Transcription ICANN Singapore
Update on T.S & Strategic Panel
Sunday 23 March 2014

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#mar
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

So thanks. I think we're going to move on to her next session so Theresa, please, come and join us and then we'll get going with that session.

All right if we could start the recording please. Thank you. So this next section is actually entitled Discussion of the Strategic Panel Recommendations. I think it's broader than that and it's an opportunity to interact with Theresa Swinehart, who's given us the time and the ability to do that.

I hope I get this right, I think Theresa is - Strategic Advisor to the President, but I'll give you the opportunity to state it clearly, Theresa. But Theresa is advisor to Fadi Chehadé on Strategic Initiatives.

And I've asked Theresa and met with her to talk through - to position her work properly so that we can then get to discuss any of the issues in and around the strategic panels that we might like to gain a Q&A session.

So, Theresa, over to you. Welcome and let's get on with the time we have with you. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Great. First thanks very much and my apologies for running a little late. I have to say this room is a bit awkward because there's a sign that the entrance is over here so you start wandering down some dark halls and realize that you actually can't get in the door there. So anyway we'll have to figure out how to solve for that.

Jonathan and I had a few opportunities to catch up between the Buenos Aires meeting and this meeting, which has been very useful to have ongoing dialogue especially around areas that relate to the organization's strategy and in particular in relation also to the GNSO and some feedback and how we can do some things a little differently.

But we thought it might be useful first of all to - for me just to give a brief overview of what I actually do or have some responsibilities for. So the Strategic Initiative Department actually oversees the work of the strategic planning process. It was also overseeing the work of the strategy panels which have concluded their work, and I'll touch upon that.

The Affirmation of Commitments and the work of the respective review processes, so the ATRT 2 and the other reviews that are coming in, the bylaw reviews or the operational review processes that exist and then we also help support different areas around some of the broader Internet governance areas and now with the announcement last week from NTIA both the dialogue in process that will be undertaken in the context of the IANA transition.

And also a conversation which we've been understanding the community has been starting to have also since the IANA transition announcement around broader ICANN accountability. So we'll be working on different areas of that.

But of course we don't do any of this alone. We work with the community and across the departments and the different organizations. But just to give you an idea of what we touch upon.

Alice, who's sitting in the row there, is instrumental on the team and does an enormous amount of work. And I know you're going to be hearing - or you have heard in the past also from Denise and Margie and other members of the team. So with that maybe that helps provide a little context of what sort of the day to day looks like.

I'm going to run through some slides that were prepared and then I do want to touch upon tomorrow's sessions in relation to the IANA transition discussion. I had the opportunity to sit in on some of Friday's sessions and also hear some of the audio from the NCUC dialogue and I think that was also a great opportunity to start hearing some things that were going to come up and I do hope that those come up in the discussions tomorrow as well.

So how do I forward the slides? Oh thank you. So just some quick overviews, we won't spend much time on these because I really would prefer to go into conversation. So the ICANN strategy panels which had been launched at the ICANN meeting in Durban, the work has been underway. The work has concluded.

So the recommendations that were put out from those are out there for discussion. Whether they're used or not or whether they help inform the strategic planning process will depend upon the community feedback that we get from the recommendations that are out there.

But just to be very clear, and I believe this was touched upon yesterday by Fadi as well, that the work of those panels is concluded. Some of the work might be interest to continue dialogues in different forums or the GNSO may want to look at it in different contexts or not but just to be very clear that work has concluded.

Just to express really strong appreciation for the community input that was received during that process, I know that from the business community and others there were some really excellent input into those dialogues. So just thank you very much for that.

So I think we can go to the next slide on that. The slides themselves, which can be made available, this just touches on some of the highlights that came

out of those so I don't think we need to read though those but they may be useful just to sort of see the high level focus.

Next slide. So again this one is the one on multistakeholder innovation. And I do understand that there was quite a bit of dialogue also with regard to the recommendations that came out of this panel, again, some of it may be of interest and useful, some of it may not. Again, the work of the panels is concluded and so from that nature we can see what's being used or not used.

Next slide. Public responsibility, same way, some highlights on this. I know that public responsibility is a theme of discussions and other contexts around ICANN's responsibilities more broadly and accountability. So for those that have been following those dialogues this may be of interest also to read through the report and some of the findings and some of the suggestions that were provided.

And then next slide. ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem, this is also, again, recommendations that came out of this. Some of it may be of interest to read in the context of the recent NTIA announcement. It may be useful for some of the dialogues or not but again just recommendations that came out of that.

