
ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions - Joint-ICANN Board and CPH
Thursday, October 15, 2020 - 16:00 to 17:00 CEST

[This meeting is being recorded]

FRANCO CARRASCO: Hello, and welcome, everybody, to the joint meeting between the ICANN Board and CPH on Thursday, October 15th, 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 and important 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 CPH members. We therefore have the members of both groups promoted to panelists today and are the only ones able to speak.

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 your other app

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.

notifications muted and to clearly state your name and affiliation for the records.

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 on this webinar.

This session includes real-time transcription, which you can view by clicking on the "closed caption" button on the webinar tool bar.

You also have available interpretation services in English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, and Russian. Please see the information posted in the chat in order 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 dropdown menu in the chat pod below and select "respond to all panelists and attendees." This will allow everyone to see your comments. Note that private chats are only possible in Zoom webinars among panelists. Therefore, any message sent by a panelist or a standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by everyone else.

Please note 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 on the Zoom chat.

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

Maarten, the floor is all yours.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Thank you, Franco. Thank you, everybody, for joining us for this session with the Contracted Party House.

It's been a long week already, and we've got one more week to go. I'm fully cognizant of the fact that for some of you, this is very early morning, in particular for the Americas. And for others, it may be more convenient timing. Please note that in this, that we recognize this to be the case for all, for community, people from the organization who helped make all this work, and even for us Board members ourselves as well.

So next to missing the social interaction that we're used to during face-to-face meetings, having to participate from all time zones in the world is for sure a downside of global virtual meetings. On the positive side is that you don't have to leave your family behind and that 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.

It is what it is, and we need to make the best of it. But let's recognize to each other that we're all confronted with this and that this is the best we can do at this very moment.

We look forward to see how we can improve on that, and for that, we engage with the community in all kind of ways to make sure that together we find the best way forward in these circumstances that nobody wanted.

So we're really looking forward to engage with the Contracted Party House. And I'd like to give the floor to Becky to chair this session from our side.

Becky, please.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you so much.

And good morning, good afternoon, good evening, good middle of the night to everybody, wherever you are. And thanks for joining us.

We have some interesting questions here, and I think that the -- we'll start with the question that you have raised to us. I just

want to turn it over to folks from the Contracted Party House, if you have any introductory comments that you'd like to make.

I see -- I see none.

All right --

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

This is Ashley Heineman. I apologize. I can't figure out how to actually raise my hand. So my apologies.

I wanted to first thank you all for taking the time just to speak with us and for tackling our questions first, because I think they're quite dense. And I think it puts a lot of onus on you all to answer us. And apologies in past that we haven't come to you with more constructive thoughts on how to address these.

But, you know, we're just really interested to, you know, how -- there's nothing new with these questions that we pose here, for the most part, in terms of, you know, there's -- with each crisis point, there comes criticism with the model.

And really curious to get your impressions on how to address these issues. And look forward and happy to go into more detail as to what we mean by these questions, too, if that's necessary.

So thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thanks.

Donna, did you want to -- have a --

DONNA AUSTIN: No. I think Ashley's got it. Just welcome. Good to be here.
Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Great. Thank you so much.

This really is an important question. And let me just begin by saying we don't think that the EPDP represents a failure in the multistakeholder model. We think it actually is a success, that the limits on what could be done in terms of policy development were established by law, by GDPR and other data protection laws in particular. And it's our view that the policy development proceeded in the constraints that neither ICANN nor the multistakeholder model nor individual members of the ICANN community can control.

So it is not our view that it was [sic] a success. I think we've expressed that. I know Göran has issued a blog congratulating the community on the work and -- the work going forward and the work that has been done.

I don't -- I think that we will -- we are continuing and org is continuing to have conversations in Europe on GDPR-related issues, seeking legal clarity along the lines that might allow a broader range of policy considerations if they were resolved. But I think it's our view that we all had to work within the -- within the law and within the constraints imposed by applicable law. And the multistakeholder model is not designed to route around law.

I'm going to ask Göran if he has anything further to say on that particular point, because I know the blog was something that he was -- he felt very strongly about in terms of making sure that the community understood that we thought this was a success, not a failure.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Yeah. I don't think it was a failure. I think that the -- I think that the PDP came as far as it could when it came to it, because the recommendations that the GNSO Council has accepted is as far as you can go.

