
ICANN75 | AGM - Joint Session: ICANN Board and NCSG
Monday, September 19, 2022 - 13:15 to 14:30 KUL

MATTHEW SHEARS: Hi, everyone. For those who would like to speak, it would be great if you come to the table and fill up the spaces. Thanks. Okay. Hello, everybody. We will get started.

We have one or two seats up here, if anyone wants to come up. We are one minute out. I will turn it over to Maarten, Chair of the Board, to open, and we will get started, thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Welcome, everybody. The Board is looking forward to this exchange. And we have asked a question beforehand to the NonCommercial Stakeholder Group, and they have also raised some issues they would like to talk about with us. Matthew, as the Board member selected by the NonCommercial Stakeholder Group is the best to moderate us in this session.

So, welcome, good to see you, and looking forward to a fruitful discussion.

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.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten. Hello, everybody. Great to see you, all. I will ask Bruna just to say a word or two, please, first, and then we will start.

BRUNA SANTOS: Yes, hi, everyone. Bruna Martins dos Santos, the Outgoing Chair of the NCSG. Yeah, just thank you all for the opportunity, as well. And we have a rather long set of questions about really relevant issues so maybe just to brief anyone who is not aware of what the questions are about, we plan to talk about the PDPs effectiveness and volunteer fatigue. Some of the other policy development processes, and also NomCom, leadership positions, but I guess that is it from us now. Thanks Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Bruna. So, we are going to start with NCSG questions and then we will move to the Board questions, and we will make sure that we got some time and also at the end if there are other questions, people should not hesitate to raise them. So, Bruna, would like to introduce the first question?

BRUNA SANTOS: Thank you so much. Yes, the first one, it's also based on some of the discussions going on in our community and mostly at the Policy Community level as well, so we would like to discuss Board

approval implementation by ICANN and some delays or what we considered to be delays in several PDPs, which is also something we have been talking to you for a while now.

But our question is mostly whether you would have comments on the speed, or even how do we plan, or the ICANN community could be working together with the Board on possible improvement to the PDPs timeline. We understand this is mostly, can be seeing as mostly a GNSO issue, and that is why, maybe the reason for this question is to look for possible avenues for collaborating and improving the, both, the implementation phase and also the discussion of PDPs. Thanks, Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Bruna. Let me start and then I encourage people to jump in, and some of the other Board members. So, this really gets to the heart of the multistakeholder model, I have already heard quite a bit about that this morning. So, effectiveness, addressing effectiveness, addressing efficiencies, dealing with volunteer fatigue, and just generally making us, as a community, more productive, and quicker to respond, so it is a very good question. The Board is quite pleased to see that there is a GNSO initiative on the PDP Improvements Tracker, we are looking forward to the results of that.

We think that will be one of the ways that will improve the process and bringing in these new kinds of mechanisms. We also, of course, appreciate the work that the GNSO has been doing on PDP 3.0, we think that is another important initiative for moving forward in terms of the efficiencies. And also, the Council Strategic Planning sessions that it's having at the end of the year, also part of a broader effort that the Board is very much appreciative of.

On our side, we are also, obviously, pointing liaisons to the various GNSO initiatives, and we believe very much that using these liaisons in a kind of early engagement way will help in terms of improving efficiencies and also communicating back to the Board what is happening, for a fuller understanding, as things evolve, and also as a means for communicating back from the Board to the PDP, to the policy process etc., the thoughts of the Board in terms of the direction of where things are going. These are useful new ways of looking at this. We also encourage and we are starting to see that a little bit more engagement between the GNSO and the Board in terms of when there's a policy that comes forward, having a fuller understanding of the GNSO thinking behind it.

So, we have seen a couple of letters going backwards and forwards, we have seen the GNSO willing to brief the Board and

we believe that these kinds of interactions are important, so this eases the way in going forward, in terms of understanding fully where the GNSO comes from and for the GNSO to more fully understand what the Board's concerns may be.

And the sooner that we can address those in the process, the better the efficiencies will come. We see these as being very useful steps, in terms of moving forward in this way. It may be my Board colleagues have other ideas that they would like to share. Just in terms of the second point, and then I will open it up.

Fatigue happens in a number of ways. It happens because the work is too much. It happens because we are not seeing the results of that work fast enough, and it happens also because we don't have a pipeline of people to come in and take on the burden of that work. I think it is a mix of issues that we have to deal with. And these are not new issues in any way. These are issues that we have been talking about for a while.

I think we do, as a community, need to spend a little bit more time on understanding those dynamics, so it's not just the volunteer fatigue, but it is actually the full look at this, a holistic look at how do we get more people in, how do we get people to take on, build the expertise, transition that expertise, and have those people engage. And hopefully that will not only address the fatigue issue,

but if we can address it fully, it will also address the efficiency issue. So, these things are very much linked, as they are in the question.

Let me pause there and see if anybody else, Maarten, Becky, Avri, you want to jump in and add. Thanks.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Sure. Thank you for that. I think life would be easier for all of us if we get the perfect policies that everyone agrees with at the right time, that are easy to implement by the organization because it's clear on what it needs to be done. And life is not perfect. But we do the best we can. And, as Matthew says, I think early engagement also [inaudible – 00:07:12] partial to community. And the Board is looking into how we can be earlier in its engagement as well to help, as Matthew says.

I think one more thing for the coming year would be to review how the liaisons could be even more effective than they are, to ensure that there are no surprises either way, later on. And of course, we very much appreciate, as he said, the initiatives already going on within the GNSO, to see how the GNSO processes can become inclusive, very low tracking every development.

