EN

ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions - Joint Meeting: ICANN Board & ccNSO Council
Tuesday, October 13, 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 the ccNSO Council on Tuesday, October 13th of 2020. My name is Franco Carrasco, from the ICANN staff, and I will be your 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 on this session is reserved exclusively for interaction between the ICANN board and the ccNSO Council 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 remember to raise your hands in Zoom in order to join the queue to participate. All panelists are muted by fault, so you may proceed to unmute yourself before taking the floor. Be sure you have all your other app notifications mute and clearly state your name and affiliation for the record.

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.

Bear in mind that the board will only take questions from the constituency with whom they are in session presently. 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. For all participants in this meeting, you may post comments in the chat. To do so, please use the dropdown menu in the chat box 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 amongst panelists. Therefore, any message sent by a panelist or standard attendee to another standard attendee will also be seen by all other hosts, cohosts, and panelists. 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.

ICANN
COMMUNITY DAYS 69

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Okay. Thank you for this introduction, Franco, and for holding this space. And very good to see you, Katrina and the ccNSO Council.

Looking forward to the discussion for this session. We would like to have on our side chaired by our ccNSO members. And whereas we have many of them, in particular, with Chris and Nigel, who were appointed by the ccNSO.

With that, Chris, Nigel.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank very much, Maarten.

Katrina, we're all here. We're all eager to start, so we're going to start with your questions. So over to you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. Thanks a lot. It's great to see you all, even though only virtually at the moment. Hopefully, we'll see you pretty soon in person. Unfortunately, that does not depend on us.

So one of the questions that we wanted to discuss with you is about the future of ICANN's model. Because we're -- yeah, we did rely a lot on face-to-face meetings. And no doubt, face-to-face meetings add to a successful advancement of our work.

So, therefore, now, when we are in this current situation, we, at least at the ccNSO, would think how to make the most out of it. But even with that, apparently at some point, hopefully, we'll be back to traveling.

So our questions would be how can we make sure that ICANN's model is still sustainable under the current setup and in the future.

So we would like -- we know that the board is now really very much involved in thinking about all these things. So we would like to hear your perspective and your take on that, how you're planning maybe on changing the way you work, how you interact with the community, with each other. So something that maybe we could take on board, learn from you, maybe the ccNSO community could also add something and suggest some ways to make things work better, make sure that, yes, ICANN's model is sustainable.

So back to you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Katrina.   Thank you very much.   That's a great opportunity for us to talk about (Audio dropped).

Maarten's going to go through that for you.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yes. Thank you for the question, Katrina. And, yes, we are very much aware that this is something that we, as a board, are confronted with, but also the community, and even the organization, in how we can work together across time, across distances, across time zones, you must say, and without actually having the opportunity to meet one-on-one.

So the model that we have over the years has been based on meeting with each other, talking with each other, agreeing with each other, finding each other across time zones and across cultures co-linked together in one place. This option doesn't work now, and we don't know when it's going to work again.

So in this, what the board itself has done is coming to the realization that it won't be as it used to be, tried to explicitly look at how we can compensate for the lack of the social context and how we can deal best with the time zones.

So the lack of social context is actually an ongoing thing that we are working on. But one of the things we did is install a weekly hour, which is -- we call -- refer to as the board social call. And in that hour, people from the board -- and it's a voluntary basis, but normally, two-thirds of the board is participating -- talk about subjects like relating to our childhood, our love for travel, our love for food, things that don't directly have to do with ICANN,

but that give a little insight into what is behind the person, the name, the directorship, et cetera.

And I enjoy this very much myself. And as we do this since April, and we still are at the rate of participation of about two-thirds of the board, always different people, because other things can come up, I think we have seen this to become a very useful part of the puzzle.

With that, also become very consistent for newcomers, new people on the board, and people who are less familiar with those that exist, the step is even bigger, because you can't just pull one aside in a meeting to ask a simple question that you may think is obvious to everybody, and maybe not. So we also put extra attention, and particularly going forward with a newcomer like Patricio, who is a (indiscernible) within ICANN, (indiscernible) so he knows people in the community, too. But at the same time, how we work together is something that requires interaction, so also stimulation of talking with each other, raising the hand when there is an issue, because we can't see when there's an issue in the room, as you don't see all the faces, as you don't see all the body language. And misunderstandings may grow out to problems. And it's important to be conscious about that.

So this is what we do in social terms.

In terms of also how do you do things virtual rather than in person, meetings of three days in a row of eight hours a day, plus dinner, et cetera, doesn't work. So one of the things we did there is that we now have weekly calls which are prescheduled in a kind of cadence on an earlier hour and a later hour to accommodate different time zones differently. And the plan to use that time, and we have shorter board workshops, three times, eight hours or nine hours, but three times three hours or four times four hours. Shorter days, basically. And, yes, it is a problem that between our -- most eastern board member, Akinori, and our most western board member on the West Coast of L.A., of California, there's 17 hours time difference. And everybody else lives in between. That means an early morning in L.A. means already a late evening in Tokyo. So we try to do the best we can there.

So that is one thing that we practically do.

Other than that and how it affects our models' interaction across this and other communities, and across the ICANN ecosystem, I think we very much are cognizant that what we experience is something that others also experience and that we need to find a solution together. And for that, we reach out and the organization reaches out with exploration of how to do this best together and find a way there.