And I think that some of the people who are now criticizing it, they are rightly so disappointed. But I think that the disappointment is channeled in the wrong direction, because if they thought that the SSAD model could sort of solve a legal

issue and sort of change the underlying principles of how this law works, they were wrong, which we have been saying all along, and I've been saying all along as well.

And a part of my job is -- because I actually believe in the multistakeholder model. I should take away "actually." I do truly believe in the multistakeholder model, and I truly believe in the ICANN way of doing this. So I take any chance to go and say that.

You can also see the letters that we do to the director generals and the E.U. and everybody else, also defend the model. Because we clearly say, the ICANN community did what it could. Now it's up to the other ones. And it's clearly so that if the European Commission, the European Union, member states in Europe, or the data protection authorities don't want to do anything, they are happy with the situation. If they don't take actions now or answer our questions, they're happy with the access and the way people or organizations get access to the WHOIS data. And then ICANN cannot do anything with that, because it becomes a political issue.

I don't know, despite what law enforcements and other ones says to us, they probably say the same things in that constellation. But it seems like if they don't change or do anything, they're happy. And then we are where we are.

Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thanks. And I see that Rubens has asked, is an EPDP an indication of issues, even if it's just a show by disgruntled parties?

And I think that's absolutely correct. There are issues about the multistakeholder model that we are all grappling with. And I think those are things that we need to continue to work on. And we particularly appreciate the sentiment in your question about how can the Contracted Party House support the Board.

I wanted to turn this over to Mandla and Matthew to talk a little bit about the work on the multistakeholder model that's going on. And then I hope we can just get into a freeform discussion about how we can work with each other and support each other going forward while we're in virtual mode, but even after we're back in face-to-face mode, at least in part, how we can make the multistakeholder model work better and make sure that the fact that you don't always get what you want is always pointed to as a failure of the model as opposed to an outcome of the model.

So Matthew and Mandla, who would like to just provide a little bit of background on where we are on the evolution work?

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Becky. I'll kick it off, and then Mandla will pick it up.

This is an incredibly important issue. And as Becky has said and as you are clearly stating here in your question, which is, how do we ensure the multistakeholder model continues to thrive within this new context?

We've been talking about how do we make the multistakeholder model more effective. But that process kicked off before the current environment, when what used to be a supplement to meetings, getting on a Zoom call, has now become the medium that we have to deal with. And I think that changes the dynamic a little bit.

But in a way, when one thinks about this, some of the key things that we have been working on as a part of the multistakeholder model evolution are as important going forward as they were before this new environment and before the pandemic. And those things get to issues around prioritization, around scoping, around finding consensus. Because the more that we can scope, the more that we can prioritize, the easier the work becomes, the less the work is cumbersome, and the more focused the work is. And in many ways, we need to get to that point where we are working on prioritization, on scoping, and on other key factors as we're evolving the multistakeholder model, just as

much now, if not more so during the pandemic, as we were in the past.

Let me turn it over to Mandla, who will give you an update on where that particular issue is and where we see that going in the future.

Thanks.

Mandla?

MANDLA MSIMANG: Sorry. Just getting set up.

Thanks.

Thank you. This is Mandla Msimang, ICANN Board, just for the record.

So I think just taking off from where Matthew left off, I think -- and the questions that you've asked, it's really important that we -- that you know that the multistakeholder model is constantly evolving; right? So -- and it can't evolve and improve without the input of stakeholders and the community as a whole.

And as Matthew started saying, this process kicked off -- and I'm sure the CPH has been following it -- but was kicked off about a

year, a little bit more than a year and a half ago, early last year, when, as part of the -- the ICANN operating financial -- and financial plan review process, when the Board solicited input through a process that was led by Brian Cute. And Brian facilitated this and had chaired ATRT1 and 2 prior. And with community input, the process that he facilitated identified six main issues, six priority topics that the community thought were hampering the effectiveness of and the efficient functioning of ICANN's multistakeholder model.

So prioritization of work, efficient use of resources was high amongst those.

We put out the Board paper for comment, got comments, and once we had received those, the community input, then came out with a paper in June, which, between June and August, got a second set of comments. Then in August, we finalized the paper, which is where we are now. And the final version of the paper has been published.

So that's where we are now.

And in terms of the way forward, what we've seen is that the community really is quite overwhelmed and overstretched and doesn't really have enough bandwidth to deal with yet another project.

But the multistakeholder model and the question that you ask actually is central to what we're doing. So with all these different processes, how do we harmonize, how do we streamline and make sure that we deal with the evolution, which is one of our strategic objectives, but at the same time, don't, I guess, detract in the work that's being done.