So, we see a lot of movement, and yes, more needs to be done. Just one remark on fatigue. I do recognize that having to take zoom calls from all time zones, that are not as effective as being in one room. As an extra effect, up and beyond of what we already knew. inaudibleWe just need to be clear on what to expect from people, make sure there's new people coming to also help do the job, and be very mindful of what we can do to ensure that effective participation becomes possible, which is in itself less fatiguing than less effective participation, I would say. Avri.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah. Thanks. I want to think about fatigue. I've always had trouble, to be quite honest, understanding fatigue. And I think because we include so -- and I think you alluded to this, we include so many things under that definition. And so, for example, if the fatigue is frustration. That is one thing. If the fatigue is working too much in the middle of the night, that is a different thing. If the fatigue is doing this for years on end without a vacation, that is a third kind of thing. If the fatigue is having no one to back you up when you're working on stuff, yet another.

And so, I think part of the problem I have had with fatigue, is it has been a sort of an undifferentiated globe of things. And it is impossible to fix that undifferentiated globe of things. So, I think

there might be a lot of value in sort of, not thinking about fatigue quite as much, but thinking about frustration, thinking about time, thinking about extent to which you work on a problem, and seeing if we can't try and break down some of the things that are included in this notion of fatigue, and attacking them.

Because I, personally, do not believe we will get anywhere sort of saying, "We got to get rid of fatigue. We got to get rid of fatigue. How are we going to get rid of fatigue?" But, if we could dive deeper into what fatigue is and what kind of fatigue people experience, we may be able to make those circumstances better. I mean, it's just a very hand waving way to look at it, but I've always had trouble with the notion of fatigue. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Although, the record suggests that Becky Burr just said that, that was Avri Doria. But Becky Burr associates herself with those comments.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Becky. Bruna, over to you. And if you have further comments or suggestions, et cetera..

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS:

Thank you very much for your comments. I do think that Avri kind of hit the main point about this discussion. We should have qualified better what we meant by fatigue. It's not just zoom fatigue, we're also talking about how, maybe, some parts of the community, or even how hard it is for NCSG to have a certain presence in discussions because some parts and in some moments, we're seen as just NCUC or as just an NPOC, and almost rarely seen as the stakeholder group we are, and as one of the groups that actually represents the end user and civil society voice within ICANN.

So, that is also frustration, that's also a problem of having an equal footing to other stakeholders within this community, having the space and participating at the same level for other places. And, I guess, in the agenda later, we have a question about a chair, the NomCom, and this is yet, another example of what we mean by fatigue, what we mean by frustration and qualifying our problems, and so on.

But, just to wrap up this, it's also important for me to acknowledge that we've been in conversations with you over the past two years about how to improve this, with the Board, with Göran, with David Olive, and staff, as well. So, we do appreciate these chats into improving how we can make NCUC lives slightly better. So, that's highly appreciated.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Anyone else want to comment on this question? No. ? Okay.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Benjamin, for the record. I would just say, from constituency's perspective, fatigue simply for us is -- we don't have the wavelengths for the period that the PDP takes. And people fall out in the process, and, at some point, our voices become silent because the energy and the momentum to sustain the amount of wavelength that the PD process is taking, is becoming exhaustive.

And for that reason, whichever way you look at it, the best way to qualify it, is fatigue. Calling it frustration, for us, we don't -- may cause to make any progress, but it is fatigue. Maybe it's a more friendly word that can make us look for a solution around it. That's what we'd like to bring to the table. How we could have a system where those things are put into consideration. To some extent, some of our members feel -- it would do well if the processes are limited, not creating new ones, this is just stretching us more.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Avri, go ahead.

AVRI DORIA:

I guess I would want to talk more about that and then probably is to sort of to understand why -- things do take a long time. People know that things will going to take a long time. When they get committed to working on something, they know it will take a long time. So, I do not quite understand, and I used to be in your constituency, and may again be someday, but I do not understand it. I don't understand why, the fact that it takes a long time to reach that, means that people can't do it. And people get tired of doing it.

So, I really have trouble with that. In sort of, when you join -- perhaps it's stupidity on my part, I will accept that. But I do not understand it, and having been a NCUC member for umpteenth years going through very long things, how do you get tired? It is interesting, it's exciting. There are new arguments every day. How do people get tired of that?

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS:

I think it is the lack of resources.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Can I, for the record, what are you eating or something? Because I need to get whatever you have.

AVRI DORIA: I was eating a spicy chicken for lunch, it gave me lots of energy.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay. We do need to move on. But if you wanted to comment on this, then we'll go to the next -- Oh, and David. Then we move to the next question.

DAVID OLIVE: Just a very quick comment to you, Avri. I think, one of the tiredness issue is really the fact that people work really hard, and even compromise, and then feeling like, because -- the delay then causes a relitigation and a revisiting of those things that they just worked so hard to achieve a compromise on. I think that's where the frustration comes from.

AVRI DORIA: And that, itself, is kind of what I mean about the analysis. If that's it, if it's the, "We negotiated, we got there. It's not that the PDP took so long, we got there, and nothing is happening." That is a different root cause, and a good thing, yes.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Göran, you want the two fingers on --? And then we go to David.

GÖRAN MARBY: Fatigue, yes, we can call it whatever we want. And I think I'm going to have some of that chicken. The fact of the matter is, it's not a singular problem somewhere. So, we have to start working, and I know the GNSO is talking about, how do we improve the actual PDPs?. What can we, as Org, from a subject matter experts and facilitation to do it better there. And then, you know, through the GNSO council. And then, if it's really big, one of the efficient things we do is actually do our liaise so we can prepare the Board to make a decision and make the implementation shorter.

