
ICANN69 | Virtual Annual General – Joint ICANN Board and ALAC
Monday, October 19, 2020 - 09:00 to 10:00 CEST

FRANCO CARRASCO: We are now at the top of the hour and this session will now begin.

I.T., please start the recording.

[This meeting is being recorded]

FRANCO CARRASCO: Hello and welcome everybody to the Joint Meeting between the ICANN Board and ALAC on Monday, October 19th, 2020. My name is Franco Carrasco from the ICANN staff, and I will be the remote participation manager for this meeting.

Before we get started, I would like to provide some brief information. Please note that we are holding this meeting as a Zoom Webinar. Be advised that the floor of this session is reserved exclusively for interaction between the ICANN Board and the ALAC members.

We, therefore, have the members of both groups promoted to panelist today and are the only ones with the ability to speak.

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.

For our panelists, please raise your hand in Zoom in order to join the queue to participate. All panelists are muted by default, so please proceed to unmute yourself when you are given the floor.

Before speaking, please ensure that you have all of your other app notifications muted and to clearly state your name and affiliation for the record. Bear in mind that the Board will only take questions from the constituency with whom they are in session. Consequently, the Q&A pod is disabled in this Webinar.

This session includes realtime transcription, which you can view by clicking on the "closed caption" button in the Webinar toolbar. We also have available interpretation services in English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Arabic and Russian. Please see the session information in the chat to learn how to access them.

For all participants in this meeting, you may post comments in the chat. To do so, please use the drop-down menu in the chat box below and select "respond to all panelists and attendees." This will also allow everyone to see your comments. Note that private chats are only possible in Zoom Webinars amongst panelists. Therefore, any message sent by a panelist or standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by everyone else.

Please note that this meeting is being recorded and chat sessions are being archived.

Finally, we kindly ask everyone in this meeting to abide by the Expected ICANN Standards of Behavior. You may view this on the link provided in the Zoom chat.

Having said this, I will now give the floor to Maarten Botterman, chair of the ICANN Board.

Maarten, the floor is yours.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you very much, Franco, for that. And, welcome, everybody to this meeting of the ICANN Board with ALAC. I'm fully cognizant of the fact that for some you it's the middle of the night, beginning of the night, or very early in the morning, in particular for the Americas. And for others it may be more convenient timing. Here in Europe, it's normal morning hours. Africa as well, most of Africa as well.

And as we just heard from Maureen in the Cook Islands, it's 9:00 at night.

So please note that this is true for everybody, both for the community, also for the Board, and also for the staff, the Organization, that is making all this possible.

So next to missing the social interaction that we are used to during face-to-face meetings and that we learned to value over the years, the other thing is that having to participate across time zones in the world is, for sure, a downside of global virtual meetings.

The positive side is you don't have to leave your family. You don't have to leave your home. And you can join any session of interest without having to travel, even if it's just for one or two sessions that you have a key interest in. And that is what it is. And we make the best of it together.

So looking forward to this session very much. ALAC has been very active throughout the week already and more is to come.

But for this session, I would like to give the floor to Leon, the chair of it from our side.

Leon, the floor is yours.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Maarten. This is Leon Sanchez.

It's a pleasure to be with the ALAC again. Coming back home is always good, as I always say. And we have a pretty packed agenda for an hour that we have of calls. So I would like to jump

right into the issues that we have on the agenda without further ado.

So we have pretty much still two topics to address. The first one is that we will be hearing from the ALAC on responding to the Board's question on the MSM discussion. And for this, we will be having two speakers, Marita Moll and Sebastien Bachollet.

And then we will hold -- we will exchange some views between the ALAC and the Board.

And after, we'll go to answering the questions that the At-Large Advisory Committee has posed to the Board, which are two questions -- two main questions. And we will as well hold a brief discussion after trying to address the questions. After that, Maureen and Maarten will wrap up the session and we'll go back to our activities.

So with no further ado, I would like to kindly ask -- I believe it's Marita to kindly address the first issue to the Board's question on the MSM.

So, Marita, you have the floor.

MARITA MOLL:

Good morning, Leon. Good morning, everyone. Marita Moll, for the record. Thanks very much for having us here, even at 3:00 a.m. in the morning for me.

I do have some prepared notes. I wouldn't dare try to say anything too sensible at this time.

I think our entire session is going to be mostly centered around MSM one way or the other.

So we're really happy for an opportunity to -- (audio drop). And thank you for actually making it your topic of discussion.