So what we've done is, through the community input that we received, we further prioritized the six areas that were identified under the Brian Cate process, and really, I guess, streamlined them to three priority areas, which is: Prioritization of the work and efficient use of resources; the precision and scoping of the work; and then consensus representation and inclusivity.

And I think it's really important to note that that doesn't mean that the other priority areas that were identified, like roles and responsibilities and others, doesn't mean that they disappear. It just means that they'll be dealt with within the five-year operating plan period. And it also -- what we're hoping is that by addressing these first three -- prioritization, precision and scoping, and consensus and inclusivity -- we might end up addressing the other issues. They might be a side effect of those.

So the more -- so the process that we've started is really to deal with those and to make sure that the work is complementary with the existing efforts, like ATRT3 and PDP 3.0.

So where we are now is we're in implementation planning phase. And so that means that we are allocating resources, and we're just scheduling how we're going to actually move forward with this. And then still looking for your input very much on how this works out, and continuing to work with the community to carry out on these activities.

So I think that just really sums up where we are. And we -- the Board question was really about your thoughts on this. And I think the questions that you have posed already talk to the importance of this project and how we take it forward.

So I think on that note, I'll just hand over to Becky, I guess.

BECKY BURR:

Yep. So just -- thank you, Mandla and Matthew.

And just to go back to your question in particular, and some personal observations. Although we clearly benefit from having face-to-face meetings, I think many of us would say that in some ways, the exchanges that we've had between the Board and the contracted parties, for example, via these Zoom calls has actually been -- the quality of them, in fact, has improved somewhat. And partly that's because we can have them more frequently, we can have them in somewhat less formal and more

true exchanges, conversational kinds of things. And we think that that's important to take advantage of.

And so just having conversations with each other and building the kinds of bridges that enable us to understand each other and understand each other's point of view. And so the Board is noticing that in its interactions with different parts of the community. But I think it's probably something that different houses, stakeholder groups, ACs, interactions among those various parts of the community could benefit from that as well.

And the other observation is just one of the things that Maarten mentioned in his opening remarks, the time zone issue and the fact that, you know, for some people, it is the middle of the night or very, very early in the morning or literally, you know, the wee hours of the morning when these meetings kick off can increase (indiscernible). And people -- some people have been already -- we're in the first week of this, and already doing a lot of work all night and then continuing through the day.

So I think that's an additional tension that gets added to the fully remote meetings, which is people are jet lagged without being in the same place and without really no opportunity to get over being jet lagged. And I think that we should just try to be understanding about that as we interact with each other.

But more to my point, just in terms of let's -- what is it that -- what are your suggestions for how the Board and the contracted party house can interact, and how the contracted party house can interact with other parts of the community on the theory that if we're all in this together, there will be less inclination to label outcomes of failure when they are, in fact, a success.

I see Jonathan's hand, so I will turn it over to Jonathan.

JONATHAN ROBINSON: Thanks, Becky. I think what I was going to try and do here is -- looking at this slide is maybe articulate into some more -- into some partitions that may be helpful.

I mean, in terms of the evolution of the multistakeholder model, that's our collective strategic problem that we're trying to work on. In terms of the next 12 months, we have collectively a management issue to deal with. And, of course, these things interact.

And then in terms of the crisis of the PDPs, well, in some ways that's almost existential if it's not strategic. And I suppose for me I'd like to see those in something like those three different buckets.

You're right and it's a very good point. We have got 200 people on this call. There are many elements of the way in which we are working now that are improved and substantially satisfactory.

But on the other hand, the other point you are making is there is a reasonable question, say, of: Why are we cramming this in in 60 minutes immediately adjacent to an ICANN meeting when it may not be necessary? Could we doing it in a different time zone, at a different time, under different circumstances?

So I think what we can do is try and work with you to manage these different issues and to try and provide suggestions like that, that we don't simply go ahead on rails as we have -- perhaps to some of us seem to be doing and dealing -- you know, this -- for example, the evolution of the multistakeholder model, maybe we need to pare that back even further and say, again, looking at everything through the lens of the next 12 months, what is important for the next three to five years is very different to what might be important for the next 12 months. And every time we look at a set of problems or challenges to break those down and say, what can we not deal with right now or what do we urgently need to deal with in the next 12 months, I think separating that out to some extent maybe helps the problem.

So I hope that helps to perhaps provide just a slightly different view on this question and some of the thinking behind it.