Next slide. So as we said the outputs themselves help inform the strategic planning process. There are four community conversations. There will be a session tomorrow - I don't recall the exact time but it's in the afternoon - where there will be an overview from the different panel chairs and opportunity for everybody to have a conversation and provide input to that session specifically so there's a special session to that. And it will also touch on the timeline of the strategic planning process.

Next slide. Oh, here's the schedule. We've adjusted the actual strategic plan schedule slightly. There's a blog post that's gone up on the web site and there's also the adjustment of the timeline. That was in order to ensure that

there was enough time for community input and feedback for the strategic planning process and also to ensure that the timelines were in better sync with the outputs of the strategy panels and anything that the community identified as being relevant or not relevant for that planning process.

Next slide. So on the ICANN globalization we have sort of two tracks, one is the IANA transition which I think is - everybody has heard about - and then we also have on the chairing the organization overall more broadly and community dialogues.

I believe that Fadi mentioned yesterday that the originally formed advisory groups that had been put in place from the Board to engage in community discussion and have conversations about certain themes events have overtaken the circumstances for those and so we really have an opportunity now to focus on what the specific areas are that the opportunity of the NTIA announcement has now provided.

Next slide. Other areas of work are the GNSO organizational reviews. And I understand that's being discussed with everybody. And then also the ATRT 2 recommendations that have come out which are being - we appreciate all the community input that's already come on those and then look at having the conversation - we have a session on Wednesday specifically focused on ATRT 2 and then obviously the timeline is leading into London.

So I think that sums it up. Let me just touch quickly on two other areas. As we know, tomorrow on Monday at 10:30 there will be a session that's focused on the recent NTIA announcement and the launching of the consultation with the community and the dialogue.

And that is really the launching of how should the process look that needs to be put into place to look at the elements that are relevant for the IANA transition. It's not a conversation on what the solution should be because that's preempting but what should the process look like. How do we ensure a

truly open global multistakeholder process? And what are the elements that are necessary for that?

So I would really ask that people come to that session, provide your input. It's not going to be the only opportunity for providing that input but it's an important one. We're also - want to ensure that there's other forms of providing input so there'll be a Twitter hashtag I guess people who provide input that way so different mechanisms that people feel comfortable providing input on.

The input that's received during this process, and again this is not - ICANN has been asked to facilitate the process together with the affected parties so this is - it's a broader community initiative so we need to look at how to run this well.

That input will be compiled and the objective is to be able to post that by the 7th of April. And put that together, again, to put out for community input into what the process should look like. So I wanted to just flag that event for everybody.

We'll have an opportunity to have the chair of the IAB and the chair of the IETF and also from the Regional Internet Registries outline some of the mechanisms that they have and also some of their community dialogues that will be occurring as input into this process but also to describe a little bit for people who are less familiar maybe how their forums function, how they actually have a role in relation to the IANA function, for example, around protocol parameters or IP addressing space. Because this is actually the full IANA function, not just names and numbers.

The reason I really call out this session though for the GNSO is that you run a lot of multistakeholder processes, right? You run a lot of areas around developing policy. And so I would anticipate and very much hope that you have some very good suggestions on what are some of the ingredients and

elements that will be very useful to take into consideration on running a good process so I would ask that you go there.

In the afternoon we've been hearing from the community also in relationship to the announcement, you know, how does this impact ICANN accountability overall? I mean, we obviously have the Affirmation of Commitments and that's a very valuable and very important document. And the review mechanisms in that serve and allow for a multistakeholder review mechanism to the broader community.

But we understand there's also interest in having further conversations around that. And so the afternoon session at 5:30 that had been originally titled, Globalization of ICANN, will focus much more on ICANN accountability. So I would encourage also people to attend that session. And that's in order just to facilitate a conversation, it's not conclusive in any way but to begin the dialogue there.

So with that I think I'll end and maybe I can answer some questions but that's sort of a big picture overview of different things.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Theresa. It's a big picture. There's quite a lot covered there obviously. And pretty important stuff given that it's by definition strategic. Let's hand it over, love to hear from people. Steve, go ahead.

Steve DelBianco: Hey, Theresa. There was a slide at the end of the strategy before you got to schedule where it said "the fate" decide the fate - can you scroll back where it says "fate." Look at the bottom right hand corner. "The fate of recommendations to be determined after extensive input."

And earlier you prefaced it by saying, "The reports are simply - they're simply there," they're just done and they're handed over. But their fate could come about through a formal process. So I want to know whether that's a formal process to understand whether we're going to adopt and embrace.