In preparation for this session, I went through the new paper that was brought out on MSM, released on Wednesday. I looked for areas of change or improvement -- and improvement as a result of suggestions made by the community. For what this paper was trying to accomplish, suggesting improvements for three priority areas, it was pretty well scoped and didn't change a great deal.

And I think the reason for that is -- well, it is. The reason for that is that this particular project has taken on a bit of a different trajectory from where we were back in Montreal at the end of 20-- in the fall, yes, of 2019. It seems like a long time ago.

Various speakers at that time were taking on various responsibilities. We all remember that.

From my point of view, anyways, and I haven't been leading the discussions on this on our side, there has been a bit of confusion about how this project was evolving, right from the time that project became an appendix in a financial plan.

We appear to be headed in the other direction. We can feel it. And there were good reasons for that, not disputing that at all.

But for us those trying to keep up with a lot of stuff, that change was not, as far as I know, clearly articulated until it says in the current paper, page 5, a previous iteration of the work plan identified owners for each of the work areas and asked for community input, et cetera, et cetera. And then to avoid overburdening anyone, the approach to the work plan was updated.

So just to put it bluntly, we could have used that information really right up -- a long time ago. It kind of changes the way we addressed the plan.

What we see here now is a new work plan and a plan that's focusing on efficiency. Actually, we could have started with that idea that the system needed to be more efficient than not than

put us through the entire process of reimagining the system. But effectiveness is still the goal, and that goes beyond efficiency.

So one thing we really want to say is that communication on this is really crucial. Otherwise, we may be in danger of losing our way.

My second point, also, is on something that I see in the new paper which notes that the paper has been updated to incorporate the most recent public comments and to remove "seeking community input" as that task has been completed.

Well, I know we all say it's been completed in this particular moment in time, but we truly hope that statement is not true. Community input becomes more important and not less important as we move into implementation. And saw in the comments, including those coming from ALAC, actually mentioned that an outside facilitator to manage communications, make progress on this project might still be useful. And we wonder if you might consider reinstating the project in that way. It could be useful.

It was useful before it brought us to a certain point, but we all do need to be on the very same page in order to move ahead with this.

Another point we wanted to bring up is the use of the word "priority." And we're not the only people in the community who have said this in the last two papers. The word "priority" is being used in two different ways. It's being used to say, Let's do this first. And then sometimes it's being used in a way that implies this is more important. Possibly that is not the intention, can be misinterpreted. I would point out that in the original paper where we were asked to prioritize, we were asked to identify what caused low-hanging fruit, issues that are more acceptable. And there's a ranking at that time of time and resources than (indiscernible) a ranking of importance.

Our issues are already condensed -- (audio drops). And we don't want to end up in (indiscernible) because -- (indiscernible) -- I think that would really be a wrong way for us to go after having done all this sorting.

That brings me to my next point, the remaining three projects that somehow seem to be hanging off a limb. I've heard twice during this session of meetings in the last two weeks both from Göran and from Maarten that there is no intention to drop off those last three points: Complexity; culture, trust and silos; and roles and responsibilities.

But the limited time resources -- the paper notes that limited time and resources, the Board proposes that the community

revisit topics later in the (indiscernible). And then in another part, the paper notices that -- the paper said that issues may be revisited in the future as progress -- (indiscernible).

The word "may" in the second instance does not inspire confidence. And it's not -- we're not sure that when we read that, we can't be sure that there's a commitment (indiscernible) issues on the table.

ALAC has asked for a time line to be established in which we can continue looking at the issues. On that we set up something that forces us to look at those issues again and again, so that we don't kind of lose track --

LEON SANCHEZ: Marita, Marita, sorry to interrupt you. We seem to have some audio issues with your audio. So if you could try to speak a bit louder or closer to the mic, that would be helpful.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Leon, did most of that not come through at all?

LEON SANCHEZ: No, I think most came through, but it was a little bit broken. But I think the way you are speaking now seems to be much clearer.

MARITA MOLL:

Okay. The point I just went through was that we want to make sure that those last three issues that seem to be hanging in various parts of the paper, it looks as though there's not a huge demand to keep on looking at.

The ALAC has asked for the time line to be established to look at where we are with those issues, but that we do something in any case to make sure that those are continuously put back on -- under the microscope to make sure where we are in addressing all six issues, not just the top three that have been identified as the (indiscernible) -- very nicely identified. And there are plenty of programs (indiscernible) -- to make sure that we are moving ahead with priority and scoping.

To end, I would just like to say that we have spent a lot of time and effort in what I would say is renovating the kitchen in the house. But if we only address those two issues, we would be ignoring that (indiscernible).