We also have to work through the implementation. And there's one more thing, after we are done, for instance, compliance has to do something. All those things has to be sort of linked in together. I think there are some holes, we all agree, but we have several projects to do that. It is important that volunteers, coming into the ICANN Org, sorry, the ICANN world, actually feel that what they do make sense, and it does. And I agree, sometimes it takes time.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Göran. David?

DAVID OLIVE:

We do seem to be having some processes just seem to be taking much longer than expected, understand where Avri is coming from. I've signed on to PDPs that I knew were going to be long. and going to take a lot of effort. And then found they were longer than that. And tthen there was a follow-up, and then we seem to be getting into a lot of the time and the IRT will be quite delayed and quite fractured and controversial. And that requires effort, which sort of has to be from people in the original PDP.

And the process can -- I mean, just yesterday was faced with the idea of, "Oh, now we probably have to reopen PP SAI somehow, because it no longer is very applicable post GDPR. I signed on for that how many years ago? And thought it was done, years ago, and yet here it is coming back from the past. We are having real difficulties, and particularly where you think that some of the original work is going to be relitigated and really, it's going to be difficult. So, yes, it can be a real problem. I appreciate that people are trying to solve it. I also appreciate, it is not an easily solved problem. So sometimes we just got to -- have a very naughty issue.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Maarten, yeah..

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah. Thanks. I think we hear each other and we listen to each other. One thing is, of course, that Policy Processes, themselves, are not up to us to arrange, this is for GNSO. And the relitigation would be less so if these processes would be more effective, one would think. And I think the length of the process is a part of the multistakeholder model.

We also want to give the rest of the community the opportunity to give their opinion at times. We are sort of -- I think what is fair, what we can do about it, the better the PDP is, and also by early interaction from us and others, might reduce the number of relitigation and might already make clearer what can happen when sooner. And that would help. The other thing, what I thought was an interesting proposal, and I hear there's thoughts about it, is to have kind of faster PDPs, when it is possible, and very focused. That might help, as well. Just some thoughts of what we need to continue to do to improve our way of working together!

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Maarten.

AVRI DORIA: I know I'm dragging this on, and I apologize. Would PP SAI have needed to be changed because of GDPR anyway, even if it had not been implemented. ? In other words, does the change of what goes on in the world also factor on in this. ?

DAVID OLIVE: I know these things are not easily solved, yeah. And sometimes for reasons that are not under our control. But it is a real issue. It can be a real problem for volunteer fatigue. We all have felt burnout from a process that is still ongoing.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, David, thanks, everyone. We are, as Board members, we are sensitive to the issue, and it is important for all the reasons we just discussed. So, Bruna, back to you for the next question.

BRUNA SANTOS: Thanks, Matt. Fully agree, and maybe as a future trip for us, leadership, to qualify, the discussion is properly within what are the problems and the actionables. The third question we had for you was about the WHOIS Disclosure System. The question is basically the recently published System Design paper mentioned a risk that it would not provide actionable data for use to enter questions raised by the SSAD ODA, and this has concerned us, in light of the EPDP recommendations. So, we would like to know

what the Board -- where are the actual Board concerns about this topic? And if you could like -- yeah.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Bruna. Over to Becky.

BECKY BURR: Yeah, thank you very much. Becky Burr, for the record. We have been following the work of the small team, and very closely I have been participating in that, and we have received a request from the Council to proceed on design of the SSAD Light, which we began calling the WHOIS Disclosure System. At this point, the Board is very interested in making sure that there is a very solid understanding across the community about what the WHOIS Disclosure System is intended to be. What value it will deliver. And what it is not.

We do understand that it will provide a simplified process to submit access requests to participating registrars, and we do understand that one of the goals and a perceived value is that it could inform consideration of the SSAD Policy Recommendations themselves by collecting usage and outcome data. And it also, David, just to be clear, it does allow us, for example, to implement the Privacy and Proxy issues. So, that could be just part of the implementation because the things that

are holding it up are wrapped up around SSAD. So, I just wanted to mention, I think that's an opportunity.

It is not intended to override the community's Policy process. It is not SSAD itself. It is not the system that was recommended in the outcomes on the EPDP phase 2 Final Report, it does not include accreditation. Or provide for automated processing, or third-party reviews of misuse of the system or anything like that.

All the obvious things, it is not going to re-create open access to registration data, it will not going to relieve registrars of the obligation under applicable law to have a lawful basis and to, therefore, conduct the balancing test. And it is not going to relieve them of obligations that they have under applicable law regarding cross-border transfers. But, as I said, what we think and what you want to confirm, that we are hearing from the community, is the simplification of the submission of access request and the possibility of informing the SSAD Policy Recommendations by usage data.

One of the things that is really important about this usage data issue is that it is not going to be -- it will be information, and we will get data about use of the system, but that data will not be definitive unless there is widespread adoption by registrars and widespread use by requesters. So, there are dependencies on

whether we get the value we are looking for from this, in terms of information. And there are some solutions or there are some vehicles that the community could use, even as the SSAD Light system is being developed to address those.

For example, there's nothing that would prevent the community from doing policy work to require all registrars to participate in the system, or to permit registrars to require requesters to go through the system to the extent permitted by applicable law. So, we recognize that one of the values is around getting insights about usage information, there is no question that it will provide information about usage. But there's also no question that that information won't be definitive absent widespread adoption across a system. And I want to reiterate, this is not about throwing away the EPDP work.