And the other way a fate gets decided is a group who's working on a given initiative like our IANA transition. We may cite an entire section of the - say the ecosystem report where Vinton Cerf and his group recommended allowing many countries to sign an affirmation. And what is the status then? If I cite that report does it have special status because it came from a high level strategy panel of experts?

And I realize we'll discuss this on Monday. But in the months ahead as we work the transition you reach back and you cite this 75-page report led by Alejandro and Vinton and suggest that they offered an idea. Does it have special status because it came from them?

Theresa Swinehart: So my perspective would be that it has equal status as ideas that come from other places. So people may read a certain section of a report and say, oh that's interesting and they have some discussions around that. And that people may coalesce around a concept that's relating to that and provide that as input.

But that has to be looked at also in the context of the other kinds of input that's received, right.

Steve DelBianco: So it's among equals. And yet what was meant on this slide where the fate of their recommendations - because if in fact they've simply been posted and one can cite them and copy or disagree, versus them having a explicit fate, which would either elevate or change their stature...

Theresa Swinehart: So what was meant by saying "fate of the recommendations" is they are out there for the community to do with what they chose to. That's what is intended by the use of that word. I didn't put too much thought - I'm sorry to say, into the specificity of the word.

Steve DelBianco: And so that's...

Theresa Swinehart: It's really up to the community now what they choose to do with them. It could - let me give you an example.

Steve DelBianco: Yeah.

Theresa Swinehart: It could be that there's a recommendation that came out of the multistakeholder innovations or the ones that came out of (unintelligible), right? You know, maybe it's a toolkit idea people want to experiment with or maybe it's a concept that people want to explore further. It's food for thought into a dialogue. And I think we have so many avenues of input into our dialogues whether it's through individuals or whether it's through a panel or whether it's through a workshop or whether it's through, I don't know, a meeting people to go, whatever it might be.

And so I really would encourage people to look at - these are inputs into discussions.

Steve DelBianco: Got it.

Theresa Swinehart: It's like reading a news article that has a different perspective and causes you to think differently about it, that's all.

Steve DelBianco: Got it. And I appreciate that, that was really news to us when we had that conversation yesterday with Fadi. But this particular slide, I guess that last "fate" should just be removed because...

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: ...it really won't be decided in any formal way in any given report is going to have a certain stature due to recommendations that are determined after extensive community input. There isn't going to be community input on the

fate of the recommendations. Instead as we design our work we will pick and chose and cite some of those reports if they suit our purposes.

Theresa Swinehart: And let me just go - so if you look at the fate, okay, and I don't want to drill down on one particular word, okay? But if the entire community said we really like that one recommendation in that one report, right? And it was really through dialogue with the community and they love it, right? Then that might have an impact on the fate of that recommendation. Whether it's adopted or whether it goes through a process or whether it goes - so what I'm saying is that, again, the recommendations are out there, it is up for everybody to do with them what they would like to do with them.

Steve DelBianco: And it's the fate of the tiny little bits of recommendations, wherever they came from, there isn't a fate of the recommendation report taken as a whole.

((Crosstalk))

Steve DelBianco: The recommendation reports as a whole just simply get exposed, right? They don't continue. And then I asked you about the globalization, the Montevideo principles call for the accelerated globalization of ICANN; in a separate one accelerated globalization of IANA. So I really have the sense that the accelerated globalization of ICANN is still on the table; it didn't get dumped off the table by the IANA announcement.

Theresa Swinehart: I think the ICANN globalization is always an issue that has been under discussion so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Theresa. Let's go to Chuck in the queue at the microphone.

Chuck Gomes: Thanks, Jonathan. Thanks, Theresa. An observation on the strategy panels and the timing. In the previous session the comment was made about people drowning - the community drowning in things to review. And I appreciate the

fact that you want the community to look at these things and pick what they want.

I would venture to say that very few people, small minority, will have time to review all the stuff that came out of those four panels. Not even over the long term. I'm one of those who tried on just one, reviewed the others at high level and it was overwhelming. And I'm fairly experienced in this community. Imagine what it is for newcomers.

So I think we need to think about going forward how much stuff we put out to the community all at once because you cannot expect reasonable feedback when there's so much going on at once. Even all the things that you listed on your first couple slides, it's overwhelming. Now we don't all have to be involved in everything but if you want broad community input on these things we've got to think somehow about managing the load of material to review.

Theresa Swinehart: Chuck, I would agree there is a lot going on. And if there's ideas on how some things can be streamlined in different ways but while still enabling each of the organizations within the ICANN structure and each of the accountability responsibilities to the broader community to be accomplished I really welcome some suggestions.

