ICANN75 | AGM – GNSO: IPC Membership Meeting
Monday, September 19, 2022 – 13:15 to 14:30 KUL

BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. My name is Brenda Brewer. I will be monitoring -- Excuse me one moment. I would like to welcome you to the IPC Membership Meeting. Please note that this session is being recorded and governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. This session includes automated real time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real time transcription, click on the closed caption button on the Zoom toolbar.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign into zoom sessions using your full name. For example, first name, last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. And with that, I will hand the floor over to IPC chair Lori Schulman. Thank you.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you very much, Brenda. And it's great to see those in the room. And hopefully there's more online. And we have a packed agenda. So I'm going to get right into it. I did want to give some announcements on anticipated positions and where we are because there's a lot on the list. We've been asked to provide

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.

representation to a lot of different discussion groups and projects. So I did want to let you know that the CSG leadership has decided to put forth John Mcelwaine as our nominee for Vice Chair. And congratulations, John. We'll also be supporting the work of Mark Datysgeld in carrying the goals over on council regarding DNS Abuse, and hopefully working toward a leadership that would be coming from the CSG in the near future. So we're on our way in terms of Council and goals was leadership and counsel.

People have asked the update on the status of our representative to the small group that discussion with the GAC on closed generics, we have not come to a decision on that. Each of the constituencies has put forth a very good candidate. So we're in the middle of discussions on that. But we hope to have an announcement for you before the end of the day, tomorrow, Wednesday. So we're on track for that.

Also, I had announced it the general membership meeting of the IPC, I think it was two weeks ago, that I would be stepping down as the IPC primary on registration data accuracy scoping. And I'm very pleased to announce that we had three wonderful volunteer candidates for the position to replace me so to speak.

And in fact, what is happening is Scott Austin, who's done an incredible job really dedicated job in the last year will in a sense,

become primary. There's official primary role, but there's usually one of the volunteers who takes the lead, Scott will be taking the lead.   And we will have Marco Martinelli from Thomsen Trampedach, who will be in the second chair and very pleased to also welcome Matt Schwartz as our alternative.

So we have an abundance of talent and riches is very important scoping team, I will remain on as an observer and the work will continue hopefully seamlessly.   So this is a very good development, I want to really extend, thank you people heard me when I talked about needing more worker bees. We're leaders and we're worker bees, we need to do both the hard work, the leadership, all of it. And the leadership is hard work.

So thank you.   I really appreciated that people reached out stepped up and we have oversubscribed on when we have asked for volunteers for our last few projects. So I think we need to pat ourselves on the back that that we're got over that hump with these positions.

In terms of looking ahead, right now, quite frankly, the leadership is here today present in this meeting. Once the meeting ends, we will figure out a strategy on how to move forward, there's been a lot of discussion on the list about whether or not to support the WHOIS request system. I am no longer calling it the disclosure system because it's not. So I will be referring to it as the WHOIS

request system and hopefully everybody knows what I'm talking about.

On membership last month, I had announced that we have a new category of membership called emeritus member our first emeritus member I think very appropriately is Jonathan Cohen. But I'm very pleased to announce a second emeritus member equally notable and very happy that he is accepted and will stay engaged on the list and that is Steve Metalitz.

Steve Metalitz was a very strong voice for the IPC for so many years. And I reached out to him and asked him if he would consider such a position and he is very graciously accepted. And welcome back Steve, we love you, I love you. You're the reason I got involved in the IPC. And so great to have you back if you're on the call.

We'll be announcing more about and Damon, not on this meeting, that was in the closed meeting. I'm sorry, but we're going to be announcing more about the changes to the IPC bylaws that we're considering the [inaudible - oo:05:50] membership will be part of those changes. So it will be officially in our charter bylaws.

I also want to remind everybody that the IPC and INTA are co-hosting a reception at the Traders Hotel Sky Bar tomorrow from 6pm to 8pm. The invitation was posted on the list. All are

welcome, your spouses or traveling companions are also welcome.

We have received a lot of support on the ground from the Malaysian law firm of Shearn Delamore. Shearn will be providing some on the ground support in terms of staffing, registration and badges. So I really want to thank Shearn Delamore for their contribution to this.

And I want to remind people who are involved with or want to get involved with responding to the different initiatives on domain abuse that have been presented, ICANN that we're having a closed-door strategy session right after this meeting -- Well, actually a half an hour after this meeting in room 301, please come.

There is a document we'll be looking at, I had sent the document by email to those who expressed interest, if you didn't receive it, or you want to come last minute, don't worry, I've got all your emails, once you're in the room, I'll distributed to everybody via email, or maybe we'll even post it for review on the screen. And I'm going to now hand over to flipping John for the GNSO Council update.

JOHN MCELWAINE: This John Mcelwaine for the record. So just going to kind of go over what is on the council agenda not hitting every point here. I think to start, there's no votes, not even a consent agenda. So it's just going to be a lot of discussion. The first thing is going to be I think of note is with respect to the registry, data Accuracy Scoping Team, that Scott Austin and Lori have been involved with.

And as I understand it, Michael Palage is resigning as chair of the groups, so we're going to get an update. But there's also going to be some discussion on the timing in the process of finding and appointing a new chair for that. So if anybody has any interests, thoughts or opinions on that, please let flipper I know.