I think we have clearly said this is the kind of thing we want to look at, at a specified time. , and say, "Is it delivering value to the community? Is it providing the insights? Even if it is not providing the insights, is it in fact providing a simpler way to make those access requests?" And so, if the counsel determines that the system that is reflected in the design paper, with all the limitations that I have laid out, will provide value?

Then, I think the Board is prepared to move forward and would propose to move forward as quickly as possible in order to minimize any negative impacts that this would have on other upcoming development and deployment work. For example, development and deployment work on next rounds and the like. We are very much looking forward to talking about this across the community this week.

To moving forward in our collaboration and conversations with the GNSO counsel. But, as I said, there is no question that it will provide data, the question is, how definitive is the data, can we remove arguments about what the data means through some policy development that is simultaneous with the development process?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Becky. Just before we go to questions, Göran, you want to add a word or two?

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. One thing that is really hard is to describes the value of anything, when it comes to what we do. Because is the community comes to -- works together and such, this is important. Many other things were never done -- has never been done before, which is very typical of the ICANN environment.

When we started the dialogue with the GNSO Council and the dialogue with the GNSO Small Group it was one thing, because we have to match it against something. So, I just want to repeat one thing, is that the WHOIS Disclosure System, which has an excellent name, by the way,. is about simply find for the requester and simplifying for the registrar. So that is the measurement we are looking at when we concentrate the system.

And when you look into this, it means it won't be simple for an average user, because the average user is not the one who actually is going to use the system. It's important to realize it's on the other end of this -- information is deemed private by law, and you need to be able to provide a legal basis to get access to that private data.

That means you probably have to be trained in which law to use to get access to this data. And the GDPR and [inaudible - 00:30:02] gives very specific reasons for you to get access to this data. So, it's very unusual for us to build a system like this because it is not targeted to everyone, but is not targeted to the ICANN people. The ones inside here. It is actually targeted for people who doesn't come to ICANN meetings. It's a worldwide system.

I want to put into simplifying for the requester, simplifying for the registrar, but still it's going to be a system based on the fact that you have to have a legal basis to get access to this data, because legislation deemed this information not to be publicly available. Thank you very much.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Göran. I think we have an online question. Or, in the Zoom room question. Stephanie, can you come in? Are you able to ask your question?

STEPHANIE PERRIN: I'm back at the fatigue issue. This is a comment as much as a question. I don't think it is the case, I appreciate Avri's desire to break this down into its component parts and I, for one, and I'm on quite a few PDPs, and I've been in for the long haul. Some people wish I would get tired and go home, I am sure. But I don't think I have any illusions on how long this is going to take. Some of these PDPs.

On the issue of the PPSI IRT, I do have vivid memories of telling people that GDPR wasn't progress; at the time we were doing the PDP, I even asked for footnotes to note this. And since that was not factored into the actual recommendations we came out with,

we proceeded with something that would be proven irrelevant when 2018 rolled around.

So, here we are years later. That is a frustration, I think, with the process. It is not a timing issue. We would be in worse trouble if the IRT had marched on and got things into place that were non-compliant with GDPR. The fast is we need to start all over again. I don't find that frustrating, what I find frustrating is the inability to be smart about listening and paying attention to what's going on around us.

Now ICANN responded to the GDPR crisis we hit back in 2018 by starting a group that would look at developments around the world to keep a better monitoring eye. I think that is probably a good idea. It would be very interesting to get more intel on what's going on at the ITU, since we don't hear much about that.

I think that Avri has her finger on the right idea, we need to break apart, let's call it frustration, the burnout. The burnout that we are getting is not time, it's not always a lack of proper briefing. It is not always a lack of mentoring. It is a whole host of things. And it particularly affects our stakeholder group more than folks who have a long-term vested interest in the profits to be made from the Domain Name System. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Stephanie. You were heard. There was a bit of an echo at first, but I think we heard you loud and clear. Thank you. Is there anybody else who wants to comment on the issue of the WHOIS Disclosure System, otherwise we will move to the next question. Anyone? No? Okay. Bruna, over to you.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thank you so much. I think our next question is about ICANN leadership positions. Very direct question, what's the Board's take on the phenomenon of ICANN recycling veterans for leadership positions? Do you think it is beneficial to the community to have similar people rotating between leadership roles for different stakeholder groups? Do you see this as a problem? And what do you feel that it is the Board's role in assisting the community to recruit new blood?

And I think, just as a background to you all, this discussion comes from some reflections on the recent NomCom selection that just happen. So, there was a discussion on the NCSG liaise about how there was a very noting lack of female nominees. And also, how we could do a better job and also recruiting a new female for this space, because it's not like we don't have candidates. It's just maybe a selection problem.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes, thanks. On this one, I'm also not sure what the pool of candidates was. Because the NomCom is asked to look at the best and then at diversity, rather than -- so, sorry for not being able to answer that. But, in general, of course there is a balance to rotate, to get new leadership in, to have new ideas and talent, and the environment is changing, and that happens all of the time. We do believe it is not the role of the Board to involve itself in the leadership of the community. I think that is prevalent. We also do recognize the value of many of those people who continue to be there.

I mean they keep to be reappointed, reelected, because apparently, they have some value. At the same time making sure that there is space for new blood and new ideas etc., the best we can do is the Fellowship program, the NextGen program, and in that way trying to get new people up to speed and working with us. That and briefing programs and also the online education so people can get faster up to speed is something we fully support, and think is very important.