Jonathan Robinson: All right, we've got a good queue developing. I've got Marilyn next.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm going to just open my comments by reminding everyone that on the weekends the - although this meeting sometimes is understood to be a GNSO Council gathering it's actually a GNSO plus gathering and there are many members from the community not just the councilors but most of the officers and members of the community that are here.

And I say that because I want to make a specific comment about ICANN governance. Not Internet governance but ICANN governance. And ICANN

governance is one of the major responsibilities that all of us as stakeholders have.

There are three processes going on and one is the IANA transition toward further globalization. One is the improvements and enhancements of ICANN governance and accountability and the ICANN ecosystem. And the third is the larger Internet governance ecosystem evolution that a lot is going on tomorrow and the next few days that we're all going to be interested in.

Like Chuck, I consider myself, having started early, before ICANN existed, to normally be able to keep up with the tsunami of information. So when I feel overwhelmed I feel sorry for myself and for everybody else. I read all four reports. One of the reports has charts in it that are misleading and nonfactual. And they're now in the wild so to speak because they're on the World Wide web. Not on the Internet, on the World Wide Web.

The report says that they're partial and not intended to be definitional. But you got to read the fine print and I've already seen these charts copied and referred to by other people. One of the charts shows the GAC separate from ICANN. Nope.

I'm just laying out for us the fact that we've got a lot of information out there that was generated by a number of high level panels that had funding from ICANN and the we have a strat plan that is dependent on volunteers to absorb all that information and the rest of the information that is going on and try to contribute effectively to ICANN governance.

So I made this statement, I'll make it again. I think we need for ICANN - and Theresa, we're kind of putting you in the point of maybe taking this message back - we need for ICANN to spend as much money on supporting the bottom up consensus based ability and participation of the community as on high level panels and external events.

And we're going to need to do that before we approve a modified strategic plan. I'm not quite sure how we do it but I know we need to do it. So finally I'll just say one other thing about - because of the - too much simultaneous processing on trying to gather information and address issues I think we're losing actually the ability of the community to think carefully before decisions get taken.

And maybe we need to slow some planned timelines down. Maybe we don't approve the strategic plan on the present schedule and we extend it until we have more time to assess a number of things. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Marilyn.

Theresa Swinehart: Thanks, Marilyn.

((Crosstalk))

Sam Lafranco: Me?

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, I've got - what I'm going to do is I'm going to alternate between the table and the mic so I'll take Mikey first and then we'll come back to the floor mic.

Mikey O'Connor: This is Mikey O'Connor from the ISP Constituency. It's great to see you, Theresa. I want to go to the meeting tomorrow, the NTIA figure out what we're going to do process meeting. And as a process guy I love the idea of just focusing on the process.

I want to start coming at it negatively. Let's not quite do it the way we did the one in Buenos Aires where we sort of threw the question out to a group of 700 people in a room early in a morning and then sort of let this unfold organically. You know, I'm an ex-hippie and I love organic but that was too organic even for me.

You made a point that I want to touch on which is you're looking especially to the GNSO and I was - it was great to hear you say this - looking especially to the GNSO because we are pretty good at policy development process. But I'm from a part of the US that's generally modest and generally doesn't throw itself out in front of the world and say how great we are.

And so my going in position for tomorrow was to be equally modest and say, you know, we here in the, you know, we do now how to do working groups. But I'm not going to like throw it up there and say, you know, this is the best thing on the planet because it's just not my nature even though I believe that's true.

So that's all by way of preface to say can you tell us more about how you're expecting that meeting to run? And how you want people to engage? Because, I mean, I'm happy to march in and talk about chartering or steps. I just don't know what you're looking for there.

Theresa Swinehart: I'd be happy to. So the session will run first by getting just an overview of the different elements of the IANA function and having the leadership of the IETF and IAB and also (IR)s and Fadi will do sort of an overview of, you know, what are the protocol parameters space and how are the relationships there and then the IP addressing. And obviously we have the ccTLDs and then the gTLD space so the naming space, the numbering space and the protocol parameter space.

So also to provide some context of what this is about and what is being sought in the context of a proposal, right, and then from there working backwards of what kind of process do we need to put into place?

So with that introduction really framing a little bit the dialogue about what it is we're trying to look at. And then it would be opened up for community

discussion around, you know, input on what are elements for consideration in a good process?