After that, the next thing is going to be another discussion from the council committee for overseeing and implementing continuous improvement, just referring to his continuous improvement committee. In particular, they've made a proposal concerning changing the SOI process. So we should be getting an update from that, and the recommended potential changes to that.

I think it will be of some interest to this group for folks who are lawyers, I understand that there's going to be some changes to identifying clients, but that there's protections for lawyers, but let's all keep our eyes and ears on that so I process. Then what we've been talking about, all meeting long, essentially, is the

WHOIS request system, not the disclosure system. So there's going to be a discussion on that to get people up to speed a little bit more on it.

There was a staff paper issued right before we came to the meeting, that paper details this WHOIS Disclosure System, and we've obviously on the list, there's been a lot of issues, ideas going back and forth, and whether there is support. There is a press to try to get input concerning that system all handled by the end October Council date.

So anybody who's interested in I know again, there's been lots of interest from the IPC. Just be prepared to look for information. We're going to take all the points that people have made some of the demands or suggested changes and get that input into a Google Doc, probably before we leave probably on Thursday.

And then lastly, just to mention is that we're going to get an update from the universal acceptance steering group. And that would then conclude, and I don't know if Flip has anything to add that I've forgotten

FLIP PETILLION: That we have a second meeting. And by then I will be gone. And Susan will have stepped in on it.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yes, congratulations to Susan Payne again, we did announce on the list, but there is a transition coming. And I want to thank you for the reminder, Flip, because someone we should absolutely be thanking a lot is you. He has spent his full term four years on GNSO. He's lived and survived some of the liveliest discussions and votes on EPDP and subsequent procedures and it's been a slog.

And he's been an a very admirable and really nice, balanced contributor to what has been going on GNSO. And Flip has very kindly agreed to take on another project. So hopefully, we'll find one that is suitable, but he's going to take a little bit of time off for himself very well deserved.

So thank you again, because serving in any capacity here in leadership roles, but a particularly on council is extremely time consuming. And there's a lot of reading, there's a lot of consensus building, not only have you has to get consensus from in the IPC, but consensus and council as well, in order for us to advance our goals. So Flip, thank you very, very much for your dedicated service. And Susan, welcome aboard. Can't wait for you to start. Here we go. Thank you in advance.

So next, we're going to spend a bit of time on participation. Jan has sent an announcement to the list about the open comment periods. Before I hand the mic over to Jan, I do want to note that

the IPC leadership understands the importance of these comments periods, and that there's been some challenges getting to the deadlines.

And so we will be employing what I'm going to call leadership wranglers to some of these proposals -- some of these open comment periods to make sure the work is getting done, done timely. If there's any barriers to success in terms of completion, that they're translated to Jan and the rest of the leadership so that we make sure our comments are done on time and are concise and meet our strategic objectives.

And so for the pilot Holistic Review, Damon Ashcraft will be the Wrangler on that. The proposed amendments to -- no, sorry, the registration data consensus policy will be led by Brian King. And I know there's a third person and I'm forgetting who it is. But they will reach out and let you know who they are. Can you remind me who it is? We had pointed three. Don't worry. But those are two and more will be coming, and over to Jan. Thanks.

JAN JANSSEN: Thank you Lori. Actually, that's very good news to hear because it's it has been a slow period up till now. But this fall is going to be super busy. I don't need to read them out loud. We will have a briefing; I understand on the on the Holistic Review. But I'm

sure Devan that you could have some assistance from members in making sure.

DEVAN REED: I can use all the help I can get. And I'll be asking for help. And if you want to help please let me know. Thank you.

JAN JANSSEN: In terms of timing, that is that is really -- I think both in terms of volume and timing, that is the most critical. And also the subject is critical. So really, please do apply to assist Devan.

Then the following one is the proposed amendments to the base gTLD registry agreement and the registrar accreditation agreement. There I've seen on the list that Phil Marano wants to offer his help. So thank you, Phil. And that really is a public comment where we need people who have been working with the registry agreement to have an understanding of them. So I know there are a couple of folks here in the IPC who have that experience, so please don't be shy and apply.

Then the following one is the proposed updates to GNSO operating procedures. That one is a lighter one I think, there are there are not that many changes to the procedures. But still, I think we could look at -- I think it's worth commenting on that

one. And then Brian King on the registration data consensus policy for gTLDs, I'm sure you could use also quite some help.

And here, I think it's important that we have people who have an understanding on the registration data flows between registries, registrars, and who have been following the EPDP term spec Phase 1 spec two recommendations. So that's basically it from the work that needs to be done. I don't know if there's time to have people talk about what's going on in their working groups. But if somebody has...

LORI SCHULMAN: If anybody has updates from their working group, just keep them to a minute or two. But I think it is important to share with the membership where you are on the process, you can just raise your hand and a chat will follow that queue.

I also just want to make a comment about the pilot Holistic Review draft terms, I think this would be an excellent one for anyone who has not participated in comment drafting before to lend a hand to because this can be very objective, you don't have to know everything about ICANN or how it works to look at draft terms. They either make sense or they don't, in my view.

So I think this would be a very good one for newcomers who want to put their toes in, but feel -- we see in a lot and was noted on the

list this week that a lot of people will say, "Hey, I want to say something or contribute but I'm afraid I don't know enough." You know enough. The only way to get involved is to dive in. And anybody who's been doing this for a long time will tell you that's exactly how they started.