So, we do understand that the community implementation of Work Stream 2. is also on the way. And a significant number of

these start in community, diversity and SO/AC Accountability, and we do encourage NCSG and the broader community to take the opportunity to also to review each of their leadership transitions and succession planning strategies to ensure continued diversity. So, updating this plan I think will help us all. And be very supportive for that.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Maarten. Any comments or thoughts. , Avri. ?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. Just a quick one in that, I think we also do see a lot of new people that do come in through the various programs. It is year-to-year, the difference is a little harder to see. When you look over two, three, four years, you start to see there really is a different set of people coming in. Some move around to other jobs, but many new folks come in. Someday I would like to see a measure of that, to see whether my anecdotal impression is reasonable, but we do see new people coming in. Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Anyone else? Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Sorry about that. I think what Avri is saying is accurate, and just to illustrate, there was a study undertaken by At-Large, during the At-Large Review, that actually showed the turnover and the different positions that have been held by different people across the years. And yes, there might be usual suspects, of course, we know there are usual suspects, but the rotation of people -- the coming in and out of people is very well illustrated in that story. I would definitely encourage you to probably take a look at that study. And maybe carry a similar study within other constituencies in other parts of our community. That would be a nice illustration of what Avri has just said.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Leon. I am conscious of time. Normally we only have an hour, but now we have an hour and 15 minutes. But I want to make sure we have time to address the Board question. Maybe we can go to the next NCSP question. Thanks, Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Thanks, Matt, and everyone for their interventions, as well. Last question is about NomCom, also something that is not really new, and want to also make a note that Raul, who is one of the people that suggested ? this question is sitting in the audience and not at the table, but he's also joining

the discussion if you want. It's mostly a question about the NomCom seats.

NPOC Constituency have been talking a lot for the lack of proper representation at the NomCom. In the current state that this part of the community only holds one seat and it's only held by NCUC, we've been doing a lot of discussions on whether this should be like a rotatable seat, or we should advocate for extra ones, as we have been doing over the years.

And the point is that so far, every single time we had a negative response either from our pairs and peers at the GNSO or other parts of the community, and we just want to point this out because it's a very simple question on whether or not there's a possibility of rebalancing the NomCom, do you guys feel that it will be a relevant thing to discuss with the community as a whole? And maybe to hear some comments from you, that is it.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Bruna. I think Avri will going to lead off on this.

AVRI DORIA: Yep. Talk about frustration. Talk about exhaustion. If people want to go back, this problem has been on the table since before the transition. This topic has been on the table since before we

had to start talking to each other civilly. And if you go back, you will find me having some horrendous speeches to Board members. , at the time, about how they must fix this. It never got fixed. Now we have had two reviews, I know I'm making your case, not my case. We have had two reviews, both of which said something has to happen.

We've made recommendations both times, the recommendations have not been able to go forward for one time or another. As it stands now, the Board has the outcomes of the Nomcom Review Implementation Working Group, and the recommendation 10, which was 'this had to get fixed,' has gone undone. I think that means we have something on our table that we still need to do. I am not sure what we can do. But I do believe we are going to have to push discussions and find a solution. And, not let it drag on.

I've watched the discussion of, 'Should NCUC trade the seats back and forth with NPOC?' and I thought it was pathetic that they had to talk like that. That NPOC became a constituency that merited a seat and never got it. I cannot sort of change the position that I came into this on, we've got a recommendation from, you know, in the OEC that said, "Do it."

The recommendations were accepted, and so we have something that we have to figure out how to do. Unfortunately, I have to say, from a Board perspective, it was easier from the NCUC perspective, where I could pound my fist and say, “You, guys, got to do something.” Now, all I can do is pound my fist, and say, “We, guys, got to do something,” and I want to talk about it more afterwards. Want to see if we can find a way to it because I don't believe this is an issue that should be allowed to continue lingering.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Avri. Anybody else on the Board wants to jump in before we ask Raoul to -- No?. Okay. Please, go ahead.

RAOUL PLOMMER: It's a ridiculous situation. We have seven seats altogether, of the GNSO in the NomCom. Four of those are with one stakeholder group that we are supposed to be a counterpart of. It is four against one of each of the other stakeholder groups. Basically, the CSG can overrule the rest of the GNSO seats and have one vote over. I think it is clear as crystal that that is a completely unfair situation. And I am becoming very, very disillusioned by ICANN not being able to sort this out. It is not just an example of

these particular situations, but how ICANN fix its unfairness. And it is not happening, as I see it.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Raoul. Any other comments or thoughts? Avri, do you want to comment on that?

AVRI DORIA: All I can say, is he is right, and we have to figure out what to do, and we have been at an impasse, for a long, long time. It's going to to take creativity. The OAC has it on the table as something we need to deal with. And we will gonna have to deal with it.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: I just want to also say -- this is Benjamin speaking -- that we think justice should be done to give NPOC some representation in this arrangement. We support that opportunity. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks. So, I just have been told, and I want to check this with the organizers. We're running until 1:15 PM or 1:30 PM? Oh, sorry. 2:15 PM or 2:30 PM?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: 2:30 PM.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay, excellent, we have a little bit more time. Okay, do you want to, shall we turn to the -- if we turn to the Board question now, we can walk through that and then see if there are any questions or comments. We really are looking for suggestions. So, hopefully, you've had time to actually consider it. And then, if we have extra time, we can open up the floor.