There's one other part that I would like Alan to talk about, which is the number three issue on the list that talks about consensus. And there's some very particular issues around consensus that we would like to bring out here.

Alan, can you speak?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Marita.

Alan, I would kindly to ask you to keep it brief because we still have to hear from Sebastien Bachollet and then open it up for discussion.

ALAN GREENBERG: I always try to keep it brief.

I guess I'll summarize very quickly. The inclusiveness and making sure that everyone is heard is one of the items that is listed as being really important.

We have some strong concerns that the PDP -- some of the aspects of PDP 3.0 are not synergistic with this but, in fact, go against that. And that's really worrisome because the concept of -- for instance, how the EPDP was put together strongly limits who can speak and who can participate. And if the GNSO did not believe that that group was an important part of the PDP, then they were excluded.

And if that goes forward, then the whole nature of the PDP changes. It goes back much more to the original PDP prior to the first GNSO review when work groups were created and essentially says this is a closed group making decisions on their own behalf.

So I think this is going to have to be something that's monitored going forward and making sure that we can really ensure that our policies do consider all of the issues that need to be brought to the table. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Alan. So with that, I would like to now give the floor to Sebastien Bachollet, chair of EURALO for his intervention with regard to ATRT3 and how this intersects with MSM.

So, Sebastien, you have the floor.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Thank you very much, Leon. Sebastien Bachollet speaking.

And as Alan, I am not anymore an ALAC member and I am not anymore Board member. I am very happy that you consider us to come to this meeting and to talk as it is an ALAC and Board meeting.

I will try to talk about what is a link between the multistakeholder model and the ATRT3. As a global thing, we need to take into account that ATRT, and not just 3 but 1, 2 and now 3, was and I hope it's still at the paramount of this organization. That means that it reviews the Board. It reviews

the other reviews. It reviews a lot of other topics. And it is the place where we try to set up the view as much as possible global.

And we know that we were not able due to time and topics to take everything particularly linked with evolution of the organization. But I really feel -- no, we really feel that the proposal made by ATRT3 must taken into account at first and not because the proposal are more important than the other but because the body is the more important one in this organization as it was set up during and after the transition with the U.S. government.

And some of the discussion are going in other groups, and that's good. But at the end, it must concentrate in one place and now it is the Board to decide what to do. It's a little bit strange sometimes when the Board have to decide something about themselves, but why not?

And here, one of the reason it's important to have this link between the multistakeholder model and ATRT3 is that there are some, if not all, the proposal. And there are -- five of them in the document are important for the evolution of the multistakeholder model within ICANN.

But one is particularly important from our point of view. It's what we have called the holistic review. And if you can go to the

next slide, sometimes a design it's better than a long speech. It will allow me to be short.

But the idea here was to put on the table what was done before the ATRT3 proposal and what might happen in the next part.

And as you see one thing appears, it's last blue boxes or even purple boxes. It's what we call the holistic review. And we, really ATRT3, think it's -- not just ATRT3, ATRT3, ALAC, and At-Large consider that this is something need to go on at the time suggested by ATRT3 because it will help to frame what is the evolution.

And I want just to take one personal example as it is -- and it's outside of ICANN. How is different stakeholders are organized? It's important for any organization who set up a multistakeholder system. And in AFNIC, the French registry for .FR and other TLDs, we face this. And why it's complicated? It's because like in ICANN, the relationship between the organization of the multistakeholder and the elections, the selection of people, are linked with that.

And what was done in 2002 with the end of the DNSO, the creation of the GNSO and the ccNSO and other changes, it was in 2002. And now we have to have a broader look of what is the best for ICANN in the future.

And we think really that this holistic review must go on as soon as possible. And now that it's in your hand, Mr. and Mrs. Member of the Board. And I will stop here. Thank you very much for listening.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Sebastien.

So I would, first of all, like to thank the ALAC and Marita and yourself and Alan for commenting on the issue that we post as a question to you. And I would also like to try to provide a little bit of discussion here with my colleagues. So I would like to ask Mandla Msimang to comment first on the evolution of the multistakeholder model.

Mandla?

MANDLA MSIMANG:

Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is Mandla for the record, Mandla Msimang from the ICANN Board.

Thank you very much, Leon. And thank you for the questions that have been posed. We've appreciated actually and really taken into account the comments that we've received and like the robust discussion ALAC has brought to the table on this issue.

Just -- I'll deal with only a few of the queries that have been raised. And let me apologize for not having video. My reception doesn't seem to be very good.

I will -- so I will deal with just two issues to start with and then hand over to some of my colleagues.

