, bring people in, and then get them up to speed so that they can actually participate in ICANN. ICANN is becoming more complex. We've heard all about, you know, the challenges in the PDPs. We understand that ICANN is not a university. Some people come in and they expect kind of, just like the kids do in the classes nowadays, they want a bunch of PowerPoints, so they don't have to take lecture notes. We're not able to do that as burnt-out volunteers trying to staff these things. We know that ICANN cannot become a university. On the other hand, this is really impeding our effectiveness because we kind of lose people or we burn through their allowable travel slots before we actually get them to be contributing members. There are obviously exceptions to that, but it's a problem.

So any fresh ideas to help us out with this?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Stephanie. I think I'm turning it over to Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. Very sympathetic with this one since I'm sort of one of them, or at least try to be. I'm certainly one of those that teach and certainly one of those that writes. Probably not writing about

ICANN a lot now, but I will be some day when I'm no longer on the board. That wasn't a threat.

I have a cookie. Right.

And so, yes, it is a big concern. It's because we definitely do want the perceptions to be complete. We definitely do want the conversations to be ample.

I would actually like to ask either Sally or David to talk a little more about the whole mechanics of increasing the participation, because it's all well and good that the few academics that are here are here, but we're -- we're the freaks that are so dedicated to it we come anyway.

So whether it was David or -- oh, thank you. Sally.

SALLY COSTERTON:

See if this -- oh, yes. Magic. Thank you very much, Avri, and thank you very much all of you for the question.

I agree, Stephanie, I think it is very essential to our ability to deliver our mission. It's in our mission. Part of our values and commitments in our mission ask us as an organization to bring people to ICANN, yes, but to make sure that they are equipped to participate in our processes. And that's where the capacity development, which is what this is, and education really kicks in.

So it should be central, not just to my teams but to everybody, really, at ICANN. And we all have a role to play in helping give a hand up to newcomers and to participants and to make sure they really understand what we're doing and how they can contribute.

In terms of how we do this, in many different ways we do this and I'm happy to take any questions on the specific parts of the newcomer program, either here or separately.

On the question of academic engagement, which is the question itself, we have in the org been recently looking at this and in conjunction with the NCSG, in fact. Thank you very much because you have worked a lot with my team to help us have a good back and forth on how to do this effectively and maximize the resources available. It's been very collaborative.

And as part of that, we will dedicate some specialist resource in my team at a global level as well as providing more access, focus is a better word, in each of the regional teams to dedicate sort of two-way academic engagement. Because academics have two roles, don't they? It's both hello, people out there, who are academics teaching students. We would love you to have ICANN in your curriculum. Because a lot of programs, standardized sort of academic programs for grads and post grads, they don't teach ICANN at all. They teach about other institutions, like the ITU. And they come in sometimes to ICANN knowing more about those

institutions than us. So that's a gap. How do we reach out, literally, into institutions to help us to do that? How do we do that around the world? And who should we be talking to? And I know you guys will have a lot of ideas and do have a lot of ideas about who those institutions should be.

And then the other side of it, as academics come into ICANN to participate, which I think was what was really behind the question, how can we make sure there is a better focus, more of a specialist, if you like, set of engagement activities to make that as easy as possible?

Now, the primary platform that we are now using for the scaling problem, which you also raised, is our digital online learning platform, ICANN Learn. And some of you have really been extremely generous with your time to help us build content and courses for that. It is now ramping quite quickly. And we are seeing more courses coming on all the time in multiple languages. You may not know, but when you go into ICANN Learn, which has -- which is GDPR-compliant, by the way, just want to make that point -- that there is a little button, a little globe on the bottom of the screen as you participate in a course that allows you to get the instructions in many different languages. So it's a cool platform, cool piece of technology. It should allow us over time to scale indefinitely. There's no limit, really, as to how much content we can have. And the more we discuss that together

through our outreach at these kinds of meetings, the better we are going to be able to make sure that we have what we need collectively to serve those stakeholders. I hope that's helpful.

Thank you, Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thank you.

CHERINE CHALABY: --

MATTHEW SHEARS: Any follow-up questions or comments?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: Yes. Not to keep going on and on about this topic, but it is a pretty central one to some of our concerns. And I think that was very helpful, Sally. Thank you.