So, question from the ICANN Board is, "What collaborative actions should the community, Board, and Org be undertaking to further progress achieving our strategic priorities?" I think the real genesis of this is, "How do we work all together?" And we kind of touched upon a little bit upon this in terms of how the GNSO and the Board might work more closely in the beginning of the session. But what more can we do as an ecosystem, if you will, to progress these priorities? And so, hopefully, we are looking forward to some thoughts from you. Over to you, Bruna.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS:

Thank you, Matthew. I would like to maybe first our counselors, if they want to take in this question or start the discussion about this. Because I think we're on the same page on this. Improve the level of conversation. Be more consistent on the implementation in the Board phase but also be more communicative and open, and collaborative throughout the GNSO parts of the PDP, or even the discussion [inaudible - 00:46:31] and so on, so we are on the same page on this so far, I believe. But I don't know if anyone else would like to weigh in on this? I am opening the floor, as well.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

And do not be shy, if there's anyone sitting over there, we can hand you the microphone. Please, feel free.

MANJU CHEN:

Hi, this is Manju speaking. So this question is kind of very generic because we have a lot of strategy priorities. Different priorities need different kind of collaboration and different kind of actors in this collaboration. It's a good question, but it's hard to really answer specifically in a sense. So, in terms of, I think, the think that NCSG cares the most as why we brought up already, it's about how we make sure policies that GNSO has to deliver is implemented.

I think it's not only a NCSG concern, it's a community concern about how we've passed so many PDPs, but they just kind of output in a limbo in a sense that we are expecting implementation but there is always one thing coming up again, not blocking, it looks like it's paving the way to implementation, but then it is like taking detours and detours and detours and people were like, "Oh, well, I guess it's not happening."

So that's probably one thing we really need more collaboration on, but as I said I think different PDP's we really have to identify which chapters are the most impactful and the most impacted, and who do we really need to reach out in order to have a better collaboration instead of just, well, what kind of strategic priorities do we want to achieve? It is not a very specific question that we could give specific answers to. Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

In a way, much of what we've been touching on so far in this discussion has been about one or two of the strategic properties. I mean, if you think about the question about the time, length, and engagement of the PDP process, really gets to the heart of our multistakeholder model, which is strategic priority on governance. We are discussing, very much discussing those issues and as you say, I think that's really one of the priority issues

obviously for NCSG and all of us to improve that policy development process.

Yes, it's a broad question, but this question has to remain live, it is not just really for this meeting, it's actually something we, as a Board, want to know. So if there are other ideas that you have an ongoing basis about how we can collaborate and have a more collaborative process, these are the things that we would like to hear. Anyways. Göran, I think you wanted to come in?

GÖRAN MARBY:

First of all, I want to discuss back to the fatigue discussion. And yes. And, again, my answer would be, we have to work through how the PDP is made, how the interaction between the Board -- and also then, how we do the implementation -- we totally agree. The good thing is we have a lot of initiatives about that right now.

And by the way, many other things that has been in progress in implementation, we unfortunately [inaudible - 00:50:27] out to the community two weeks ago, because 'we have so many public consultations out there, and someone who has been taking a long time. We spend a lot of time in the RDAPdiscussion about milliseconds, and I'm not even joking. It took a while for us to come across that.

So, I think that, to engage -- so we sent, for instance, to the GNSO -- is it a year ago, Avri, you helped with the FOTS paper. A lot of things has happened that we send to the GNSO, but how can we work together to make implementation better and work? We have suggestions in there. Let us engage in the discussion that exists. Everybody's is to find a problem.

One small problem I will add, as well, is that we went out -- I went out three years ago and said, we're going to reach a point in about one year where we will get a lot of PDPs, hundreds of review recommendations from them to us at the same time. That will cause the machine to stall because we can't do everything all the time, we started planning very early on, so we started to bringing on people, we started to bringing on processes, and then Covid hit us, as well.

So it's a problematic thing, you know that we increased the staff from 318 to 420-something, now, during Covid just to get more ommission. But there will always be a problem in the end, if we get too much to do at the same time. We will go back to one of Matthew's favorite subjects, which are Priorities; which we have to do together. And I'm happy to have Matthew together with Sabir, they are the ones who's fixing all the Priorities. Aren't you?

MATTHEW SHEARS: That is what I understand.

GÖRAN MARBY: Haven't we told you yet? I have told you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Göran, I think. I saw a number of hands that went up. So, Bruna, maybe if you just want to call on a couple of people in the back there.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: From NCUC we have Farell, Julf and David. And then we have at in the back, too.

FARELL FOLLY: Thank you for giving me the floor. Farell Folly, for the record. [inaudible] Thank you very much, I think Mr. Göran has talked about one part of my intervention, the second part is quite ironic but, at the same time, I think that this particular question from the Board, is somehow related to the first question of the NCSG. So, I propose that we draft something together to put it in the strategic plan, or the strategic priority, how are we going to deal, generally, about the community engagement in general. Because participation is not equally incentivized. What do I mean by that?

There are people participating here as a volunteer, we are all volunteers, but there are people participating supported by the companies, by the work, and there are other people who are just really volunteering, want to help with ICANN. So, if I take my personal case, for instance, just to speak of myself, I participate in three ICANN meetings, will stop three weeks of my annual leaves. And if I don't come, then I will be having a meeting in the middle of the night, in my home, and then, at 5' or 6'clock PM, I need to get ready for my work. If I am very motivated, doing that for four or five years can be difficult.

And this is somehow, most of the time, overlooked because people just think that ICANN will try to put some plan and then, if it's interesting, people will just work. But you can't always work like that because there are differences between the communities themselves. Registry, registrar and volunteer, just like that, are not the same way, they should not be treated the same way. And we need to think very deeply how we differentiate between people within the community. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thank you, it's a fair point. Avri, did you want you two fingers on that?