They do then just take the leap, we're not going to ask someone who's new to be a lead, that doesn't make sense, we will provide as much expertise and support as we can. And there's a lot in the room and on the line and in the constituency generally. So this is a good time for new members or members who haven't contributed in a while to get on board with ballistic review. Thank you.

And then Brian will recognize if there's any hands on the queue report. And I'm happy to put my hand in the room in the queue to report on data. Accuracy, I see Scott is on the line and I would defer to Scott as well. Mike Rodenbaugh, you're in the queue.

MIKE RODENBAUGH: Thanks, Lori. I'm on two working groups for the IPCR, one representing the IPC. And then another working group. The first one is the Transfer Policy Review working group, looking at changes to the inner registrar transfer policy. We are currently reviewing public comments, including a 68-page comment from George Kirikos.

It's taking some time to sort through, that's what our entire face to face meeting here was devoted to. And that as to the Phase 1 of that review process, which was dealing with change of registrar issues. And then once we get through that, we will turn back to Phase 2 of the group's work which is dealing with change of registrant issues.

The other group I'm on is the IRP, the independent review process implementation oversight team which Susan is chairing, perhaps not for long, but we'll see. And let's see that one I wasn't able to attend the face to face yesterday because I had a conflict with the brand registry group.

But that one we are muddling along with an agenda with a list of issues involving currently we're talking about initiation issues, filing fees, and whether ICANN post accurate and clear information about how to file an IRP. And then we have a list of other issues that we're still needing to tackle in that group.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you and I yield the floor to Scott Austin. Thank you.

SCOTT AUSTIN: Thank you very much Lori. Scott Austin for the record. And I wish I could be there in person with all of you but I am excited about the fact that we have a good group, I think assembled now for

accuracy scope. The Accuracy Scoping Team, we learned a lot during the first half. I think we've said a few things in the various on list comments. And now it's going to be our goal to follow up on those.

But I think we've got a good group assembled and I continue to appreciate the Lori's leadership, and we'll certainly be relying on her for those times when we have some gaps in our thinking or need to lean on her experience and leadership.

I know Michael plays will be sorely missed, he did an outstanding job, I think of keeping people on track and getting views from all sides in this, but now it's going to be our opportunity to add some things I think and to explore some things that we really were not able to do in the first section, because it was more of an analysis of what the contracts provide and what the RIA provides, and what procedures are being used.

And now we're going to have a chance to explore and be a bit creative. I hope to talk about what we'd like to see as far as protection for rights holders in registration data, and the scope to hopefully end up with something that approaches an accurate database for registration data. Thanks.

LORI SCHULMAN:	Thank you, Scott. I do want to add to without too many specifics, but there's a development in this. During the final phases of writing that this report, the IPC had very strongly advocated for a type of testing using synthetic data where we would put registrations into the system without intending them to be hooked to active websites, to find out and to follow them through the system to see how they're verified for accuracy.
	Whether or not complaints are filed against them, there's been some talk that perhaps this wouldn't be allowed under the RAA, because it specifically prohibits putting false data into the database. However, our contention is that that is written with the intention of preventing abuse. Well, this particular idea is about actually fostering accuracy.
	And one of our members has very nicely reached out to an American university. I won't say the name yet, because nothing's confirmed. But it looks like this university would be very interested in forming a proposal, how such a test could be run, and run fairly within the roles of the RAA and ICANN.
	So this is an opportunity where the IPC can take some real leadership thought leadership, and how we might do some sort of testing that would really benefit the community and understanding how accuracies being verified and unmeasured.

So I want to just to keep you alerted to that it's a great opportunity for us, I know that some of the government representatives that I've been speaking to over the last few months like the idea, but have asked questions about how it would work. And I'm like, "What do I know, I'm just a lawyer." So it looks like we may be able to get some data scientists on board to help us with specifics. And I'm going to now yield the floor to Brian King, who has a report from his group.

BRIAN KING: Thanks, Lori. I have a report a comment and then a cheeky comment on that, particularly in that if you put data into the WHOIS that's accurate, to the extent that the definition that the contracted parties and ICANN agree on. You wouldn't be in violation of the RAA. I'd say go for it.

LORI SCHULMAN: Great point.

BRIAN KING: Thanks. Or you would bait them into saying that what you've done isn't accurate and therefore their position is wrong. Anyway, so one quick plug on Phil's group for proposed amendments to the base RA and RAA. If folks are worried that

that's too technical, because it's WHOIS protocol, I can cover the technical part of that.

And it's probably a good group or opportunity for comment for folks that have an interest in contracts because it's the contract amendments between ICANN and the contracted parties and if you're somebody who wants ICANN to have enforceable contract provisions in their contracts with the contracting parties. That's kind of a cool opportunity to get involved in that one. And then just the update on registration data consensus policy that is the new WHOIS policy.

So that's what came out of EPDP Phase 1 that governs the collection and processing between the contracted parties of WHOIS data. So this is the kind of draft policy given that, you know, SSAD or EPDP Phase 2 has no foreseeable end in sight.

This is the binding consensus policy that will exist on WHOIS data for the foreseeable future. So it's a really cool opportunity. There may be some landmines there to point out. And that's the EPDP IRT. So if you're interested in that, please do join. Or I'll find volunteers for that one. I think that's it for me, Lori thanks.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you. Are there any? I don't see any other hands in the queue? I see. So we have two really wonderful guests here. I'm

pleased they both said yes. And we have plenty of time to get through both presentations, which is great as well. We have Larisa Gurnick, who's going from the ICANN staff who's going to talk about Holistic Review. And perhaps that will inform how we go about submitting our comments, because we do intend to spit comments.