Thanks, Becky, Mandla, Matthew, and colleagues.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Jonathan. All very good points. And I think that we have -- just to reiterate what I said, I think the Board has had the opportunity to interact in between and actually more frequently with different parts of the community. And that has been satisfactory. Of course, there's always the danger that, you know, the hours of time we spend talking to each other expand to fill all of the hours of the day.

But I think that in general taking advantage of opportunities to meet virtually and have a discussion about an issue as opposed to, you know, sort of writing out positions and sending them out into the ether is probably useful.

I'm going to go to Donna and then Ashley.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Thanks, Becky. Donna Austin, chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.

Just to add a little bit onto what Jonathan said and also, Becky, you said there's been more interaction with community groups during -- you know, outside of the ICANN meetings. Just for the record, we have 60 minutes today. So that will bring the Registry

Stakeholder Group up to 2 1/2 hours' interaction with the Board in what will be a 12-month period. So, you know, we certainly -- the Registry Stakeholder Group appreciates that we have an opportunity to interact with you personally as a result of our registry calls. And I know the CPH has had a conversation with, you know, yourself and Matthew, I think, once during that time. So I'm not sure that we have actually engaged more frequently outside of meetings.

But I would like to propose a suggestion to the Board. And that is to think about the contracted party house as a resource for you. You know, Becky will often come to us with questions about, well, what did you mean by that? And particularly when we put out the definition of DNS abuse that was agreed by the contracted parties house, if you have questions about that, come to us. We're happy to talk to you about it. And I'd really like to change that kind of mind-set that -- think of us as a resource to help you understand what the industry is and what contracted parties do in their day-to-day business. And we can do that on an ad-hoc basis or we can schedule sessions to Jonathan's point, over a 12-month period on issues that would be helpful for you to understand. So think of us as a resource that you can draw on when you're having conversations around issues that affect contracted parties or you have questions about

the way we do our business and how policy/legal issues actually impact us.

So I'd just like to put that out there, that we are available as a resource to the Board. Thanks, Becky.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you so much, Donna.

Maarten, did you want to respond? Donna had a question in the chat regarding a list of work efforts going on. And I think you suggested that Xavier might be able to respond to that?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN:

Yeah. No, I think, Donna, yes, we do keep closely track of what needs to be done, what's going on in the communities. And we're very well-supported by the Organization about it. They inform us during the meeting so we know what is coming to us and we can set our own priorities in addressing that, too.

But, indeed, Xavier, in your new responsibility, even more than before, I think you have a good grip of that and you facilitate those sessions.

Can you tell a bit more about what you do?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Maarten. Thank you, Becky. Can you hear me okay?

BECKY BURR: Yes.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you.

Thank you, Donna, for the point and the question in the chat. And I have the benefit of having participated to the session that you just had a few minutes ago with the CPH. And during that conversation, there was also mention of the need to prioritize work. So there's a number of things that we are all trying to do better, which is to prioritize. The GNSO Council has planning sessions on an annual basis where there's a list of activities that are reviewed and try to schedule work around that list. And I know the CPH is doing the same thing.

And I think we're all coming to the desire to be able to organize better all that work within the understanding that each group has their own priorities. But when you look at the entire community together, the list has common elements from everyone in that there is an opportunity to actually prioritize the work to get as a group together which would then have the benefit for everyone to minimize the number of different topics

that are being worked on at one time, which is, I think, a lot of the comments that your group was making earlier. There's a lot of things started and it's difficult to close topics and to finish the work. Why? Because there's so many things going on at the same time.

So in the planning process, we are trying to organize for the next few months and on an annual basis a phase that currently doesn't exist but that we would like to design and insert in the planning process where we can gather together the community groups and their list of priorities for the upcoming couple years so that there is an opportunity with that exercise to actually make a decision together on what we think we should all be working on as a community which then can be taken as an input for the Org to provide support on that list of priorities.

So this is a relatively simple concept. We haven't really tried this in the past in a formal fashion. We are going to organize this process as part of the annual planning process, with the intent, of course, to try to reduce the number of topics that are being worked on by the entire community at any one time and prioritize.

It's not going to be easy. It's going to take effort. It's going to take time. It's going to take compromise from everyone. But this is a necessary improvement to the way we actually work

together. And I think everyone is desirable of being able to do that.

It will be again taking time and effort and challenge. But the Org will try to support that community work. Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Xavier.

And Maxim's question in the chat, how many simultaneous processes can a community sustain is absolutely an accurate -- absolutely accurate.