AVRI DORIA: Yeah. I think, for a long time, we've tried this notion of 'pain sharing'. We've never been able to do it. We always have a certain segment of the population that says something like, "There is more of us than them, therefore we get to do it in the timeframe that's comfortable for us." As opposed to, you know, "Hey, there might be more of them if it was in a timeframe that was comfortable for them." So, that is something that we keep missing is, obviously, time zones are difficult to deal with, and we really do have to share the pain.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Avri. Can I just ask, Edmon, do you have a microphone? If you can grab that one, then we will come to you. Who was next? Julf, and then David, and then Edmon.

Johan Helsingius: Okay. Julf speaking. I would like to go in a slightly different direction and pick up on something that Stephanie commented on remotely. When we talk about interaction with the community, we usually talk about internal stuff. And internal processes. But I think we all now also realize that's more than ever -- so, ICANN and the multi-stakeholder model and role of IANA, and everything is under a lot of external threats.

And the way it seems to work in ICANN right now, we said Org is kind of dealing with that. That there's a lot of intelligence that is not spread among the community, and the community is not participating, and that's unfortunately, and I think that is also something we need to look at. I don't have any solutions for it.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks. I think Göran, you just want to --

GÖRAN MARBY: I'm sorry that you say we don't spread the information. At every ICANN meeting we have a Plenary session where we go through everything. We produce a lot of papers; will be put on the website. And I know my government engagement team are meeting several different parts of the ICANN community and have in-depth discussions. So, I'm sorry about the sharing thing.

When it comes to participation thing, I mean, we are a small team. I mean, hey, comparative. But I can give you a tip, just somewhere in this house here, there are representatives from 160 countries. I don't know how many are here physically. Most of you actually come from a country, don't you? Or from the moon, I do not know. Thank you, I have to make a joke every 15 minutes.

The point of the matter is, that if you really want to help, then go down and see your GAC representative in the room. Finland is there. Sweden is there. I mean, you're in Sweden, I thought it was Norway. Go and talk to them. You have a direct effect to go into the room. Go in and listen to their deliberations and their discussions. And be a part of it.

And, of course, if you want to see what I do, you read my CEO report. Where Axi [ph] writes down all the meetings and engagements we have. I think we're fairly transparent in what we do, slight disagreements off.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Göran. David.

DAVID CAKE: First, on the pain sharing point, yes, welcome to the UTC +8 time zone, my time zone and to nearly 1/4 of the world lives here, and that is nearly one of the worst served time zones by most ICANN processes. So, Hong Kong, the entirety of the Philippines, Singapore, Taiwan, and of course, Western Australia, all in this time zone.

But what I really want to say when looking at collaborative actions towards goals, one of the things that I have discussed a

few times this week already is how the process by which new people come into ICANN is still a bit of a problem and a lot of it is that people come here and particularly through the Fellows or the NextGen, and they see everything going on around them, which they may or may not come to understand.

But they often do not make that transition to becoming involved in an active ICANN, you know, an active part of the community where there is ongoing work for them to do and a place for them to be. And I do not think we will really going to solve that one unless all those active parts of the community, where they might find a home, are more connected to that whole process of talking to newcomers.

I understand there's a real reason why ICANN can't go, "Okay, you seem like a guy who should go and join this constituency or that." Because, you know, that would be a way to really get all the community riled up. But we somehow do need to make sure that people don't just come in here and look around, even people who'd have come with the best intentions, often look around and see there's a lot going on but don't see where they can find a place to be part of it.

And I know in NCSG, we've done a lot of work trying to skill up people that are already involved with policy writing courses and

so on. But they have to know they even want to be a part of NCSG and write policy before we can do that, and I don't think that even occurs to people. And the same with technical people. Same with all sorts of people involved. Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Excellent point, David, thank you. We have got Edmon and then, I think Stephanie online, as well.

GÖRAN MARBY: Thanks to you, guys, because we have been talking, and Bruna, as well, we are actually doing a new program with a lot of input from you guys, how to transition people from NextGen, Fellows, et cetera, into ICANN; to answer to that. Because, again, you are right, and we will see if this works well. And I can't for the love of my life, can't remember the name of that project, there's probably an acronym somewhere.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Policy Transition Program.

GÖRAN MARBY: That is beautiful. It's sort of floats out of your mouth, doesn't it? Thank you to the Board for updating what I am doing.

MATTHEW SHEARS: We've got Edmon, Stephanie.

EDMON CHUNG: So, I am, this is Edmon, and I am from UTC +8. Participating from Hong Kong. I do understand that that is definitely a problem. Personally, though, I'm probably the bad influence because it works perfectly for me, because it never interferes with my day job, but that is not the same for volunteers who are just coming in. Because I am already committed. I think that is a big point. What I put my hand up to talk about is actually a little bit in response to Andrew.

I want to make sure that the motivation behind asking this question is not lost. The strategic priorities is the strategic plan that was put out, the so-called Five-Year Plan, but it is the Strategic Priorities that is a first time that the ICANN community has worked together to create, and we are like more than a third into it. So, one of the motivation is to look at were those strategic priorities set in the right direction, do we have gaps, are we meeting those priorities?

And also, in the next year or two, we will start the next cycle of the Strategic Plan. So, yes, it is loud and clear that the multi-stakeholder governance model, some of the PDP follow-up

implementation issues are part of the multi-stakeholder governance model, but as Matthew said there are also other aspects like evolving the unique identifier system, the security of the domain name system and a few other things.