And we have Giovanni Seppia, who's well known to many from his years at EURid and now with ICANN. Giovanni had spoken to us probably about six months ago, when he just started in his position about where he saw things going in terms of his remit of implementing operational recommendations, as opposed to policy recommendations. So he will also be presenting.

Before I'd like to close these presentations out so that the presentation is given, we have a Q&A, and then people can leave. So what I want to do is I had forgotten to add any other business here. But I we do have time for five minutes of any other business. Is there anything else that anyone would like to raise now? Or at least put on our radar for discussion? Then I'm very -- are there hands? No hands. I didn't think I saw hands. Larisa, it's so nice to have you here. And please proceed.

LARISA GURNICK: Thank you very much. It's really nice to be here. I'm Larisa Gurnick and I'm delighted to be here with Giovanni as well.

Wanted to talk to you today about the pilot Holistic Review to provide an update and importantly to inform, as Lori said, the public comment that's currently open.

So next slide, please. Real briefly, we will touch on what pilot Holistic Review is and where it came from, and sort of the origins. We'll talk about what's up with the public comment, and then the next steps. So let's get started.

Next slide, please. So as a matter of background, the pilot Holistic Review came out of the work of the account the third accountability and transparency review team ATRT3 who looked at the work of the reviews, ICANN reviews, and to determine if they function effectively. And as part of their review in their work, they issued a whole grouping of recommendations that pertain to reviews and ways to improve reviews.

One of those recommendations is this recommendation 3.5, which calls for a new review a new specific review, which is called the Holistic Review. And specific review means that it's a review that would be conducted by community volunteers, much like ATRT and various others.

And the board approved this recommendation, subject to prioritization and resourcing, and also directed Org to proceed with the implementation as a pilot. And the reason for the pilot was because the board determined that there were certain

information gaps that needed to be addressed before this recommendation could proceed to bylaws, amendments and such.

So we're here to talk about this particular recommendation today but through presentations to other groups, it's become very clear that we should also mention another recommendation, which is recommendation 3.6, which deals with evolving organizational reviews into a continuous improvement program.

And there's quite a bit of crossover and connection and dependency between these two recommendations, as I'm sure you will soon see. So recommendation 3.6 essentially says Org reviews should eventually be transformed into some other form of a process to replace the Org reviews as we know them now.

So back to the pilot Holistic Review, a subgroup of several board members and members, former members of the ATRT3 were assembled earlier in the year to develop a draft Terms of Reference, something that would guide the work of the first review of the pilot Holistic Review when the time came. So it's that draft Terms of Reference.

That's currently out for public comment, and we'll walk through some of the components of what this recommendation is all about. In the last bullet point here, just as a reminder, recommendation 3.5 went through the prioritization process by

the community effort that took place and culminated in May, this recommendation was determined by the community to be top priority P1.

Next slide, please. So ATRT3 recommendation to initiate this new review, the pilot Holistic Review has four key objectives. This is ATRT3 objectives. One is to review continuous improvement efforts of the SO/ACs and the NomCom based on good practices. Another one is to review the effectiveness of the various Inter-SO/AC and NomCom collaboration mechanisms.

The third objective is to review the accountability of SO and ACs and their constituent parts to their members. And the fourth, is quite detailed. So please bear with me as I read it, but I think the components are important. It's to review the SO/AC and NomCom as a whole to determine if they continue to have a purpose within the ICANN structure, as they're currently constituted, or if any changes in structures and operations are desirable to improve the overall effectiveness of ICANN as well as to ensure optimal representation of community views.

So these four objectives were considered very closely by the team that was charged with developing the draft Terms of Reference to begin to address these objectives and come up with a roadmap in a way forward for the terms of reference.

Next slide, please. I mentioned board identified gaps and I'm just going to touch on a couple of them to give you a flavor of what kinds of information the board is seeking for the pilot Holistic Review to address.

So for example, guidance on how the Holistic Review teams should determine and prioritize their work areas considering the four objectives in order to ensure effective review outcomes within the 18-month timeframe. 18-month timeframe came from ATRT3, the recommendation states that the review team should complete its work within an 18-month timeframe.

Another example of the kind of gap and information that the board is seeking from this pilot is some sense of the resources on budget required to complete this review effectively. And another one that is interesting to think about is determination of how future Holistic Review teams would measure the success of implementation of the recommendation some guidelines around that.

Next slide, please. So the key components of the pilot Holistic Review, as already mentioned, it's to address the gaps that the board identified and also for the review team to create a Holistic Review program that will develop principles and criteria for conducting these various evaluations. So that the future Holistic

Review teams would be able to apply the principles and criteria to actually doing the evaluation.

So as you will see from looking at the draft terms of reference, the ideas that the pilot Holistic Review team would have produced a number of deliverables, frameworks, principles, criteria, then after that review is finished, then the various SOs ACs and various groups could apply those principles and criteria in some sort of a self-assessment way. And then when the Holistic Review, the eventual Holistic Review would come around, then they would use this information as a baseline to do their evaluation. So we're ready referred to this, the entirety of this as a Holistic Review program.