I mean far beyond just the sort of academic side of this -- and we'd be happy to contribute, because many of us get tagged to go in and do the lecture on ICANN and explain the acronyms with our colleagues in the different faculties. So I think we probably have law faculty and information faculty and sociology. We can give

you those, if that would be of any use. I'm also happy to give you all my privacy material, although nobody ever asks. I'm crushed.

But beyond that, we had a very productive meeting yesterday morning with the -- just a small group of us with ALAC. And we have initiated a joint working group, really, to work on KPIs and metrics.

Now, ever since I've come to ICANN, I realize that not so many people actually understand maturity models. I talk about coso maturity models. I'm staring at blank faces. We would really like to figure out the metrics for how we measure our productivity as non-commercials. That's not an easy thing, because it's not usually measured. So we look forward to working with ALAC and the people who are, you know, metrics geeks among us.

But if I know that you have this sort of academic team working on these instructions, then maybe I can tag you and say, what have you got on metrics? What have you got on coso?

SALLY COSTERTON:

Yes, absolutely. Please do. I actually met with (saying name) yesterday, and she mentioned this to me, exactly what you just described. And I'm extremely supportive of that. I think it's a great idea. And I have a substantial team working with the At Large all around the world. And it's a very good point of

alignment between these two parts of our ICANN outreach. And thank you for raising it. It's a great initiative.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Sally, Stephanie.

Anybody else want to jump in on this? Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Thanks. I very much appreciate the forward movement. And I must say, with the amount that Jonathan has achieved in metrics by himself over the last decade, I think, you know, Jonathan plus you should really be able to produce something quite phenomenal. So I'm looking forward to it.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Anyone else?

Anyone want to raise a question on this before we move on?

No?

Okay. Let's move to the board's questions.

Okay. So we put two questions to the community. And they're up on the screen there. What the board, ICANN org, and the community should be doing now to prepare for the successful implementation of the plans. We're talking about the strategic

plan, the operating plan, and the new governance evolution plan. And please make three suggestions as concrete as possible providing one each for the board, ICANN org, and the community.

And then specifically, we'd like to know more about ICANN -- so, anyway, can we hear what -- your thoughts, and then we can delve into the details a little bit.

Who wants to take this?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I've been doing far too much talking here. Would anybody else like to tackle our comments on the five-year plan? No?

Go on. Okay.

To be honest, I don't think we really answered and gave you too many concrete contributions. Certainly, we've been thinking about it. And I think we said that. We're working on it and digesting.

The performance indicators, measuring our own use of resources, I think, is a really fundamental platform piece. We may not have it done by Marrakech, although I think ALAC and NCSG are excited about it.

But, you know, just baseline measuring our own outputs and outcomes and even stating them more clearly as to what we're

aiming for would be, I think, an improvement on our part. So it's kind of -- we'd like to clean up our own ship first, and then we'll start telling you how to clean up yours. Usually, it's the other way around, I think.

So that's kind of a first point.

Cherine, I see you looking at -- you probably have a comment on this.

MATTHEW SHEARS: We're going to open this up a bit and have a bit of a dialogue.

CHERINE CHALABY: Let me open it up a bit and engage you in some of the things that we've been thinking about.

So there are three plans. The three plans, if we want -- if we were to execute them well, there are things that we -- I mentioned yesterday in my opening remarks are core conditions for success.

Let's take the first one, the strategic plan. And just to put a context for everybody, the strategic plan is a visionary document. It's a direction for all of us to go in a certain direction, which we know our mission statement is not changing, but there's a direction towards preserving the single Internet. And that's why

we have a new vision there that is very clear, and some five strategic objectives.

You can't execute the plan on its own. So we need an operational plan to execute it, which is going to show a detailed road map for the next five years. And one of the road maps is also some improvements to the efficiency and effectiveness of our multistakeholder model. And we're creating sort of a separate plan for that, working with the community.

So let's take those three plans.

For the strategic plan and for all of us to follow the direction, if we believe in it, there has to be a commitment, a commitment, and an unwavering commitment from all of us to see it through, to believe in it. There has to be a buy-in. It's not just a document.

So the question is, how do we get the buy-in of the community? Not just by the public comments, because we received very good public comments. Say, yes, the right direction. Yes, do it, you know, in terms of overall the structure. Some detailed comments, which we need to take into account and consider.

But how do we get a buy-in and a binding buy-in by all of us in the direction of preserving and protecting the single Internet and making sure we are the trusted steward of the unique identifiers as a vision? Plus, there are those five strategic objectives, one on

our security, one on governance, one on geopolitics, one on financial, and so on. So that's a question we need input from the community. How do we get that commitment?