And when I was mentioning the GNSO you have a lot of experience of what has work to - and been effective in a process? You know, I heard you on Friday mention the concept of working group or whatever, you know, whether that is a good model or whether a online dialogue is a good model or how do you ensure the transparency factor? How do you ensure the global reach factor?

What have people experienced as being effective for mechanisms and not effective for mechanisms? That kind of input - I realize that it may sound a bit mundane but what's really important is, is that we are looking at what elements are important to capture and what will be a good process and getting input from the experience of that.

And, again, going back to the GNSO and I think the ccNSO has a similar situation, you know, you have a lot of experience in bringing together different kinds of communities and building dialogue around that. And so I think those sort of examples would be good.

So there will be an introduction to frame what the topics - what the topic is around the IANA function more specifically, right? But then specifically it'll be an open dialogue and basically an opportunity for people to come and express exactly what their thoughts are. Go ahead.

Jonathan Robinson: Yeah, if it's brief. We just need to keep things going.

Mikey O'Connor: And that's great, Theresa, and very helpful. Yesterday I spent some time with Fadi in the room sort of saying, putting this in project manager terms, you know, and trying to tie in to Fadi's history as a GM at IBM. And I just want point you at that.

The short version of that is who's writing the statement of work or the charter or whatever? You know, how's all that, you know, is this led by the administration? Is it led by some, as yet unnamed coalition of smart folks? You know, that kind of - is that on the table for tomorrow as well? Or is there a - essentially a project management structure already in place that's simply looking for components to plug in to their work? See what I mean?

I mean, in a working group setting we would put essentially a working group together to write the charter and then we would recruit the working group and then we would recruit the leadership team for that. But that's not the only way to do it. And I'm curious as how far the sort of leadership and structuring has already progressed in your thinking?

Theresa Swinehart: We are starting the launch of the process. So it's really, you know, what are some of the elements? What are some principles that need to be adhered to? Right? Openness, whatever, you know, that. But then also really the launching of the process, right?

The scope of work is fairly clear. But the charter of how the work is done and the mechanisms by which the work is done are the elements that we really want to have the conversation about. And, again, ICANN is facilitating it together with the directly-affected parties, right? So there's that conversation and how do we ensure that each of the entities also has their forums for dialogue, right? So that also has to be taken into account.

So we're really quite at the beginning of that. And that input - all of the input will be captured and then that will be put out for public comment of what seems to be some proposed directions of what to look at for a process and that will be put out for public comment then so. I hope that helps. Yeah?

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Over to the microphone.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay. Sam Lanfranco, NPOC and NCSG. Okay - thank you. I have a concern and it sort of follows up on the process issue. There are two processes here; one is to get to as a placeholder the five-year plan and the other is that five-year plan is basically going to embody process, new processes as we're going forward.

And the role of the multistakeholder model in this has been elevated significantly given the DNS IANA transition. So we have to worry about that part a lot. And when I look at the strategic panel reports the ones on the human systems end, like the multistakeholder engagement, it's not - it's neither a blueprint nor a roadmap, it's more a menu of ideas, many of these evidence-free or untested. And they don't seem to have a lot of meaning and context here.

And what worries me is that we may jeopardize our legitimacy as a multistakeholder model in using a process in which the multistakeholder model gets heavily damaged. And so my suggestion here is that we've got this initial process to get to a process and that we should move a lot slower than planned.

Speed here is liable to de-legitimate what we do. And that we have to - we can't just deluge the public with, as Marilyn said, a tsunami of data. We have to have more of an organized process to parse out what the issues are so that those stakeholders who aren't in the game now can see what their stake is and how they get their voices heard.

If not, we're liable to jeopardize the whole notion of a multistakeholder model of governance and that'll impact on the transition of IANA and that would be a disaster. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Thank you, that's very helpful. Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: So I'm going to go to Yoav next and then we'll come to you, Chuck.

Yoav Keren: Yeah, Yoav Keren for the Registrars. I'm just curious did any of the participants of the strategy panels or their organization receive any monetary compensation from ICANN accept for the travel support?

Theresa Swinehart: I think it was offered a small amount for those who needed it but I need to come back and check exactly so I don't have the answer right on the top of my head so my apologies.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks. Chuck.

Chuck Gomes: Chuck Gomes. Theresa, you mentioned a date of April 7 on the NTIA transition process. But at that point what are you expecting by April 7?

Theresa Swinehart: So by April 7 to take the input that's been received from the discussions here, so at the Singapore meeting, from the session tomorrow on what elements could be useful to capture in a process and how a process might look to have that - to get that compiled, right, and get all that input compiled and then to post that and put that out for public comment and input, right.