The first, I think, will be the issue of community input at this stage of the discussions. And I think it's important to note that the multistakeholder model, as ALAC knows, is constantly evolving and can't evolve and can't improve without getting input from the community. And we've reached where we are right now through a consultative process that started last year when we initiated the project. And it's correct that we are now at implementation stage. But implementation stage, now that the paper has been processed, does not at all mean that community involvement is over.

Implementation stage means we are now converting the plan -- the work plan into a set of proposed actions and will allocate resources to that and then will schedule -- we'll put out a schedule for implementation according to the agreed-upon levels of priority. So it's not I think at all that this is where the discussion ends. And that's one of the reasons why this was highlighted as a Board topic because we want to still hear more

from you and from the rest of community as we get into implementation.

So I just wanted to highlight that one point and thank you for raising it.

There's also another issue that I wanted to address and it's a broader -- just give a bit of background on how we got to the three priority areas of the six. And really, I hope, give you comfort that these three priority areas don't mean that they're the last three. I'm even uncomfortable calling them "the last three" because they haven't fallen off, but we're hoping that they'll be addressed through the rest of the five years of the operating plan time frame and they also might be addressed because to an extent they're symptomatic of the topics that have been identified as the three high-priority topics. So those would be the prioritization of the work and the efficient use of resources, the precision and scoping of the work, consensus, representation, and inclusivity topics.

So while those, through community input, through the public consultation process have been identified as the first to be addressed, it's not that they are the only to be addressed. I think really throughout the process, we have been at pains to get this across. And that's for -- the only reason we had to prioritize was, one, in recognition of the overburdening of the community and

the amount of work that's going on in different pockets of ICANN and trying to use this to make sure we complement existing efforts like ATRT3 and the PDP 3.0 process, which I know there's further questions on.

We also want to make sure that we address any gaps that have been identified. So, really, I think the priority areas -- and my colleagues from the Board can step in if I've missed out on anything. But the priority areas are not the only areas. They are just the starting point to deal with this large topic that we have in front of us.

So I think I'll hand over --

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks so much, Mandla. And I see Marita's hand up, so I will go to her before I go to Matthew.

Maybe I should go to Matthew first because maybe what Matthew has to say could actually address Marita's question. So if you allow me, Marita, I will go to Matthew first. And after that, I will come back to you.

So, Matthew.

MARITA MOLL: Go ahead.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Marita.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Leon and Marita. Thank you very much for the very thorough set of questions.

I think Mandla has covered a couple of. Let me just deal with a couple more. On the issue of prioritization, Mandla has commented on this. But let me just say that there's in no way -- just reinforce there is in no way does this prioritization mean that we are not going to address the six issues in totality. It's just that it was felt in going through the public comments and when looking at the issue set, that there was a good set of complementarity and possibly overlap between some of the issues. And it was felt that by addressing those particular three issues first in order that we would probably and inevitably address some of the issues that are encompassed in the last three questions -- well, the last three issues. Just so reinforce the importance of that and you understand that we will -- we will be getting to all of them.

In terms of the time line, we're very cognizant of the importance of setting out a time line. It is outlined in the paper that that's one of the priority issues. That will largely fall to the new implementation function in Org. So we'll be working with the implementation function in Org and Xavier to set out a time line for that. Obviously, that will be shared as that evolves.

What we have to recognize is that this is an ongoing process and there's a huge number of linkages between what we're trying to do here and other priority areas that we have to deal with that also touch on planning, such as Sebastien said, ATRT3 and a number of other reviews that have similar act on planning and on prioritization and scoping of work, including other Board work. So all of this is a bit of a package, if you will, and what we anticipate is this will unfold over, as Mandla said, the rest of the operating plan.

And then just a final comment because we haven't touched upon this, obviously the next step in this as we outline is we are moving forward to an evaluation methodology because we can't assess the degree to which the MSM model has evolved if we don't have something to assess it with. So that's the next step in that.

And as a part of that process, inevitably, we will see that other issues may arise that we may need to address or some things

may change in prioritization. And there will be more community engagement on that as well. Just wanted to make sure we have a sense of how this is going to be dealt with going forward. Thanks, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Matthew.

So now I would like to go to Marita.

MARITA MOLL: Okay. Thank you, Leon. Marita Moll speaking. I'm going to leave my video off. I think that might help a bit.

Absolutely hear what you're saying, Mandla and Matthew. And we realize that this -- there's a lot of wheels in motion here. There are a number of structural changes going on at the Org level. I have heard Xavier made a very good representation of some of those back in the pre-ICANN week.