Move on to the operating and financial plan. It's going to be a far-reaching plan, because the strategic plan with the help of the community is truly bold and decisive. It says -- says change is needed, and in a variety of areas, whether it's security, financials, it doesn't matter. But there are changes in the next five years. So the plan is going to be a very, very strong plan. The question is, do we have, collectively -- and I say the board, ICANN org, the community -- do we have collectively the leadership, the management, the technical know-how, the financial resources, the will to actually follow that road map? Or are we just going to say we leave it to the CEO and say, "You implement it"?

So I think this is different this time. We need to all work together as a community and make sure that our plan's a reality. So that's the second thing. How do we get sure that we have the skills required collectively to implement the plan?

So the first one is about the commitment and the will to pursue the strategy. The second one is about having the skills required to implement the plan and working with our CEO to implement.

The third one is on the governance issue.

What the community is saying on the governance, we want to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the governance. We haven't heard we want to reform our governance. We're not talking about that. That's not what we're talking about. We're talking about improving certain aspects of our governance so that it becomes more efficient to make decisions while preserving -- while preserving -- our bottom-up consensus and inclusive decision-making process. But there will be resistance to that. There will be resistance, because there's always fear to change of governance, because people fear that you're touching on our DNA, you're touching on the things we are accustomed to. And, in general, people accept changes as long as it doesn't affect them, it affects others. But this is -- we need to have the courage to make changes that affects us. Right? In a positive way. There are no winners or losers. We're not talking about restructuring. We're talking about having changes to processes and a bit of the cultural sites. Even, you can argue, changes that are digestible and small, but that can have a much bigger impact; right? And we want to do those in the next two or three years rather than Big Bang restructuring. But I don't think -- this is not where we're going.

So question number one, how do we get the commitment on the strategy. Let's take yourself as the NCSG. How do we get your commitment on the strategy? How do we work with you on our

skills? And, three, how do we overcome the resistance on doing changes that will make all of our life and our model work better and more efficient?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

If I may -- I know Kathy wants to speak -- I -- Rafik, too. But I think you are talking to the stakeholder group who is extremely committed to the multistakeholder model, for the simple reason that in the government model, we're not usually inside the room, you know. Business is; not necessarily civil society. So we are very committed to making this work. And we try to think about how to make it work better.

Certainly -- and I think I must be channeling Jonathan Zuck somewhere -- but measurement is key. We, in my view, count the wrong things. And in my view, ICANN is old enough now that it is suffering from bureaucratic overload. It's -- you know, like governments. Anybody who worked in government as long as I did have to suffer the pain of a paperwork reduction exercise and one of these how can we cut things and make it simpler. It -- you know, it's just like pruning your apple tree in the spring. You have to do it; right?

So I think we're there. And I agree, when I saw your plan, I smelled cuts coming. Again, having worked in government, I can (sniffing), you know, catch a whiff. So we're frightened. Naturally,

people are worried that it's going to impact how we learn, how we do outreach, whether we've got seats to go to meetings and participate, you know. So we have to get beyond that. And I think the metrics exercise will help us count the right things and show that we are producing and making good use of resources.

Now, having just suffered through the EPDP and prior to the that, the RDS review, I think there's enormous frustration in those of us who participated that we don't seem to be able to cut off unproductive discussion. We don't seem to be able to stop redundant processes. I was just on the RDS Review Team, and I know that we tried to cut that, and because we were partway through, we didn't cut it. But a lot of that work is going to be somewhat irrelevant by the time we've finished the EPD process.

So how do you respect the multistakeholder process and still stop doing repetitive, unproductive things? I don't know. I don't even know how you cut people off who are -- if I may use the Canadian expression -- ragging the puck, because that's a real problem on the PDPs.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Stephanie, thank you. I see we have Kathy, Rafik, Goran.

And one at the mic, Raoul.

Kathy, you want to go ahead?

KATHY KLEIMAN:

Kathy Kleiman, and I'm sure you're not going to like our response, which is, our nose is to the grindstone now, the EPDP has been working 30 hours a week, I'm co-chair of one of the PDPs. It's a full-time job. We have our day jobs. I'm not sure many of us have looked up yet to see how you get the commitment -- to see the strategic plan. I mean, we're in the trenches, working. And so how do you get the commitment? What are the skills you need to implement? How do we make the process that we are already too involved in, because we have day jobs, as well as families, more effective and efficient?