So between a sort of real, concrete list of "here are all the things that are on our plate" and then the process that Xavier is talking about where the community actually comes together and decides what it can do and what its priorities are, we think, has to move us forward into the space of being realistic about what we can take on and then moving those projects forward where we have made a commitment to them but really focused -- focus forward movements.

Ashley and then Sam.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Thanks. I think this is a perfect lineup. So just kind of build off of what we just talked about, I think it really kind of goes to the core of the issue, is that we're all working on so many different things that we kind of lose sight of, you know, what are we all working towards as a community. And I think that's part of the systemic macro problem with people fully buying into the multistakeholder model, is that we're not always working together as a community. We're not always working towards a common goal. And you see that reflected in just about every single working group and activity that's going on and that we're working towards different things. We're on different kind of playing fields. We have some people who are contracted parties and others who are not and those who might just dabble in this space but don't necessarily -- you know, the core to their business and focus isn't necessarily the DNS as a whole.

And I think, you know, we focus a lot of time on improving process and procedures and that sort of thing. And perhaps we need to go back to building the community. And if, like, shortening -- or decreasing the amount of work that we're doing can somehow contribute to that, perhaps that could better the multistakeholder model overall because, again, I kind of feel like, again, if we're not working together as a community, we're always going to be pitted against each other.

And I feel like that's pretty much how we have been structured for a good amount of time, is that we find ourselves in a particular trench and we never get out of it because there's nothing bringing us out of it.

So, again, lofty, you know, comments but not a whole lot of constructive input. So I apologize for that. But I think, you know, if we're ever going to get to a state where we support not only the model but the outcomes that come out of it, we've got to figure out a way to bridge that gap. So for whatever that's worth, thank you.

And, Sam -- I know Sam has some good input with respect to a more formal approach to the evolution. So glad she's following up. Thanks.

BECKY BURR: Thanks. Sam.

SAMANTHA DEMETRIOU: That's a great deal of pressure. Thanks, guys. I'm kidding. This is Sam Demetriou. I'm the vice chair of policy for the Registry Stakeholder Group, and I work with VeriSign. I'm trying to be better about announcing that for are the record than I have been in the past.

I think Ashley made a lot of really excellent points, and I want to sort of point you guys to some of the items that the registries -- and I think the registrars also echoed a lot of this -- brought up in our comments that we submitted on the most recent Next Steps paper that Mandla mentioned was published in June and then finalized in August, all that stuff that we've been reiterating over the duration of the consultation process on this evolving the MSM process, which has to do with the importance of the prioritization process.

So, I mean, I think we're very much in line with exactly what Xavier laid out, that this is not something that the community has ever done before, especially across the full community. And we recognize that it's going to be difficult.

So one of the things we suggest -- and I want to throw it out here for consideration -- is that I think it's going to require a decent amount of professional support. You know, I think that in my observation, one group that's been really good about figuring out how to prioritize and order and structure its work has been the GNSO Council. And I know they've had a ton of external support from professional -- from ICANN staff who have a lot of experience in both project and program management. So the council has really shifted to sort of a program management

structure that allows them to look at work over a longer duration and sort of fit things in together like that.

There isn't anything that exists like that across the full community. And so not only do I think we need to get this done in order to address those issues of prioritization and making sure that we're able to get to all the work we need to do, but also I think the act of bringing community together and letting each -- like, each different segment of the community hear what is a priority and what's important to other groups is going to go really far in addressing what Ashley mentioned and something else that has come up in these papers, which is the issue of silos and the sort of cultural issue that we deal with where everyone is a bit entrenched and focused on their own work. And it's easy to get sort of blinders on and forget that we're all trying to ultimately work together here.

So I think that, you know, that is something that we've really looked at as sort of one of the key issues with this Evolving the MSM project. So it's really good to hear that this is something that you guys are also focusing on next.

And, finally, I think that's the most concrete thing we need to be working towards to really get this thing off the ground. Just to also reiterate what Donna and others have said, we are here to

help in any way that we can and any way that we can support that effort going forward.

And as much as we have been trying to be really active about putting in comments and things, I definitely agree with what Becky said earlier, too, which is that these more casual interactions where we can actually talk and hear each other's voices and see each other's faces are very helpful. So I think we would all welcome more of that especially as you guys get this work underway. Sorry, that was kind of a tirade.