I think -- can we please make sure that we're all getting the same message at the same time so that all communities clearly understand what is being dealt with. That would really help because now I feel that the message is getting a bit scattered. Whereas, previously, it was focused on our multistakeholder meetings that were taking place in the public meetings. And we

all went away with the same information. We all had (indiscernible).

That's how we got here. So that's kind of what we really want to focus on, that part of the project, making sure we all get the same information. Thank you.

Passing it over to Jonathan who is actually going to deal with the evaluation part.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Marita. Before we go to Jonathan, I would like to, of course, thank you for your comments that there is room for improvement. And as my colleagues have said, we're trying to do our best effort to bring uniform information to you all. And this is, of course, an ongoing exercise and we have to look at the documents. By "documents," I mean the strategic plan and the operating plan as documents. So it will continue to move for us as things evolve.

Also, before we go to the next part of the agenda, I would like to kindly ask Avri if she could comment on Sebastien's presentation on ATRT3.

So, Avri, could you, please, add a couple of comments.

AVRI DORIA:

Sure. This is Avri speaking.

I just wanted to comment briefly on where the Board is in looking at the ATRT3. First, it's a very, you know, large set of things to look into, think about, and we have a caucus that's going through all these.

In terms of the reviews, both the specific and organizational and the wider review, what we're doing at the moment in the OEC is basically sort of saying, if we apply this model, how does it work. Does it meet the requirements that we've been collecting over the years about issues with reviews? Does it actually meet the schedule priority in terms of maintaining its consistency and never ending up with too many things ganged up? How does it affect the bylaws? Do we need to change the bylaws to accommodate this view of the reviews? And if we do, then that kicks off the process. So we're very involved in these couple months because we need to give a sort of response by December in terms of doing that analysis.

But very much value the thought that went into it and the suggested process, and now we're really going through a period of sort of testing it and trying to understand its implications.

I hope that answers the question. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Avri.

So any other comments from any of my colleagues? I see Sebastien's hand is up. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Leon, I believe there are other colleagues from the Board who want to take the floor, other people from At-Large.

But just to say in brief, ATRT3 spent few months in the discussion of this proposal. It's not came just by handout and we think we see something going on, if possible, and we put it.

We really discuss all the questions, Avri, you raise. And happy that you, the Board, redo part of the work that was done by ATRT3. But, really, we have done the job and it's why we came up with this proposal. And, yeah, we (indiscernible) there is a need for bylaws changes. But it's quite normal after an ATRT because as we review the reviews, there are consequences on the bylaws.

But we are -- and you know, as your disposal as a ATRT3 member, and I'm sure At-Large and ALAC also as well as the Board will continue the discussion. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Sebastien.

Avri.

AVRI DORIA: Just to quickly comment, there was no view that ATRT3 hadn't done its work. But the Board also needs to do its complete due diligence to make sure we understand. We also need to take the various comments from other groups into account, taking into account also the degree of self-determination that there is in the SOs and ACs. So certainly understand how much work and analysis the ATRT3 did, but that doesn't absolve us from making sure and didn't say that doing a bylaws change was at all problematic in terms of a possibility. It just has its own process that has to be gone through in order to do so. So thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Avri. And I would like to emphasize what you just said, because I see these different tracks as complementing themselves rather than substituting each one another. So it is good you highlighted this. And, of course, I think it helps our community to understand how we do our work and how we assess the different situations that come to the Board and what is happening in the overall environment.

So with that, I would like to move to the next agenda item. And for that, I think it's the At-Large questions to the Board. And these are going to be introduced by Jonathan Zuck and Joanna Kulesza.

So, Jonathan, I would like to now give you the floor to kindly introduce the questions that you have posed to the Board.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Can you hear me okay?

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes, we can.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Yeah. So my name for the record is Jonathan Zuck, and I am the vice chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee focused on policy. But my historical role within ICANN has been to harangue the Board endlessly on the topic of metrics. And that led to me getting the nickname of "metrics man" at one point by a former CEO.

And so somehow it's fallen on to me again to bring up this issue of measurement. There is in the new document a discussion, a little bit of evaluation, but it already begins to fall into a very

classic trap which is to say we will do these three things and we will measure our success by having done those three things. And I think that can be a very disheartening way to measure something as ethereal as the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model. I think that we need to make sure that we figure out what we consider to be the criteria of effectiveness.

The other inclination of the current draft of the document is equating "effectiveness" with "efficiency." And I'm not sure that's a sufficient definition of "effectiveness" of a multistakeholder model. And so we need to be careful that we don't fall into that trap, that our measure of effectiveness becomes how quickly we're able to complete PDPs because we've better scoped them or something like that. And we might need a more nuanced definition of "effectiveness" and a way to measure it.