So my question to you is, how much time do we have to think about it, to look at it, to evaluate with you, because, again, our time's already so --

CHERINE CHALABY:

You've got 15 months. What can we do to help you during those 15 months? It's not going to come into effect before 15 months. So we have 15 months to prepare for its implementation. What can we do to help you understand it and get the buy-in? That's what we're looking for. So make a suggestion. There's a session on Thursday, going to be facilitated by the community, by Brian Cute. We're going to be part of the larger community. The board doesn't want to drive this top-down. This is bottom-up. But we're looking for ideas. So we say here's the plan, we've got 15 months

to implement it. That's why we prepared it long ahead. It's been in the making. It's out for public comment. But we have 15 months from now before its implementation. How do we get -- in those 15 months, how can we help the community understand it, get the buy-in, the commitment, and believe in it so that we all, then, from 15 months onward for the next five years continue with that plan?

That's what we're looking for. So if you have suggestions, do you want us to produce webinars, education, training? So we're looking for ideas so that we can help you, right, and you can help us. It's working together.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Is that okay?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Rafik.

RAFFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks. Just a question about one of the plans, about this whole discussion, about the multistakeholder governance model and how to improve that.

I think maybe there is a perception, a problem, because, like, it's kind of maybe it seems that we -- the community's not doing maybe a good job and so on.

I just wanted to ask, I think it's an easy question, does the board think that the board itself is working efficiently and effectively in terms of, you know, doing its job or in terms of processes and so on just to learn from you your experience? And also because to - - maybe to set kind of the record that it's kind of maybe shared the problem, or that different group are trying to do on their side, to fix that. For example, at the GNSO Council level, we discussed a lot about this kind of issue and tried to come up with a PDP 3.0. So I just want to hear from you, from your perspective.

GORAN MARBY:

I just had a follow-up comment to the previous one, because I want to agree with Stephanie. Sometimes -- we also talk about changes like this in a very broad term. I've been here now for three years, believe it or not. And I have some very practical ones. For instance, dot E.U. in Greek, where we had SSAC on one side, ccNSO on another side, working independently, talking to each other, in their ivory towers, and in the end, they came up with two solutions. So we spent an enormous amount of resources, fatigue on that one.

I think the reviews, if you look at the cadence of the reviews, we are talking about that as well. But they take an enormous amount of workload from the community.

When we did the Hubba Bubba bub project, the flowcharts of all the processes, we ended up having places where the process actually stops. We don't know what to do. Because there's no way. We invented something called impasse just to make sure that we actually have one way of going forward.

So we have several of those very concrete examples of where we probably -- I mean, it's hard -- when you create a multistakeholder model, it's sort of hard to think about everything. And we created many layers. ICANN is sort of a -- we are an onion. We have layer after layer. And if you try to peel them, you start crying.

So I think that what my intention -- this is -- we're not talking about the power balance or anything else. This is, like, how do we fix those problems that we are already seeing? And we're talking about them. I mean, you mentioned several times, we are working -- we are asking so many times the community. Another simple one: We -- on one hand, you want us to send out consultations. And on the other hand, we drown you with consultations. So we have those very practical things. And I agree with you, the matrix. And I think it's important for us, as all of us,

to discuss it. And I'm happy that we brought in Brian Cute as sort of a person who has no stake in it to be neutral in those discussions. So I'm looking for a practical fix.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Go ahead.

RAOUL PLOMMER: It's Raoul, for the record. So this is a really simple idea, but I think it could be helpful, I mean, I think the community doesn't really pay attention to some high-level documents. And I was thinking maybe one way of sort of alerting the community would be to get an email from the board member saying that this is an important document, having the link to the document and, like, making it painstakingly obvious that you should be going through this. I don't think we're getting that at the moment. I might be wrong there.

But that might be something that a person of importance, like a board member representing -- or a stakeholder group could send us a little, I don't know, maybe even a little reasoning why you need to see this document.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks. I think Becky wanted to come back on the board improvements that Rafik touched on.

BECKY BURR: Just a brief note, because I think it's an entirely fair and appropriate question to ask if the Board is looking at itself and thinking about whether it's doing its work efficiently and effectively.