BECKY BURR:

No, that was actually very, very helpful. Just to go back to Jonathan's comment and your comment about being a resource, I think that is a critical reminder to us. And there is a little bit of being careful what you ask for.

I know Göran and I were just having a conversation about something about we had a question on. And the result of our conversation was, Well, we're just going to go and ask if we can talk to you about it.

So I think you're going to be seeing more of that "we don't understand" or "can you help us understand this" or "what is this process going on."

I think that is something that we really do need to do, just having the conversations before, you know, comments get written in stone to make sure that we understand each other.

And Ashley says "please do so." We will.

Donna. Oh, wait. I'm sorry, Donna. I'm going to interrupt you because I promised Göran could talk about the survey that we all really want input from.

GÖRAN MARBY:

Thank you.

So, of course, the Contracted Party House is a resource, like everybody else. It's important that we work together. And I welcome the discussion.

And some of the things we talked about is the -- we have done the -- the ICANN meetings, the face-to-face meetings, are sort of part of the ICANN DNA. And that's how we solve issues. Because that's where we go out of the bubbles and we meet each other and we have conversations that are spontaneous and just happens. You see a couple of people, you have a problem, go into a room, go into a bar, and sort them out. Because ICANN is really about sorting out issues. And in this environment now,

that doesn't happen. So we get more siloed and the tension gets higher. And we do it in the middle of the night.

One of the tensions with this discussion, this (indiscernible), is actually to have that discussion, and also to make sure that it's not only a few people in one room that it's about, it's so you in your parts can actually have a discussion and come up with proposals about how to do it. And you might say it's about meetings or meeting strategy. But it's actually all of those things you talked about. We have to interact differently when we can't meet physically. And that is the input I think we're all seeking. I don't have the answers. You might have the answers. But they could be different answers from different parts of the community.

(Indiscernible) survey is as a discussion point where we will take that back and we will look at it and try to figure out proposals based on those individual things. And I hope that this can be a starting point of this discussion.

In every conversation I have, this has come up, the need for discussion. And there's a lot of commonalities between different parts of the ICANN community who usually often disagrees about some of the things we can do.

So I'm -- it's a short time frame for the discussion, but I'm really looking forward to the results of that, which then we will take on, turn it into concrete proposals, and as you've seen, we have a process for that.

So in your words, both the sides of this one is going to be very important in this one.

Thank you.

BECKY BURR: Thank you.

Donna, and then Maarten.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky. Donna Austin.

Yeah, have you got me now?

BECKY BURR: Yeah.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks.

I just wanted to come back to something that Mary put in the chat. And it relates to conversations that Göran and Maarten have with the SO and AC leaders. And this is a little bit of a bug bear with me.

Please acknowledge that the chair of the GNSO Council does not speak for the rest of the GNSO and its respective SGs and constituencies. And that the issues and thoughts and opinions that we have on certain topics being discussed in those fora might be different, might be really different.

So, you know, when we talk about what's happening within the GNSO Council and they do their strategic planning and they have policy development processes that come out, within the Registry Stakeholder Group, we have a number of discussion groups or working groups that are looking at other issues.

And I don't know -- Xavier, I'd be interested to understand whether you capture those. Because it's important to understand that we have resources or people within our respective SGs that are working on, you know, other work efforts that are related to ICANN issues.

You know, I think the Registry Stakeholder Group probably has four or five active working groups that are meeting on a regular basis. So if it's not once a week, maybe it's every other week.

So please be cognizant and respect that the chair of the GNSO Council does not speak for the GNSO. And we are, you know, SGs and Cs that make up the body of the GNSO. And that is quite separate from the council.

So just, I guess, a respectful request that perhaps in the future when those conversations happen, that the -- that some consideration be given to including the SG and C chairs of the GNSO in those conversations.

Thanks.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Donna.

Göran, did you want to respond to this?

GÖRAN MARBY:

I -- I can speak for -- now I can sort of comment from what is -- this group doesn't make decisions. This group doesn't take decisions on anyone's behalf, and it's cleared out in the statutes of this group. It's in coordination. But it's also very much in coordination between the different groups in ICANN, where, for instance, the GAC can talk to the GNSO Council what's coming down the road. And as you know, Donna, and I think every time

we have made proposals, we have come out to the whole community about them.

But it's a good point for discussions. And the chairman of the GNSO has made it clear that he's not there to make decisions, but has also brought back the things that we talked about in that group to the GNSO Council.