                  So it's a consolidation of the discussions and the threads of what has been discussed in the community as what might be key elements for a process and to put that out for public comment.

Chuck Gomes: So the expectation is not to have a process defined by April 7.

Theresa Swinehart: That's correct.

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: And then after that.

Theresa Swinehart: Correct. Right, so...

((Crosstalk))

Chuck Gomes: ...on a process. And who would - how would the decision about the process ultimately be made and by whom?

Theresa Swinehart: So that - one of the points that I think is very relevant to the dialogue, right? I've heard some say, you know, maybe there should be some sort of working group or volunteer group or whatever it might be to oversee that, maybe that's the group that would, you know, have responsibility, there's a question then of how they get selected, right?

So those are all aspects of what we need to look at. What is getting posted on the 7th or the objective or goal, in an ideal world, would be to get posted is a compilation of the input that's been received from these discussions. And that very well may also look at, you know, who makes the final decision on whether it's the right process or not. And that gets put out for public comment, right?

So we're not making a decision on what the process is on the 7th; we're compiling what's been discussed, input received and that goes out for public comment.

Chuck Gomes: And part of the process will be to decide how and ultimate process is chosen, is that correct?

Theresa Swinehart: That would have to be one of the elements, obviously, of a conversation that happens, yeah.

Chuck Gomes: Thank you.

Jonathan Robinson: Just to help people know where they are in the queue I've got John Berard, Kristina, Klaus and Avri.

John Berard: Thank you, Jonathan. John Berard. Thank you for being here this morning. There has been already since Friday, when many people reached Singapore, a persistent discussion about the effect and more importantly the influence of the strategy panels and outside experts looking but not touching the process.

I was one of those who felt very concerned about the notion coming out of the Multistakeholder Innovation Panel, the notion of applying crowd sourcing to the policy development process because it did not seen to suggest that qualification entered into the process. So that if you were to receive a comment from Chuck Gomes on a subject and a tweet from Darthvader41 on a subject that it seemed as if the two would have equal weight. I'm sure you didn't intend that.

But much - but much of the criticism that is leveled at ICANN generally, and perhaps your activities specifically, is a blind eye to how some of the activities would play to the community.

There was a - sometimes insight comes in a moment and yesterday James Bladel, one of my councilor colleagues, noted that the multistakeholder model is slow, loud and messy. I think that that's a totally appropriate description of the multistakeholder model.

I also think that it is often viewed as something that needs to change. Right? But it can't. If you change the slow, the loud, messy qualities of the multistakeholder model you will lose the value of the multistakeholder model. And in this instance it's - to draw upon a phrase from many years ago, speed will kill the multistakeholder model.

And I would just urge some caution that if you are truly interested in supporting and maintaining the multistakeholder model you've got to become a little bit more comfortable with slow, loud and messy.

Theresa Swinehart: I think your description of the multistakeholder model is well said. And I think we have - there's various interpretations of multistakeholder models and how it's being used in different foras. There's IETF has its multistakeholder model and its input mechanisms and all of that. And I think we have - they're not easy; you're absolutely right. They're not easy processes. And they're not easy models. And they take some time.

And I think one of the - this is just a personal observation - one of the things that I think is incredibly valuable about these kinds of models is new ideas and some work and some don't work. And one has the ability to share the views, whichever mechanism it might be and also to disregard them and say no, that's not good; that's not going to work.

So that I think, you know, there's plusses and minuses of multistakeholder models and there's different variants of them that are used in different forums obviously. And you're absolutely right, patients and time, you know, are important to be taken into account in those so.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks both. Just to let everyone know where we're at we've got about 10 minutes left and currently three questions in the queue led by Kristina.

Kristina Rosette: Kristina Rosette. First, I'd like to just follow up on a point that Chuck had made. I had not had the opportunity to read the panel reports but I figured with 22 hours of flying time ahead of me that was going to be a really good opportunity.

And setting aside the fact that there was report that in particular that kept putting me to sleep, I could not make it through those reports in that 22 hour period.

And if I'm somebody who's interested in this issue who cares about the issue, has an interest in what happens to the outcomes and I still couldn't find the 25 or 26 hours to plow through them in a meaningful way I think there needs

to be an adjustment in the expectations of ICANN as to what type of input they're going to receive, how much and from whom.

If you want to perhaps make it easier one thing you could do is set up kind of similar to what was done for the draft Applicant Guidebook, where you took - instead of having different modules of the Guidebook to provide comment on, take each panel, break each recommendation down into a three sentence summary of what it is and then provide an opportunity for people to report. That might be the most realistic way that you're going to get any meaningful volume of public comment.