The Board does a -- every two years a 360 and in-depth review, and we have spent a significant amount of time this year talking - - going through that in great detail, developing action plans to respond to things. The bot -- and we published a blog on this a couple months ago, so it's out there. The bottom line is, we think we're getting better. We think we have work to do. We do think that this question about sort of reform -- not reform, I don't -- not the word at all. But the enhancements of the multistakeholder process for efficiency, effectiveness without sacrificing all of our core values doesn't exempt the Board. The Board is part of that and needs to be part of that. But I just wanted to acknowledge the comment that it is -- the Board is -- appropriately should be looking inward and looking to its contribution to this.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Becky. Any other comments or follow-up?

BECKY BURR: Question answered?

RAFIK DAMMAK: I will say I understand that there is -- there are efforts and activities on that regard, but because also we talked about metrics and so on and if we take some of the maybe latest activities like approving some of the, I don't know, like something coming from the Work Stream 2 or other -- I don't know, other process, do you think that you -- it was done -- dealt with quickly or not, something like that, to be more concrete in what you think you are improved compared to before?

CHERINE CHALABY: I'm trying to understand the question in the context of the discussion we're having now. So we're talking about the three plans. One of them is -- sorry, Kathy brought in something that we're really sensitive to which is the unbelievable demand on community's time and the sacrifices you're making, and we know how hard people are working, sometimes at 4:00 in the morning and you're snowed under with so many projects. So we understand that, absolutely. And how do we navigate also getting these buy-ins and so on, right?

The good thing is we still have time, right? And we want to help you. And we want to help you without causing additional burden

that at the end you can't even do anything. So we understand that. It's not an easy solution, but I think if we can find a way together we can get there. In a manner that is digestible and gradual and acceptable to the community. So we have -- we need to find that way. We haven't got it yet.

So -- and we talk about the three plans. I'm trying to understand Rafik's point about WS2 in relation to talking about getting the buy-in, finding the management skill, and doing changes to our - - so I can answer the question within the context of the discussion.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

No, it's just I wanted to -- I mean, I appreciate the response from Becky. I mean, I understand what you tried to do and effort from the Board, but just want -- if it can be more concrete. Like you can tell us, for example, that on this topic to make a decision the Board took X time or something. So compared to before, so we can see how -- how improved, in term of effectiveness, efficiency. Because like let's take an example, if we are working on some PDP and people put a lot of effort and so on and then you will take longer time to approve, it doesn't really help at the end. So just I want -- I mean, I'm not --

CHERINE CHALABY:

No, and I think this is a very important point to bring into discussion on Thursday about the multi -- about the efficiency of the system, because it's the efficiency of the Board decision, as well, as part of that, right? So on the session that Brian Cote is going to lead on Thursday, if you have an opportunity to be there and make these points, all right. I'm going to give you at least some pointers.

So the last -- take the last ten years our revenue, our funding, has been growing exponentially. And anything that came from the community in terms of advice, in terms of policy, in terms of recommendation, by and large the Board looked at it, did its due diligence, the process was right, and things are, you know, consistent with the interest of all the stakeholders and we would accept the recommendation and not think about in a way the cost implication or the timescale implication. Because there's always money coming in. So the issue of affordability and prioritization has been in our people's mind but not in the forefront of our minds, nor was it an impossible thing to implement everything because money was coming in.

Now, more recently, and I think you've heard us, the level of funding has plateaued, right? And we don't know what the future looks like in terms of will it increase again, nothing. So you have to assume that over the next five years the level of funding has plateaued, that -- so we have to find a way now, we cannot receive

recommendations, and this is very frustrating from the community. So you have a group of people working on WS2 for a number of months and years and then come up with 112 recommendations and then you have CCT working for another two or three years, another set of recommendations, and then you have got PDPs coming up and you've got other things coming up, and the Board is sitting there seeing all of this coming in, all good work, right? And then -- and the cost of implementing all of those is multi-million dollars. Not over immediately at one-time but there are annual ongoing expenses. How do you press that button like this knowing that we probably don't have the funds to do it all? And how do you go back to the community who works its guts out for months and say, sorry, you've worked on all this, but we can't implement. So we -- not that we can't -- not that they're not good implementation but it can't be done all at once. It has to be prioritized and then over a period of years. And how do you do the trade-offs? And if you leave it only to the Board to make the decision at the top, it's going to be a bottleneck.

So I think we have to find a way of taking down affordability and prioritization all the way down to the community level so that when the community comes up with recommendation -- and I don't think we have the answer. At least you're aware of what the budget limitations are, what the cost implications are, and we have to find a way of prioritizing this work. We don't know how

to do it yet. We need your help. We need to have a discussion together of sorting this issue. Sorry.