This is probably one of the kind of more unique reviews of the specific reviews in the sense that you'll have an impact on all the SOs and ACs and the NomCom as well. So paramount to the work of the pilot Holistic Review team, would be to have a process of engaging with the various community groups to understand what processes are already in place, what self-improvement mechanisms are already available, and how to create this program in a way that would be applicable and consistent across the different structures so that some evaluations could be done fairly and objectively in the future.

Next slide, please. So the public comment proceeding. That's out currently it opened recently, August 30. It will stay open through the 20th of October, and it's good to hear that you're considering submitting a comment.

Obviously, the implications for the various community groups are significant, not only in terms of contributions to this work and possibly participation on the review team, but also in terms of potential changes to how the various structures and are organized and evaluated in the future. So the public comment was initiated at the direction of the ICANN Board, and the board is seeking input on a couple of main areas.

First, whether the draft Terms of Reference seems to be fit for purpose, and whether it's tailored to the community's expectations based on what the ATRT3 intended with its recommendation. And also for the pilot Holistic Review, scheduling and timing in light of other community and stakeholder work that's currently underway.

Next slide, please. So what happens next, as the usual process posts public comment, staff will prepare a report, we will inform the board through the organizational effectiveness committee, depending on the nature of the comments and the substance of the comments. There may be a need to involve the terms of

reference team to address the public comments and the topics raised.

Eventually, when the terms of reference is finalized, it will then lead to the initiation of the review, which starts with the call for volunteers, and the selection process by all the SOs and ACs to select volunteers to serve on this review team. The Board also would select the liaison to support the work from an ICANN Org perspective.

Then in parallel, we would be preparing various documents and materials to make the work of the pilot Holistic Review more efficient when they get started for their 18-month period, and then kickoff the review. We have a page here a slide with various links and information that may be helpful as a reference, and I'm happy to take questions.

LORI SCHULMAN: Larisa, thank you so much for that. I think this will be super helpful as we go through our comment drafting process. I have a question but I'm going to yield to other members. Are there hands in the queue? Brian? So this is my question. I forget which slide it was on, but you were talking about one of the remits is to look at the SO/AC structure overall.

And my question is how layered is the answer to that question? Expect it to be for example, is it just a question? Yes, we need to GNSO? Or is it yes, we do need to just GNSO.

And by the way, the current GNSO structure may not work. So let's not get rid of the GNSO but maybe we think how the GNSO works like I'm trying to figure out from this, how the layers, how deep do we go? Because we're not being asked to relook at the GNSO per say, are we?

LARISA GURNICK: So this question was the source of lengthy discussions and considerations by the terms of reference team, and I think, probably fair to say even by ATRT3 members, because there were different viewpoints, different interpretations of what that could mean, and how it could be applied.

So in the terms of reference, there is no clear answer to this. However, the process that the TOR lays out is providing guidelines for how this could be done in collaboration with an input from the GNSO, and everybody else. So I don't have a clear cut answer, because none was really developed. But there's definitely two schools of thought as to how deep.

On the one hand, people thought that this is really all about how the different components work together to contribute to the

overall effectiveness of ICANN. And then on the other hand, there were others that thought that this would really involve looking at how the structures themselves are configured and how things work within the individual structure. So quite a diversity of views.

LORI SCHULMAN: So I'm going to follow up and ask if it's fair to say, we're the IPC, to recommend something at that second level, that, that would be a fair a fair submission to say, "Yes, we think there should be a GNSO and that in the entire framework." And this is supposition, by the way, we have not formed any decisions.

But hypothetically speaking, where we just say, "Yes, this idea of a GNSO is a good one. And it's working well or not well, and in this is how we see, perhaps restructuring it." I want to make sure that we're being appropriate and not overstepping what this first pilot phase is supposed to be.

LARISA GURNICK: So the pilot phase is about trying to set up a baseline for how this would be done in the future. So I think there's a lot of things to consider, first of all, what makes sense from your perspective, but also seeing how this could actually be impleMented or maybe impleMented as the wrong word. But put into action, because this is a process that will likely go well beyond the pilot.

The pilot is intended to create a way for this to be done. So it's more of a framework and a process. But it seems improbable, I suppose, or unclear, certainly, that the pilot Holistic Review would actually be able to set up the baseline, do the evaluation and issue recommendations and how things should be structured.

So I think this is the foundational moment to provide input on what would be helpful to your group or how you would think this would be interpreted in a way that would stay true to the ATRT3 recommendation, but also reflect what works for your community.

LORI SCHULMAN: Let me say I'm want to thank you very much. We might come back to you with more questions actually have a lot more but I'm going to reserve. Susan, hang on, I'm sorry, I didn't see your hand.

SUSAN PAYNE: Hi. Thanks, Larisa. It's Susan Payne. And actually, it's a sort of follow on from Lori's question, really, because I think I'm not really understanding where will the decision get made then on what the Holistic Review should cover and shouldn't cover?

Is it the intent that groups will put in their public comments now and that then they will be reviewed and that point, the Holistic

Review pilot will reflect whatever the consensus setback appears to be from that public comment? Or is it the intent that this pilot work itself will actually be working out what the Holistic Review should look like in future?

Because it seems to me, if there are two different interpretations about what is anticipated to be within scope, someone has to address that before we even start doing the work. And I'm not clear where that decision gets made.