So to that end, I think it would behoove the community and the Board as part of that community to define some goals around effectiveness of the multistakeholder model so that success or failure of the actions we take can actually be measured as part of the evaluation process, not just the fact that we took those actions.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Jonathan.

So anyone from my colleagues would like to react to Jonathan's question? Maybe Avri or Mandla?

AVRI DORIA: Sure. This is Avri speaking. I can basically quickly say, "Yes, Jonathan, you're right."

Everything that I've learned over the years and in courses way back when about measurements and statistics and tracking something longitudinally through a study does really demand what you're mentioning in terms of making sure that you have meaningful metrics that will, indeed, measure what it is you will need and then testing those over time. So some of the things that you've said about ways to approach it are, you know -- really do resound in terms of, yes, they are important. Let's make sure we understand them and do them right and track them over time and test them for the validity, et cetera.

So I already much agree and think that some of the processes that groups of people sitting and talking and figuring out what is a meaningful metric, how do we use it, how do we collect it legally, how do we do all those pieces of it is very important. So I thank you for the comment.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks, Avri. I guess I would like to reiterate Holly's question from the chat, which is: Is it our intention as part of this implementation phase to open up the definition of "effectiveness" and a set of objectives associated with the improvement of the multistakeholder program to be a public consultation as well?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Leon, may I?

LEON SANCHEZ: Absolutely, Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yeah, thanks. Jonathan, it's a great question. When we put out the document for public comment, we were looking for these kinds of inputs from the community.

And what we see as implementation occurs -- and as I mentioned before, it's not just about the multistakeholder model evolution in the context of what we're talking about now. It's across a range of other issues and initiatives that we have to take into account.

So I think at this point in time, we've really -- what you've seen in the paper is more or less where our thinking is at the moment and we recognize that this is very much -- when you do -- when you try to measure the efficiency, effectiveness of the multistakeholder model, there's going to be a part that's very much driven by metrics. There's going to be a part that's going to be driven by how well have we accomplished the areas of scoping and prioritization and things like that. And then there is also going to be probably very much a subjective element to it as well that we'll have to take into account.

As a part of that and as that is implemented and underway, we're very much welcoming community input. So if there's ideas about metrics, about how we should proceed with the multistakeholder model, I think that would be very helpful as this evolves over time.

It's going to take time to get that up and running and to get those processes --

JONATHAN ZUCK:

Matt, it's Jonathan Zuck again for the record. Does the board have a working definition of "effectiveness" from which they are operating at this point? Or is that something that's still up for discussion as well? Because I sort of hear the words

"effectiveness" and "efficiency" used interchangeably by a bit too much perhaps. Because it seems like there's an awful lot more to "effectiveness"

MATTHEW SHEARS:

I think we address that in the paper in part, but I'm not 100% sure. I don't know. And, also, we've addressed it -- and we've looked at it elsewhere in other work the Board has undertaken in various board papers. But I don't have an immediate answer for you in "effectiveness" and "efficiency" and a specific definition we are working to at this point. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ:

It seems we haven't been efficient enough to define what "effective" means. So, no, I mean, input from all of you, it's very important at this phase. I don't think there's a silver bullet or universal definition of what "effectiveness" or "efficiency" is. It may more from one situation to another. So that is why it is important to get this feedback and this input from all of you at this point.

I see Göran's hand is up. Göran.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Thank you. So speaking to many of the community members, I think -- and being sort of a (indiscernible) of what they say, I'm a little bit afraid of the word "effectiveness" when it comes to ICANN because we can -- we might be more effective but does that produce inclusiveness?

Many people from the outside would look at ICANN and say, Hey, guys, you are not effectiveness.

On the other hand, we are not meant to be effective. We are meant to do policies when it really matters and through a bottom-up multistakeholder model.

I want to caution the word of setting a benchmark of something that prevents us from being the kind of organization we are.

So, I mean, the insanity of ICANN should always be there. Maybe that's the one we should measure instead.

I mean, if we look at ICANN, we are very effective because we do produce policies when it's needed. So just want to make sure we never forget the reason why we have a multistakeholder bottom-up process which is not to be effective. It's to be inclusive and produce results when it's really needed. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Göran.

MANDLA MSIMANG: Thank you very much. Mandla Msimang for the record. I think Jonathan's question, as Avri said, is a very important one. And I think it's one of the discussion points in the document but not so much about effectiveness but about -- or defining "effective" but how do we define "success." So we had a discussion with the community around that or trying to seek that. And so I think in terms of language that might have been the difference.