Second, I had a question about the timing of the publication of the final draft strategic plan. I went and looked at the blog post that you mentioned it - and you've indicated that the strategy panel reports public comment is open until April 30. But the blog indicates that the final draft strategic plan is going to be published before that date.

So either that's not correct in which case I think it's helpful to the community to have a better idea as to when that plan is going to be provided, or it is correct in which case our input on the panel recommendations doesn't really matter, so you should just tell us that and we won't waste our time.

Theresa Swinehart: Thanks for finding that. I'll check on that.

Kristina Rosette: All right thanks.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay, Klaus.

Klaus Stoll: Thank you. Thank you, Theresa. I want to come back to a little bit what Marilyn, Sam and Mikey said. So a little bit from the perspective of the Non Commercial Stakeholder Groups, we've got a lot of stakeholders now pounding at the door. And it is, for example, the pounding of the door of NPOC and others and they want to get in.

And the problem is that, for example, I'm not clear - it's clear we have to have a process and I agree with that. But we also need to have the way the resources to let these people in. And we have to make sure that we have the ability to listen to these people and to let them participate.

And all I'm asking for is really please let's have speed at the same time clarity and at the same time transparency. I think, for example, from our group, from NPOC and other able groups there is a lot, a lot, a lot of resources and there are a lot of abilities.

What I'm not clear about is - I feel like somebody pushing me through the door and I'm hanging there and I don't know how do I finance it, how do I organize it, how do I do it? I've got requests for dozens of workshops and contributions but I don't have seriously no idea how to get them in.

Because what the expectation is everybody says, okay, I want to be in. But how do we do it? Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: So maybe we could all brainstorm together on how we might fall for that because I think we do - we do need to find ways to make it easier for people to engage and contribute to things.

Klaus Stoll: Let's brainstorm as quickly as possible because seriously, guys, a lot of pressure in the back and we need to get some answers very quickly.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Klaus. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. Thank you, Theresa. First I wanted to thank you for sort of giving us the indicator on the strategy panels that it basically was a bunch of ideas that we could use or lose as the community wished. And I think that that's a very important indicator for us to have been given.

In terms of now moving forward with the multistakeholder process I feel like I'm sort of caught in a very funny contradiction in that in the last session when we were talking about the new gTLD process and all that had gone on we pretty much had a sense that it wasn't working here.

Then we come to this talk with you and we've got a lot of feeling of the promise of how we can make it work to resolve that. And I'm not sure that I see the continuity between the two other than sure, we can trust you. But that puts a lot of trust and weight on your shoulders. And I'm not quite sure I understand that.

So that's a problem I'm having in terms of, yeah, we can do a lot as the community. We can send lots of stuff from the bottom up to the Board. And then the Board sort of turns to Staff and say, okay, you know, here. Just like the strategy panels, here's some advice and recommendations from the community that you can use or lose as, you know, as you please.

And that's sort of the sense that we had from the previous discussion of new gTLDs. So I'm not quite sure how we bridge the reality of where we've gotten to with our stakeholder process that we value a lot going forward.

The other thing I wanted to ask is - and you and I had a brief conversation about this before is we've talked a lot about how we, as a multistakeholder community, are going to do all this. And I'm just wondering what the mechanisms are for bringing in the larger multistakeholder, you know, community into all of this.

You know, we've looked at a schedule that sort of says we do this at ICANN, we do this at ICANN, we do this at ICANN. And yet we have a whole set of events in Internet governance 2014 and 2015 that have nothing to do with ICANN meetings.

And so I'm wondering what kind of mechanisms can we create that sort of brings in the rest of the multistakeholder world into - and fuses it to our small community so that we get something that the greater community, those that have been beating up on NTIA about IANA finds something acceptable that we do. Thanks.

Theresa Swinehart: And you raise two really good points, Avri. The first one, to your first point, unfortunately I couldn't fit it in the session beforehand and so I maybe thinking in a bit of a disconnect. And it's something I've been thinking about for a while, operationalizing multistakeholder is hard. Having a multistakeholder process is hard. And then operationalizing elements that come out of that are equally hard.

I don't know whether that goes to the first point but, you know, I think that, you know, as this all evolves we all have lessons that we can learn and share and figure out how to make things work better so I don't know how that answers or doesn't answer the first point that you were making.

But I do find that not only are some of the dialogues in multistakeholder processes, you know, they're open, they're transparent, they're messy, one argues, one has different views and then, you know, and sort of builds a conversation.