LARISA GURNICK: Well, definitely public comment would be a good time to reflect on that. And as you take a look at the public comment proceeding, there's even further questions, I highlighted the two main questions. But there's further questions as to kind of guide us through the thought process. Does this terms of reference, does this approach make sense in terms of how does what your interpretation of this recommendation is all about? So I think this would be a good time to provide that kind of input.

LORI SCHULMAN: Are there any other hands? Brian. Thank you, I have similar thoughts to sort of how does this all get evaluated once the inputs there? Where do we go? And I suppose we'll read the terms. And if we have more questions about that we will reach out before the

deadline or perhaps even ask them as part of the comment, period, if that makes sense.

LARISA GURNICK: And I just wanted to add that we anticipate a possibility that the terms of reference team itself may want to do a webinar post ICANN75 before the public comment period closes? Because I think that the questions you're asking are and others are asking similar questions.

These are good opportunities to have those kinds of discussions, but also with the people that develop the terms of reference, as well as where they're at the initiation of the rug, that were the creators of the recommendation itself. So I think that would be a productive next step after ICANN75.

LORI SCHULMAN: Larisa I can say, I certainly would support that. So thank you, I think there was a session that was supposed to happen here and didn't. So that would be very welcome. And thank you again, and this is a great segue into the future. And now we'll get to the present with Giovanni and ask him how it's going since the last time he visited, and please Giovanni, take the floor.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:
So, first of all, thank you Lori and thank you Susan for having us. This is indeed an update from the implementation operations team, which today is focusing on the enhancing the effectiveness of the outcome multistakeholder model, which is one of the projects that we are supporting.

And I'm going to have this presentation together with my colleague Negar who's joining remotely and Yvette is doing the support for the polls that are going to be part of the presentation, as well as for a very nice and interactive jam board session at the end, the very last part of this presentation.

So I'd like to leave the floor to my colleague Negar was going to go through the enhancing the effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder model project, which we have somehow resurrected is something that ICANN start in 2019, there's been quite a lot of work, probably not so known to the community. There's been at work going on this project over the past two years. And Negar is going to drag us through this process and where we are now. And then we move to the post. So Negar the floor is yours. Thank you.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:
Thank you very much, everybody. Hello, everyone, and thank you so much for your time and giving us an opportunity to walk you through our project on enhancing the effectiveness of the ICANN

multistakeholder model, and where we go next. If you can move on to the next slide, please.

Just a quick overview of the agenda for this presentation. We'll talk about the current status. We'll spend a bit of time talking about consensus based decision making. We are looking to get some input from you today on this topic. We'll talk about next steps and then we'll talk about the future steps that Giovanni will help walk us through.

Next slide, please. And let's go one more. Thank you very much. So as you're all aware, the multistakeholder model being at the core of ICANN's operating model is in fact one of our five strategic objectives.

So as Giovanni noted, the implementation operations functional ICANN work we are managing this project and we are helping contribute to implementing and achieving this strategic objective pertaining into enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN multistakeholder model.

There are some key steps ICANN Org is taking to continue to advance this project forward. Those steps are for us to evaluate a number of the projects that were identified back in October of 2020, when the work plan associated with this project was finalized, and approved by the board.

Our goal is to work through the findings of these evaluations of the projects and really determine if these projects did help enhance the effectiveness of the MSM, and didn't really help address the issues that were initially identified as those hampering the effectiveness of our multistakeholder model.

We're going to also investigate and evaluate other projects that were not initially in the scope of the evolution or enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN multistakeholder model project. Not intentionally only because these projects came up later, after the final work plan of this project was finished. And they were critical projects. We'll talk about a couple of them in the future slides.

And lastly, but not least, given how critical the community's involvement and input is to the success of these evaluation efforts, we will continue to engage with all of you to help resolve the six issues that were identified as those hindering the effectiveness of ICANN multistakeholder model.

Let's go to the next slide, please. Thank you. So when the final work plan of this project was released back in 2020, there were a total of 20 projects or initiatives identified that were included in the final work plan. And these are projects that were deemed as ones that could when impleMented, address the identified issues. Of these 20 projects, we have selected four of them for evaluation, you can see the list of the four projects here.

The projects that we've selected, or ones that have been fully impleMented, and really involve the whole community. And we think that's a really good starting point because we want to work with everyone to continue the evaluation of these projects. The four projects selected are improving communications between ICANN, Org and the community, Consensus Playbook, the Fellowship Program, and ICANN Learn.

There are obviously other projects that we have not selected yet, as some of these projects are not fully impleMented yet. So our goal is once those projects get impleMented, we will pick and choose from that list again and continue evaluating the remainders of the project.

And as we just noted in the previous slides, there are a number of projects and initiatives that came up after the final work plan of the MSM project was released. Those are initiatives like the ODP, the ITI, strategic trend works other elements that were not really fully incorporated into the work plan but we think are important enough and impactful enough in the way that our multistakeholder model works, that we should evaluate them.

So we're going to continue to look at these new projects and pick from them and also evaluate those at the right time to make sure that you're continuously evaluating and enhancing our multistakeholder model to the extent we can. At this point, I want

to point out that there is a dedicated wiki space for the MSM project that includes all information pertaining to this particular project.