But we are trying to -- how do we stop measuring? When is -- Oh, my gosh, my phone. So sorry. Sorry about that.

When have we properly measured? And the way we captured it is how do you define success rather than effectiveness and efficiency and that terminology. Just wanted to add that input.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Mandla.

Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Thanks. Thanks for your comment. I think you are actually zeroing in on my concern and the concern of the greater At-

Large community and perhaps the ICANN community generally, is that we too easily conflate "effectiveness" and "efficiency." If I were to think about the effectiveness of a multistakeholder model, it would have something to do with its multistakeholderism. In other words, is it effective in hearing all voices? It effective in terms of its representation of a balance of interests between stakeholders? Those would be measures of effectiveness as much as any mention of efficiency. And so I'm worried even as you're using the word "effectiveness" almost again interchangeably with "efficiency," I share your concern, Göran, about efficiency becoming the mother of exclusivity, which is again why we are looking at -- somewhat askance at the PDP 3.0 and it's first implementation in the EPDP process because the argument could be made that there was some concession to efficiency there at the sacrifice of more balanced representation.

So effectiveness, if we were to look at what effectiveness means, it has a lot of elements associated with it beyond efficiency. And I think that's why we need to look very carefully at what we mean by that.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks, Jonathan.

If I could also comment on that, I think we are in a loop here between "effectiveness" and "efficiency." From what I'm gathering from our discussion, it would be effective to listen to everyone but it wouldn't be efficient for those who didn't get their way to actually have an outcome that didn't consider their views.

So it's a difficult balance in the formula here. You can listen to everyone, but that doesn't mean that everyone is going to get what they are actually pushing forward. That might put into question the efficiency or the effectiveness of the model.

So again, that's why during this process, it is very important to take this input, to boil it down into whatever definition we come up with. It might be a Board exercise, but it is definitely a community effort. And the Board being part of the community needs to take that into account, and the community needs to take into account that we are also part of the community. That's why this exercise and this input is so valuable to us. So thank you, thank you to that, Jonathan.

If you are okay, I would like to move to the next question the ALAC has. We are ten minutes before we end the call. So for that, I'd have Joanna Kulesza. Joanna.?

JOANNA KULESZA: Thank you, Leon. This is Joanna Kulesza for the record. I am hoping my video is working as well.

Actually, the next agenda item or the next question falls directly in line with the discussion we were just having, speaking about inclusiveness or diversity is the core of the few items you will find on the slides before us.

What this question does, it is trying to reflect the internal discussions we've had within At-Large since the beginning of this challenging time when we had to move our entire social networking online.

We've queried our members. And what you can see on the slide are the key challenges that we have identified. Indeed, the At-Large has been active during the pandemic. We've organized a number of sessions. We're playing around with the format, trying to make sure that we are as interactive and as attractive to the online audience as only possible.

This has proven somewhat successful. We enjoy high participation, and we feel like we maintain the emphasis of discussions we've had even in face-to-face meetings.

But as you can see on the slide, we've also identified challenges. What we would like these few remaining moments to focus on would be feedback from the Board on what you guys have

observed throughout the community as responses or solutions to these challenges.

Those specific challenges focus on a few items that you can see reactivated on the slide.

Jonathan mentioned the emphasis we put on metrics, and I would like to put the emphasis on inclusiveness.

Though, one thing that is unique about At-Large, and has always been unique about At-Large, is that our members usually do not have any ICANN participation in their mandate. We do it because we care. We do it because we find it fascinating. We do it because we're just curious or we like the people we work with. Face-to-face meeting added a benefit to the work we have done online.

Now, this being taken away has been observed by our members as a crucial element that weakens this social fabric that we have weaved over the years. The question is: How do we prevent that? How do we enhance this network that has operated so efficiently?

There have been a few ideas thrown around. You can see the responses for the temperature of the room also reflected in our question. How do we make the environment more engaging?

We would be curious to hear from the Board on your ideas or experiences commenting from the entire community.

Better recognition of volunteer commitment is strongly linked to metrics. We welcome the Board's initiative to offer funding for Internet access during online meetings. We note that the RALO chairs have approached the Board with a suggestion of another form of compensation for the time that is offered to online meetings.

And this has, indeed, proven to be a challenge for the community. We've received numerous comments from the community members saying they need to focus on their day job during this challenging time.