I think the -- I think that that group that came out of the community initiative, if you remember the discussion in South Africa, there was a -- there was a plenary about how to improve the ICANN efficiency and who sets priorities, an excellent point. And this group came out of that discussion. And I think it's been working very well. And they are a part of the structure. But they are not the decision-making body.

So I hope I can clear out any misconceptions about that group.

Thank you.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Göran.

Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Very much to second that. Yes, I've been at those meetings, and, yes, it's been made very clear every time again, we don't ask for decisions from this body. It is to help, to better understand what's happening across silos. Because it's important to work across silos and work effectively together, as Göran said.

So I wasn't going to talk about that. But the question came up just before I was going to speak, so just 100%. It's merely to help the process than to hamper the process. And in that way it's used. So it doesn't change the decision of processes in which the communities all take their role.

Just wanted to say that the other thing in interaction between Board and communities, we are also looking at different ways of how we can organize this, because, yep, it's become clear to us as well that it may take some time before we get back into face-to-face meetings. So how can we further improve our interactions together?

A survey is one thing. Within the Board, we were thinking ourselves how we can better engage with you and how we can provide more opportunities for interactions like this.

One thing to note is that, in my experience, having been in the community for some time, these interactions have progressed a

lot already, because we are now talking interactively, openly, and really address the issues that we want to touch upon. That's one thing.

We also traditionally have, of course, the public forums, which is more across silos or independent from silos, and really to be able to work across silos. The SO/AC leaders' gathering has been useful to be better able to understand what's going on and how to better communicate to the outside, rather than the process itself.

So, yeah, we look forward to continuing to find new ways. We are very open to suggestions. And we are very aware that the Contracted Party House is with us in making ICANN a success. So we're very open to listening to that. We all want ICANN to work, and we all work towards that. So that's a common ground that we share.

Thanks for your comment.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Maarten. And I'd go a little farther to go beyond "listening to," as I mentioned before, to actively viewing you as a resource and actively reaching out to get your input on issues as they arise. And I think, as I said earlier, and as Xavier said, too, there is a little bit of a "be careful what you ask for." But I do

think that it's our clear intention to start doing that more deliberately and more aggressively and to promote conversation before positions are hardened, in the hope of promoting understanding.

And I think, just to -- I just want to acknowledge Donna's point that, you know, the GNSO chair -- the GNSO Council chair has a very particular role. But it would be -- and has an obligation when interacting with us to represent the views of the council. But it would not be a fair assumption that in all cases the chair of the GNSO Council is going to represent or reflect the views of any particular part of the GNSO itself on these things. So we have to be conscious of that as we go through.

Ashley, I see your hand is up.

Maarten, you assume your hand is an artifact.

ASHLEY HEINEMAN:

Hi. So This is Ashley again, (indiscernible) Registrar Stakeholder Group.

I just wanted to say, I am not at all concerned about what I am asking for. I think any opportunity to talk to folks is absolutely critical. And I'm sorry it hasn't happened to a greater extent already.

I would love to get to a point where, you know, if an ICANN Board person wants to talk to us, we don't freak out and panic and go, "Oh, no. Why are they trying to" -- That should be a normal course of action.

And I think one of the artifacts of ICANN is that we tend to automatically assume what people's intentions and meanings are, and motivations. And I would like to get beyond that and be able to talk to folks and get a better understanding. Because that's another thing that happens on all sides. And if we just get to a point where we can communicate on a more regular basis, forced or voluntarily, I am all for it. And if there's a way to profit off of this virtual experience to make that happen more, I think that's something we should certainly engage and try to figure out.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you. I think -- I think we all agree on that.

Other -- any other comments on this topic?

I think if I can sum up this, we really do need to come together as a community to understand what our workload is and to prioritize it and to focus on what can actually be done. We do need to view each other as resources and engage in conversation more and take advantage of the ability to look

each other in the eye, even if it's over a Zoom screen, to make sure that we are working together to make the multistakeholder model work.

Any -- Ashley, Donna, do you guys have final words on this? Does anybody else have final words on this issue?

Donna, go ahead.

DONNA AUSTIN:

Yeah, Becky, let's -- I guess we've all said it. Let's continue talking.

I think Ashley made a really good point that if we can try to, you know, just be a little bit more open, so just take the guard down and just think, well, let's not start from a defensive point. I mean, I caught myself -- we had a conversation with the PSWG the other day, and I always feel when somebody says "DNS abuse," we go straight to the defensive, because we always feel that we're the ones that are being attacked, because we're really the only ones in the community that can do anything to address DNS abuse. So, naturally, that's where the conversation goes.