Everything from the onset of the program all the way to what we've accomplished to date, all the way to the detailed list of the projects that we are looking to evaluate along with how they really correlate to the MSM and these issue areas that were identified. And shortly we'll put the link to this page in the chat. So please, at your convenience, take a look at this chat, the link, take a look at the information and do let us know at any point in time if you have any questions.

Next slide please. So our current action plan as listed here includes applying the evaluation methodology to the selected projects that we just talked about. There was an element of the work plan that came which was designing an evaluation methodology, which ICANN work has completed.

This evaluation methodology is detailed it goes was through step by step process for how you can apply an evaluation technique to various types of projects. That is also listed on our wiki space for the MSM project. So feel free to use that for any projects you have as well. We are currently in the midst of applying the evaluation methodology to the four projects.

And our goal is to share the findings from the evaluations of these projects with you once completed. As ICANN75 is ongoing, we have a number of hands on engagement sessions to get everyone's input on one of these projects in particular that we were looking to evaluate and we want to collect some data on.

So let's go to the next slide. And we'll talk more about that. Thank you. Of the four projects that we are evaluating or looking to evaluate currently, one of them pertained to Consensus Playbook and rather Consensus-based Decision Making. When the MSM project was being conducted, community had differing views about how consensus is applied to a given project, and raised concerns about really all voices being heard equally when decision making.

At the time, when the issues were identified, one of the projects that were included in the work plan, as one that could help address this issue possibly was the development of the Consensus Playbook. And I'm sure you're all familiar with the Consensus Playbook, so I won't go into too much detail on it.

But just at a high level, the Consensus Playbook was really developed to have a general guideline around Consensus-based Decision Making and the idea was that it was not going to just apply to the GNSO PDP processes. But it was meant to be applicable to any work across ICANN really, and maybe even

I C A N N | 7 5
KUALA LUMPUR

outside of ICANN, but we just focus on ICANN work at this point in time.

So that the practices into applying to Consensus-based Decision Making can be applied in to some extent, uniformly across our different projects and processes, working groups, PDPs reviews, etcetera. So what we're looking to do now is to ask a series of questions, to better understand how your group looks at Consensus-based Decision Making? How it applies consensus-based decision making to your work?

What your perception of the Consensus Playbook is because we are trying to understand a little better what areas of improvements or where we might need to tweak things if there is future enhancements to the consensus playbook that needs to be made. And this is just the starting point, this is going to be a work in progress.

So with that, let's go to the next slide. I would ask that if you could please have the IPC members reply to these polls, we would be appreciative of that we will also share these polls, and the questions with you after the meeting so that other members of the group can participate as well who may not have had a chance to do so today. So question one, do you know the basic principles for making decisions on a consensus basis? Let's pull up the poll question please and see what your responses are.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: And folks should have a pop up in your zoom app on your computer.

LORI SCHULMAN: It's come up. You can also use Mente for the future too. Sometimes that's easier to people who aren't on a screen. Sometimes people are on their iPhone. Forget the brand name. They're on their smartphones and Mente is a way to remotely do that without having the Zoom screen.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thanks, Lori. That's great input. Appreciate that. Let's wrap this up and Yvette, if we can see the results quickly, before we move on to the next question. Wonderful. Wonderful. This is great. Let's move on to question number two.

And next slide please. So, the existential question I guess here. "Are you aware of the existence of the Consensus Playbook?" Which I would think is a little more...

LORI SCHULMAN: Now we are.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Exactly. You can use this. This might be a Lori. There you go. It's completely acceptable if you just say yes, because you heard about it now. Yvette, let see how we did. Fantastic. And I'm just going to assume everyone knew about it before I even mentioned it. But all good here. Let's move on to the next question, please.

LORI SCHULMAN: I wouldn't make that assumption, honestly, that goes to the communications part. I'm being quite serious.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: No, understood. Understood. For sure.

LORI SCHULMAN: I think that's not a good assumption to make.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Question number three.   Lori, I said that rather jokingly completely agree that that may be part of the response here. Let's pull up the poll please here and let us know if you have used or referenced the Consensus Playbook in ICANN work in any capacity, whether it's about PDPs during reviews, cross community working groups, et cetera.

ICANN|75
KUALA LUMPUR

Let's see the results, please. This is actually very useful data point and with that, let's move on to the next question, please. And the question is, "Did the consensus-based decision making contribute to the project's success?"

LORI SCHULMAN: Can I interject for a moment about this question if you don't mind? Does success mean we reached consensus? Does success mean we were able to at least vote? I'm not clear what success means.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: In this case, our intention was to understand whether everyone could converge on a common position, so to speak based on the guidelines that have been used for Consensus-based Decision Making. Does that make it more clear, Lori?

LORI SCHULMAN: A little bit. To me it's basically, did the Consensus-based Decision Making contribute to the understanding of the implications of action or something? Because I still think success might be loaded. Is the success that the project was completed, that we were able to get a position, to have a report?

We recently had an EPDP that supposedly reached consensus. I don't know if the playbook was used or not. I can't answer that question, but we had like five minority statements. So was that a success? I would argue no. So this is where I'm stuck on the question.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: Thank you, Lori, I appreciate your --

LORI SCHULMAN: No, I'm going to answer no, but if you're trying to help communicate with the community in terms of what you are trying to find out, I might think about how to word this question a little differently. I have an answer that I think I know, but I'm not sure that the question is clear.