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

I think you have our commitment that will be very frank with you, and we always are. Sometimes a little too frank, perhaps. But we don't waste our time putting a sugarcoating on things, you know? I think constructive criticism is the only way we're going to get away here. I've been racking my brains, as I say, having gone through all these WHOIS exercises. It's a waste of my time, it's a waste of other people's time, and there doesn't seem to be a way to go time out, stop, we're not doing any more of this until we fix this. I know my sort of hills I'm prepared to die on and if somebody hears me say this is a hill I'm going to die on, you know I will fight to the death on that issue. And that doesn't seem to work in any other sort of group in which I've interacted. If somebody puts their priorities on the table, then you start negotiating. So we've got like three things we want out of this and three things we won't tolerate. But we don't do that. We -- I think it's partly a maturity of the process. We hear each other out and we waste days and days hearing each other out. And you can't say we need some facts here. We need to define that term. We need -- you know, if somebody doesn't want to define it, you can't stop it. You just have to go along with it.

Now, this is mostly I'm talking about the failures in the PDP process, but I think it happens in the comments and in the budget and all kinds of things.

So measurement, I think, is key. If I can go to a PDP meeting and say, we have now spent 38 hours discussing a definition that you guys don't know what you're talking about because you haven't bothered to read the law, that, I think, has more impact than me saying, here's what that means and everybody ignoring it, you know? So hence, I think metrics is key to a lot of this. And showing the productivity of some of these discussions. I mean, if it works, let's spend the money on it. If it doesn't work, let's not.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Stephanie. We only have a couple of minutes left. Chris wanted to respond to Stephanie. And then we have Elsa, who's been waiting very patiently, and then we have about two minutes for the last question so go ahead.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Very brief. Stephanie, I just want to say, I appreciate what you said and a lot of it I agree with. But I don't think it -- I just want to leave this as a comment, really. What we really need to talk -- everything you said is right. What we really need to talk about, that won't solve the what does the Board do when it gets a bunch

of stuff racked up, it all needs to be done, and we just don't have the funding to do it. That is a fundamental issue that we need to try and figure out. And we don't want to try and figure it out by having the Board sit in a room and say we pick this one, we pick this one, we pick this one. We want to find a way of having everybody come together and understand -- and there be a process by which, to use shorthand, stuff is picked. I don't literally mean that, but we need to find a way. Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Chris. Elsa.

ELSA SAADE: Thank you, Matthew. If I were to maybe put the points together, I'm happy Rafik mentioned PDP 3.0 and the fact that the GNSO, for instance, is looking inwards at the same time and in parallel to working on PDPs, the EPDP, all other PDPs. So maybe one concrete suggestion would be for the Board also to look inward and self-reflect in parallel to the strategic planning that is committed to the community as a whole. But also like in order to be able to implement it better for the community and for the Board and for ICANN org, it would be best also for the Board to make some kind of exercise that's similar to PDP 3.0 and at the GNSO level, for instance. So I think that could be one concrete

suggestion, based on the conversation that we're having right here putting points together. Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thank you, Elsa. If we could put up the second question. So the first question was looking inwards. The second question is looking outwards, which fundamentally is without reading the whole thing, please provide one suggestion of something that could be done externally with external partners to improve trust and collaboration. Anybody wants to address that in the last two minutes?

CHERINE CHALABY:

While you think about it, provide the context as well? Would that be all right? Yeah. So we can't solve everything on our own as part of our strategic plan. Take, for example, security threats or security issues. It's not something that ICANN can go on and say, we fixed it for the world. It's not going to happen. Take, for example, the evolution of the unique identifier system, the absorption of new technology. It's not something we can just do because there are other parties like the RIR, the IETF, ISOC, all of these people. So the question we are saying is, how do we -- help us, give us some ideas, how do we get their commitment to buy into our objectives as well so that together collectively and collaboratively we can achieve the goals, for example, either on

security or evolving identifiers. And it may not be immediately in your remit, but we're looking for ideas everywhere that could help. So this is about collaboration and partnership with sister groups rather than within the ICANN community directly. So if you have some ideas, some people came and said you have to be really transparent, share with -- share with them your goals, decide on who's going to do what and be much more collaborative, much closer with them, things like this.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Cherine. Anybody want to jump in? Elsa? Kathy?