So that is one of the issues we are, indeed, facing, trying to find a good solution to solve it. And we would welcome any feedback on how to do that efficiently and fairly. So throwing money at the problem does not seem to be the easy solution. We might need to think in a more complex manner.

And, eventually, there has been talk within ICANN and beyond of trying to change the format to smaller, regional meetings, maybe focused working groups, et cetera, et cetera.

So I would appreciate using the remaining minutes to hear back from the Board on what tools, measures, methods you guys see

to better support inclusiveness within the multistakeholder policy development. Thank you very much.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Joanna. I think Maarten would like to provide some input on that.

Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Very happy to do that. And thanks, Joanna, thanks. I know this is, indeed, part of our wider ALAC discussion as well.

First, these times is not what anybody invited. And we feel and try to be a point of stability as much as we can in all this uncertainty and provide in the best way a solid platform for moving forward.

We are aware that these are new times, and we are constantly seeking also for input how to do it better and input from the community and from ALAC is really very welcome and that our pilot to see whether we can help with getting a program to reimburse additional Internet costs is an example. And we're going to look at how it's being used and how it's been appreciated afterwards. It's just an example of trying to see how we can help best.

So we're keenly aware that across the community and the multistakeholder model, there's many that participate because they care rather than because they paid for it.

ALAC, a very important group but also even in the contracted parties, I can see small businesses participating and also putting in their time, not because they get more money but because they're interested. This is true for all of us.

So with all the solutions that we're thinking of, I think the discussion within ALAC could stimulate and come out with very good proposals that we can take further.

And I would really also encourage you to also involve and reach out to other communities to see how as a whole system we can come to best ways of supporting ourselves, finding the way forward in that time.

So we are really out to explore more frequent, constructive ways in how to do it. The surveys, one step in it, you've seen the discussion that is planned for shortly later this morning on how to best interact in COVID times. And please do participate.

Also, the organization is very actively reaching out both to the At-Large community and other communities to see how they can best support the human interaction and the practical interaction in these times.

So thank you again very much for the points you make, and let's get it as concrete as possible. We will not have a single solution at one point in time, but this is something where we can improve together step by step.

So I hope that helps. We really are actively reaching out for that and looking forward for input and for opportunities for the support in the multistakeholder model also in this way to function in coming together.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Maarten. So we are two minutes before the top of the hour and that means we need to wrap up.

So I would like to ask Maureen and Maarten to kindly provide closing remarks.

So, Maureen?

MAUREEN HILYARD:

Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Leon.

Thank you for enabling us to be part of this discussion. It's been such an important issue. And I'd like to thank Mandla, Matthew, Avri, Göran and Maarten for their interventions.

I think what's really helped us now is to get more clarification about what the Board is envisaging. But, also, it will allow us to prepare our future thoughts on your proposal as we sort of like delve into a little bit more deeply into the implementation process.

But I think what Marita said was really important about the communication of the messages, as things develop across the community. We don't want -- so that we're all on the same playing field, including how we might define and measure effectiveness or success. That's been an interesting discussion.

But we all want to be working consistently toward the same goals that the Board has prioritized at this time. But I think that from what we've actually sort of like been talking about today, I really -- I think my At-Large team will join me in thanking you because we certainly appreciated the dialogue. Thank you very much, Maarten, and your team.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you, Maureen. Maarten?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thanks. Thanks, Maureen. Thanks, Leon. I guess it's clear that together we are committed to continuous improvement of what we're doing, and ATRT engagement has proved that the multistakeholder model process that we've engaged in is underpinning that. And in a way your questions and suggestions add to that.

So in that, I thought it was a very fruitful discussion and I really appreciate it. Noting that, for instance, PDP 3.0 for me -- things came across that I wasn't aware of before.

But this is a GNSO process and good to also discuss that with GNSO.

And, also, for how we deal best with our meeting, effectively interacting with each other -- I hardly use the word "effective" or "efficient" after this morning's discussion. But effectively interacting together is something we really care about, and we also would really like to see your continued input in that.

We have a session later on, and there's a survey out there. And that is not to come to a definite solution. But this will be input to further improving our way forward together. So thanks for your always constructive contributions. And really look forward to progress ICANN together with you. So thank you for that.

Back to you, Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much, Maarten. And thank you, everyone, for the discussion. I think it has been a good session. As some signal in the chat, we should continue to do this more often and continue the ball rolling, so to speak.

And I would like to thank everyone for attending. Thank you to the interpreters. Thank you to the support staff, the technical staff, and everyone who has made possible this call. Thank you, everyone, for joining. And see you soon in some other Zoom room or meeting.

Thank you. And have a great meeting. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]