NEGAR FARZINNIA: I appreciate your input, will definitely take that into account. That's a great comment. Thank you for that. Let's wrap up this comment, we'll take a note on the definition of the question for consideration for sure. And let's move on to the next question, please. "Did you achieve better consensus of goals and objectives as a result of using/learning from Consensus Playbook?"

Of course understanding that if you were not even aware of the existence of the playbook or having used the Consensus Playbook, obviously it would be a no. Just wanted to make sure that you don't have to have used it before.

Let's wrap this up a bit and see what we got, please. Great. Thank you for that and let's move on to the next question. "Did goals/objectives become clearer as a result of consensus-based decision making?" And see what we have please? Interesting, even split.

Next question, Yvette please. "Did you reach better mutual understanding as a result of using consensus-based decision making?" Yvette, let's see what we have, please. Very well, thank you. And let's move on to the next question, please. "Did differing positions converge successfully?" And let's see the answers. Great, wonderful. Thanks for responding to this.

And last but not least, we have one more question. "Was there good communication and context when converging differing positions?" And let's see the answers. Wonderful, wonderful. This was the last question that we had for this portion of the presentation. Thank you everyone for participating and providing your input and also providing input on the questions on how we can enhance them. I appreciate that.

We are going to be collecting this information during our presentations this week. And as I noted, we are going to email out the poll questions to all the constituencies for those members that did not get a chance to participate before, but may like to they will have an opportunity to do that after ICANN75. So with that let me hand this over to my colleague Giovanni Seppia to walk us through the next portion of this presentation. Giovanni, over to you, please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Negar. And if we can have please the jam board on the screen. So I'll guide you through the jam board exercise. So as we have just said the announcing effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder model is about evaluating, assessing a series of initiatives, projects that were included in this paper that was released in October, 2020, and also those that we posted on the wiki space dedicated to this project.

And as those are, we're talking about more than 50 projects and initiatives that are at the core of the ICANN multistakeholder model, we would like to ask your help to help in a certain sense to guide us where we should focus our attention. So the scenario is this, that in 2047, that's going to be the ICANN meeting number 150. That's true.

And if we go at this speed and this meeting is going to take place it's a of course is a fictional scenario. So it's going to take place in the Naboo planet. The Naboo planet for those who are not familiar with the Star Wars environment is a planet in the outer ring territories.

However, ICANN organizes a big space shuttle to move attendees from the planet earth to this planet and the space shuttle as a small engine issue. So they're forced to land on planet Mars. And once on planet Mars, they are told, "Well, we can take you to planet Naboo however, you cannot carry on everything that is with you."

And among the things that they have to drop are some stone tables where all the projects initiatives that are supporting the ICANN multi-stakeholder model are written. And so it's like recipes and those are eight of those projects and initiatives. And what we would like to ask you now is to use the jam board and place some of the sticky notes close to the projects initiatives that you believe they should be taken back on board the space shuttle and take into planet Naboo.

So you can use maximum three sticky notes and those who are participating, they will receive this next planet Champion sticker that you can place on your ICANN badge, possibly not on the ICANN logo. So that's going to be a big issue.

So place it somewhere else, not on the emergency number, but you can start know now practicing with this jam board and placing your sticky notes, your preferences next to those projects initiatives that you believe they should be taken back on board a space shuttle to continue the journey to planet Naboo.

So let's start this exercise and please place your sticky notes. So just on your left there are the sticky notes and you move a sticky note close to the project initiative you believe is worth to take back on board. Thank you. Let's give you few minutes. You can just place a sticky note without writing. Just that's much more practical. Don't move the spaceship please.

BRENDA BREWER: And this is Brenda with a kind reminder that we have two minutes left in this session. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Brenda. We'll make sure we wrap up.

LORI SCHULMAN: Giovanni, should I instruct people to send you questions directly and we can then provide the answers? You have a choice, you can stop now and take question or just run through and we'll send questions afterwards.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I was going to say thank you Lori. I was going to say that let's wrap up this jam board exercise. We will post those lights and the jam board on the dedicated page in the weakest space for this session. And indeed we'll make sure that you have the capacity to send us any question and we'll be happy to answer them.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you very much. Take us out.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: So that was gone. So the spaceship has left -- No, good. It's back. Where is the space shop? Looks like PDP3 is winning and also the Holistic Review not started and already popular. That's good. Last 10 seconds. Otherwise, Brenda is not going to put me on board at the space shuttle, so I'll be the first one to be left on planet Mars. 10, 9, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, 1. That's it. Flash is close.

So thank you for participating. We'll leave this jam board again on this wiki space so you can continue to exercise what to put on the space shuttle. Thank you so much. Thank you for having us. It's really a lot of information in a very short timeframe. I appreciate for this time slot and thank you so much again, Susan and Lori for an invitation.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you. You're always welcome. And I will remind you it's an open invitation so when you have updates, we are always open to hearing and helping and playing with spaceships. It's all good. Thank you all for your time at this meeting. I know it's been a packed schedule and it's only like day one.

I look forward to seeing with the reception. Please RSVP to the reception that's important Davis @nta.org. I'm not taking the RSVP so please send them to Louis and we'll see you in the halls and anybody in 30 minutes in room 301 will have our DNS Abuse session.   So thank you very, very much and that's our open meeting. It's done. Bye, guys.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you all very much for attending. This meeting is adjourned. The recording may stop.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]