But if we can take that guard down a little bit and try to be a little bit more open in the conversation and say, well, okay, let's -- DNS abuse is the problem, but let's assume that, you know,

we're on a good path to resolving the issue. What else needs to be done? And it opens the door to another conversation.

But I think when people talk to contracted parties, that's a singular focus. But if we can broaden it out to get our heads up a little bit above the crap, I suppose, we might have a more open and frank conversation. So I think that would be really helpful.

I did want to, if I could, just recognize that Chris Disspain is stepping down at the end of this meeting.

So, Chris, I want to, on behalf of contracted parties, thank you for your service and contribution. I know that it can't obviously - it's not an easy position to be a Board member. I know you carried, you know, much of the load with -- on the NGPC -- is that what it was? -- the New GTLD Program Committee, and with the Sub-Pro being front and center, I appreciate that you have the history, and you're probably taking much of that with you. But I just wanted to recognize your service to the Board and the broader community and thank you for that and to welcome Patricio.

So thanks, Chris.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Donna.

All right. "Yay, Chris," is right.

Should we transition to the Board question? I think we have sort of presaged it a bit here.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: I don't mind if Chris gets a little bit of time to express his appreciation of GNSO, of the Contracted Party House.

BECKY BURR: Go for it, Chris.

You're not going to say how much you're going to miss being on -
- front and center on the next round?

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: You're speechless?

BECKY BURR: Apparently, he is.

Okay.

All right. So this issue -- and I think we've heard -- seen some of it from Mandla and -- and Matthew on the enhancing the

effectiveness of the multistakeholder model key issues and opportunities for acceleration.

And I think, Mandla and Matthew, without repeating what we've already said, do you want to kick off the conversation here?

I see Chris's hand now. Go, Chris.

I think he must be muted.

FRANCO CARRASCO: He's unmuted. But he seems to be having an issue with his mic.

BECKY BURR: Okay. Well, when he gets back --

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: He's an excellent meme player. He's an excellent meme player. We can read your lips.

BECKY BURR: His mic is not working. Okay.

DONNA AUSTIN: Hey, Becky, sorry to interrupt. Can we do a time check? We thought we only had 60 minutes for this call, so we're four minutes from the end of that.

FRANCO CARRASCO: That is correct. We have four minutes left.

BECKY BURR: Okay. Which is a really good thing that we've pretty much talked about this issue.

Do we want to -- and I do think that with our conversation, we did touch on this issue beforehand, and I think our conversation was very useful.

Matthew and Mandla, are there any parting words you'd like to say on this particular issue?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yeah, Becky, actually, I think you're right, we've very much touched upon this. And your questions to the Board really did get to the core of many of the issues that we're grappling with at the moment.

I just thought -- I put it in the chat, but I think Sam made a couple of really great points. And I just wanted to point to -- to

point us to the multistakeholder evolution paper, because it does address issues such as prioritization, scoping, and a number of other key of what we called at the time gap-filling efforts to try and make the process more effective to help in the evolution.

So I think there are steps. But I think many of the -- a lot of the things that we're doing now are going to come into fruition over a period of time. And so we're just kind of gearing up.

And as Xavier said, we've got a new planning function in org. The Board will be spending more time on planning as well. So I think we're all pushing in the right direction, and, hopefully, this will allow us to evolve the multistakeholder model so it's far more efficient.

And this will help, I think, in times of COVID and the pandemic.

BECKY BURR:

Thank you, Matthew.

So just wrapping up, I'm going to let Maarten have the final word here.

Thank you, all, for your time this morning and for a good conversation, and expectations that we will have more and be able to move the dialogue forward.

Maarten, would you like to....

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yep. Thank you very much for your time and for all you bring to ICANN and to us. It's really appreciated.

I fully understand that the way of working that we're doing now is affected by COVID and the inability to travel.

At the same time, I also see that together, we are really looking at how can we do things even better together, make things happen.

So thank you very much for all you brought in this discussion. And we look forward to further discussions over the time to come in whatever way, shape, or form that serves us best.

So thank you very much, and until the next time.

BECKY BURR: Thanks.

Donna and Ashley, any final words?

All right.

>> Nope.

DONNA AUSTIN: Thanks, Becky.

BECKY BURR: I'm just going to note that for -- since Ashley already knows this, that in the rating of bookshelves, Ashley wins.

Thanks, everybody. Talk soon.

Bye bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]