But I think also the unique factor of it is, is that anybody can participate and so that's an important attribute. But again when you start operationalizing things that also gets hard because one has to bring in that consensus.

On this other question of how do we bring in the broader community, so in relation specifically to the process for the IANA transition part the dates that have been indicated in the process are actually just sort of milestones or key sort of events, right, in the context that ICANN had been asked to facilitate this with the other affected parties.

But there's obviously going to be a lot of other dialogues that are happening. I mean, the Regional Internet Registries have their meetings in the regions, the CCs have their regional meetings so they just don't meet at the ccNSO meeting, they also meet in their regions along with the RIRs and others.

So that's going to have to be an important way to also get the input but also it could very well be that some of these other initiatives around the broader Internet governance may ask that there's also consultations held there and so finding a way as we identify the right process to ensure that that reaches them.

On then to broader community overall, I don't have the answer yet, when we talk about nonspecific process issues that we're not dealing with. But I think it's worth brainstorming about because I think there's a lot of good things and lessons learned, you know, from different elements of the ICANN process that might be relevant for those so maybe that's worth a little time in the bar with a bunch of people and brainstorming a little bit.

Jonathan Robinson: Thanks, Theresa. I know you have to be somewhere at 11:30.

Theresa Swinehart: I do.

Jonathan Robinson: So, yeah.

((Crosstalk))

Theresa Swinehart: And what time is it?

Jonathan Robinson: It's coming up a bit on 11:30 so, I mean, we've got one last question, can you...

Theresa Swinehart: One last question.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great, if you can make it as brief as possible please?

James Bladel: I'll make it very brief if I can. A lot of what I would say has already been said at the table and elsewhere. I'll leave with kind of two brief points or questions. One is I think that there is - it's not clear what the role of the existing multistakeholder groups is in advancing the multistakeholder model.

I think it needs to be much more clear. It's my belief that the existing multistakeholder groups should be where the new stakeholders who are showing up should be directed. And I'm concerned that the global stakeholder engagement and the strat panel on multistakeholder innovation didn't really say a lot about energizing the existing multistakeholder structure.

So my question is, what can ICANN do to support the existing multistakeholder structures better in terms of financial support, in terms of staff support, in terms of support for outreach and intake? I think we're struggling with all of these things with very limited resources in spite of some people on the outside who believe we have boundless resources.

And that's really - I think really my only main point is to - that this should be the place where multistakeholderism takes place, this and the ALAC and the SSAC and other ACs and Os and that we need the support to make it happen because we're not - we're running on fumes in a lot of ways both personally and financially so we need more. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Thank you. Thanks. I'll take that back.

Jonathan Robinson: Okay great. Thank you very much, Theresa. Thanks for taking the time for us and for stretching it a little, really appreciate you coming and listening and sharing your thoughts with us.

Theresa Swinehart: And thanks for being patient with my slight delay of arrival. One thing that - and maybe I can just tee this up for London. It's not a work product, it's not anything more.

But I'm interested in sort of starting a conversation also where from a strategy standpoint, right, and this is not for a strategic plan issue, this is not anything - this is just a - maybe 5 minutes at the London meeting to talk a little bit about from your perspective what are some ideas just to look at, you know, where the GNSO could, you know, wants to be in 5 years or how things are evolving or ideas around going to the point, you know, how does one share the multistakeholder experience with the broader community?

What are some of the really valuable lessons learned of the GNSO that can be shared more broadly? You know, maybe just some ideas that might have been percolating in the context of discussions that, you know, members might have had in different places. Just a brainstorming just of ideas. It's nothing in particular, it's not a, you know, conclusive in any way. But I'd really love to engage in sort of just a two-way dialogue not specifically on what, you know, ICANN staff is doing but also, you know, what individuals - what you're thinking about.

And, you know, part of it's - you know, I deal with the strategy part of the organization but strategy is not in one department, it's holistic and it's inclusive. And so I enjoy a dialogue around some things there.

Jonathan Robinson: That's a very helpful and interesting suggestion. I mean, I think in - I've heard people talk about the budget slightly controversy that there's been some point of transition before getting into a strategic plan. And I think in some ways there's an analogy here. We've done some work to get things going smoothly and stably operationally but I think it's time to move into where might we be in 5 years so that's a...

((Crosstalk))

Jonathan Robinson: ...that's a helpful suggestion. Well, we really have to call it a day now, I mean, we - as far as Theresa is concerned I'm afraid.

All right so we stop the recording on that session now. And that closes it.

END