KATHRYN KLEIMAN: Thank you for the context, Cherine. This is Kathy Kleiman. What you're doing is giving us things to think about that we can get back to you on. But one thing I can share is that some of our work closely with our local Internet society groups, for example, like ISOC-DC and others. So if there are issues that you're looking for answers on or that you would like us to share or that kind of as long as we're prioritizing, that's top of mind, top of priority, there are people -- there may be ways to set up networks to communicate that. So as we're having our meetings with ISOC-DC, as we're doing kind of discussions that we all hold in our communities, we can find ways to include those priorities and get

input that we can bring back or share different things that are on timelines. We can begin working more together.

GORAN MARBY:

This is Goran. Thank you for that comment. We have started really to engage the discussion with Andrew and Rinalia as well to see how we can -- how we can join forces in a better way. I mean, ISOC is in the process right now to look into its mission and how we do. And we're in the process of the five-year strategic plan. We don't know, each of us, the full extent it's going to go. It's going to be a slightly new environment. I'm also very protective of ICANN's multistakeholder model when it comes to the strategy. I don't think that anyone has a right to outside tell what we do, the same way that ISOC doesn't. And I think we have a very positive discussion with ISOC right now, and I'm -- I'm very happy about the relationship. Which I -- I think that we all share. Sometimes our history's too long. Now we have an ability to restart. It's a very good point.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Cherine (sic). We have got time for two last comments. Elsa and Joan.

ELSA SAADE: Thank you, Matthew. I'd say priorities, listed priorities of what ICANN should focus on and what ICANN should not focus on. And I say that with two thoughts in mind. One the GDPR and the fact that it was overlooked for so long while it should have been on the priority list. And on the other side, it's where we prioritize when we should not prioritize. So I think a very clear list, as a concrete suggestion. A very clear list of priorities whereby the community can comment based on that list and see where exactly ICANN should focus on and where exactly ICANN should not. Just as a suggestion, I'd say.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Please.

JOAN KERR: It's Joan Kerr, for the record. So your question is one suggestion that could be done externally. And I'm a community engagement person and one of the best ways to create trust is to include people in the picture. I think that there's a perception that ICANN wants everybody to work for them and come and tell us what to do and how to do it, but ICANN should be sending a message that we're here for everyone else. So that's one perception. But in order for you to improve trust and to engage collaboration, you have a significant stakeholder group that can be an ambassador for you. Like, why go outside? Like, strengthen that stakeholder

group and give them some of the tools to go out and do it. Because they're so stressed out because one, they have to work for a living, two, they have to come up and satisfy what ICANN wants, and three, service their own constituency. So, you know, I think a showcase project together might be a good suggestion where go out and saying this is what we're doing with our stakeholder group, this is how you're in the picture, what can you contribute?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you very much. I'm very -- oh, Stephanie, one -- 30 seconds and we do have to wrap this up. Thank you.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I mentioned earlier that, you know, as a bureaucrat I participated in the paperwork reduction exercise. And if I may be blunt, there's an awful lot of hot air about Internet governance. And I don't think it helps ICANN. I think we need a hot air reduction act here. Tangible, what tangibly does ICANN do for the whole ecosystem? And if we could convey that, we'd get more people supporting what ICANN does. Instead of not understanding it and getting a whole lot of sort of airy gobbledygook in terms of communications. So pragmatically, everybody ought to have a domain name. Explain that. We don't really do that job well, I think.

GORAN MARBY:

The -- I don't want to push back, but I just imagine myself, if I would produce a paper which statements you would comment on. I'm just thinking about the next, you know, session we have with the Board, if -- remember, when you talk about ICANN, you talk about the institution. You talk about all of us. You know, ICANN is you. It's not me. And so hang on a second. So think about me, org, would produce a paper, statements about something. You know, I don't think we have that climate. I'd rather have you in the community coming together with your parts and other parts of the constituency coming up with something and telling us what to do. Because I don't think it's my role or the Board roles. I mean, look at the strategic document. That is built entirely on the trends we did with 700 people within the community. And the Board's role is to sort of come up with ideas on then how to mitigate those trends and then to go back to the community to have, did we get it right. But it actually always has to start within the community. I -- this is -- I'm really sort of careful about yes, it would be easier if I would do something, but that's not what I'm supposed to do, is it? That's not the job I signed up for.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay. I'm very reluctant to draw this to a close. It's been a great discussion. Thank you very much, and I apologize for running over. Thank you, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]