What, I guess, the Board is interested also to know from the community is are there gaps so far? Are we heading in the right direction? And also, in the future, how do we refine this process as well. I think part of the motivation for such a broad question comes from that angle, as well.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Edmon. And just to add on to that, we will be starting planning for the next Strategic Plan for '26 through '30, years '26 through '30. , next calendar year, so probably in the first quarter of the next year. It is actually sooner than one might think. So, there is opportunity there, and we will be engaging with the community to build out that plan. Next, is it Stephanie online? Stephanie?

STEPHANIE PERRIN:

Yes, thank you. Stephanie Perrin, for the record, I just wanted to follow up on Edmon's comment. It used to be that we were on working groups where the time zone was varied, so that there was more fairness. I think that that is a rule that we should follow. I

noticed that many other groups I am on, we are not varying the time and it's extremely rough on, particularly folks in APAC. But I lifted my hand to comment, again, on the openness. I realize this is a delicate matter. There are some things where we can be extremely open, and there are others where perhaps we can be less open.

I make jokes too, awful ones. So, I did joke that, possibly, it might be too cheeky to ask the GAC, in our meeting with the GAC, how they were voting at the ITU. But I don't suggest that the Board should be doing that to the GAC. But the fact is that while we've made great progress with our relationship with the GAC, in terms of their -- our liaison and knowing what they are doing, and having good dialogue, it is still very opaque. And this is a really important manner, we would like to get a little more transparency from them, instead they are always banging on about WHOIS. Let's talk a little bit about what a good a job ICANN is doing, and how do they really feel? Thank you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Stephanie, and your reference to GAC, as well. I think it's almost an example where it's really, how do we get the best out of the constituency? So, if we have -- and we're very happy to have the GAC here, to really consult us on Public Policy matters.

From their perspective. Admittedly, the rotation in the GAC is big as well. And they are trying to give us the best advice they can, and I think we've invested a lot in improving the processes to make sure that we understand them well, they understand us well, and then we follow-up.

We also are very happy to see that GAC has been willing to step up and participate directly in the PDPs, and conversations with the GNSO and other parties. That is a way to improve those processes and to level that. And indeed, Göran is also reporting back to the GAC. Is part of your CEO report as well? On which governance we need, recognizing -- and I have a public policy background, myself. I have been a civil servant.

I'm not the Dutch government when I was a civil servant, I was a civil servant with a task in that government. The capacity building within the GAC is also something we're stimulating in a way to make sure that they understand the broader context that we operate in, for them to take into account and they develop that. I hope that helps a little bit.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Can I make a very technical comment? I have also been a civil servant. So there is a very interesting aspect that you can actually

utilize but when you speak to your GAC rep. , you don't speak to a GAC rep, an individual, you speak to a representative for a government. And what they should be doing, when they are here on a government assignment, which someone has told you, “You are going to go here and you are going to do this or do nothing, or prevent that from happening,” those three basic things; there's always an instruction from their governments.

It's a democratic institution. Why is it a democratic institution? If you say something to them, if you go and meet them and say this is something that you think should happen, they actually will report that back to their government.

Doesn't mean that a government will actually say something about it, 'but they are a vehicle, a vessel for you to report back to your government. And so, in many other instances, we meet someone where we talk to and engage with. The governments representatives are very, very different. They cannot take sides, if their government hasn't say they can take sides. So, I always wonder why, especially you, has not utilized the opportunity. Other groups in ICANN community have free club meetings and discussions, by individual GAC members and also with different parts of the GAC. Many of them are also very good people.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Göran. We have a couple of minutes left. I think we have two more questions and then I am afraid we are going to have two more comments, and I am afraid we are going to have to wrap it up.

BENJAMIN AKINMOYEJE: Thank you. Benjamin, for the record. What I wanted to say is concerning how we can work together to make sure we pursue the strategy plans. I will say that my support team, the ICANN support team have been helping our constituency in the past three months, based on what conversation we had at the last ICANN74 meetings.

And I think, such interactions are helpful meaning that -- I mean for the ACs, our role is just to mobilize participation, but also, just like the program that has been done, it is fair, but it's also not fair if required resources are not put in place to backup this type of initiative. For this transition program to work well, you need to put resources to bring in those who are going to support the new business to come online.

And there are many of them that are not here, even though we have the agenda on the list, many of them could not come. [inaudible - 01:09:45] like the backbone of some of this agenda

and could multiply their knowledge in others. So, in a way we should have a holistic intervention, that we know we'll really succeed and is sustainable. Those are the things that can support the implementation practicality of the Strategy Plan. That capacity transition is required. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: I think we are done. It is almost time. Any final comments from anyone? No.

BRUNA MARTINS DOS SANTOS: Just on the Policy Program, really quick. I think, just to maybe bridge on that, for Policy Transition Program as well to work, you need to allow us to talk about ourselves. The way the program is being shaped is rather institutional about ICANN, it's organization and so on. But you need to give community the space to explain how position taking is done, consensus is built, and everything else, and not just from the Org perspective, that is just my two cents on it. I just to take the time to thank you all for this. It is my last meeting as the NCSG Chair with you so thank you for the past two years, as well.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Bruna, thank you very much for your time, for leading NCSG. Really appreciate it. And we will be welcoming Julf at the end of

the meeting. Anyway, thank you everybody, really appreciate your time and your questions, good session, good discussion, and I think we can draw it to a close. Thanks very much. Meeting is closed.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]