So as a consequence, for instance, this time, we've expanded the togetherness over a longer period, but shorter days.

So if anybody wants to add to that, you're very welcome.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Nigel's going to take it from here, I think.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah. Thanks, Maarten.

Just before I pass to any other board member and then take questions, I'm going to add one personal insight to this.

We've been working since February, March, April time on the basis that this has been a thing we have to deal with in the moment. It's -- I see it as we've been looking at it that one day this is going to go away. If this goes much into the middle of next year without any light at the end of the tunnel, I think we're all going to have to -- both board and community -- take a long, hard look at how we deal with this long term. We're all learning as we go along. And I'm sure you are as well.

Any other board members want to add insights to this?

Not hearing or seeing anybody --

(Multiple people speaking simultaneously.)

MATTHEW SHEARS: If I can -- really, a bit to build on what Maarten said, what we're doing, effectively, is stretching our work. So as, whereas before we would have these three-day condensed workshops, what we've done is stretch that work over a much more extended period of time.

So it means our ongoing interactions are more often, which helps, in a sense, address some of the issues that Maarten was raising, which is that we do spend more time with each other on Zoom calls on a more regular basis, which is an advantage.

On the other hand, you miss that intensity of those three days, which I think is something that while it can be long and hard, it's still actually a very useful time to get to know your colleagues and everything else. So there's a benefit and disadvantages to both ways of operating.

But I think -- just to reinforce again what Maarten said, I think it's -- the most important thing is having those relationships, as much as one can, on an ongoing basis. And I think that's something that is why these sessions are so important and why we can't lose the intent of these large meetings or coming together with the community.

One could ask, perhaps, whether or not it's more -- it's increasingly important to have more on -- you know, more regular sessions with the community rather than waiting for every three months. I think that's -- to Nigel's point, I think that's something that we may want to change in the future.

Thanks.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks for that. There's a question from Roelof in the chat: Is there any possibility we see all board members that are present?

I think that's more of a technical question than a comment that some board members don't have video on. I think --

KATRINA SATAKI: I think you can use -- I think you can use the sliding thing in the middle of the -- now, it's in the middle of my screen, but on the right back of the slide that you see, you just extend the window of those videos, if you know what I mean.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks for the intervention, Katrina.

I think Göran has something to add to this. Göran?

GÖRAN MARBY: Thank you. This is a real interesting discussion. Let me just share a little bit what ICANN org has done. We went -- in March, we closed down all our offices around the world and asked everybody to work from home which has been working quite well. I mean, we all miss the setback much it's hard to innovate if you don't meet. You can -- My experience of this or what I'm learning from this is that you can get the work done but it's harder to innovate and start something new.

One thing that sort of we learned out of this, how important it is to have meeting points with staff. So every Wednesday morning, for instance, L.A. time, we have a call with the whole ICANN staff to make sure that we do -- that we can keep sharing contact. We also do almost silly things like we have competitions about a home exercise we do. We try to make sure that people feel engaged as a working place.

But also realizing that it's hard for people to work from home. Many -- We have people with small kids, both spouses are working, or sitting in smaller apartments. We have -- we have people literally that sits in wardrobes to be able to work at strange hours as well.

So I think that we are learning. We are learning a lot about how to interact as a workplace during this time.

ICANN 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

But I want to -- I want to mention something else as well. This is something that is -- this is something where we've already been on a couple of calls during the second meeting, and everybody wants to discuss it, and I think that's fair. I mean, me and the Board's perspective is that we do meetings for the community. We're here to facilitate the opportunity for the ICANN community to meet and discuss things, and that's why we -- the Board initiated, through me, which we sent out to the SOs and ACs, a sort of survey about how to proceed. And you should really see the survey as a discussion point. The intention is that the ICANN -- the different parts of the ICANN community should sit down and discuss those things to come up with answers to either the questions we put in there or, you know, anything else. Because I think you're right in this. It's more than when should we go back to meetings, how will we go back to meetings. It's also about how the community wants to get the work done.

We are -- And the idea is that the community, also on a regional basis, goes down and has this discussion and then summarize it up, and we will summarize it into sort of a proposal based on the different ideas, and we will take that back through the SOs and ACs and see that if we understood it right. And after the input from the SOs and ACs, we'll go on to public consultation about this, so we end up -- before we end up with the Board making decisions about it.

This has to be a bottom-up process, and this has -- and different -- and the discussion is so important now.

I don't know the answers. I don't know when we're going to come back. I don't know how an ICANN meeting would look like. I hear proposals from -- a little bit like the Board does. Instead of having, you know, two weeks or three weeks of meetings, you do that over a longer time with change to the interactive model. I don't have the answers to it, but my job is really to -- and the Board right now is to get the discussion where it belongs, which is in with community. So I think it's going to be something that it's important.

I just want to mention something about the reduce the carbon emissions. Since a couple of years, we are producing reports about carbon emissions going to ICANN meetings. I think we have done two or three years now in a row. And that was really to just add to the conversation for the community, to take that into or not take it into account.

As everything else, it's the balancing point. But we started to do that when it came to carbon emissions as well for -- just as a factual point into the community discussion.

I personally appreciate that you put that on the -- as a question.

Thank you.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks, Göran. And your point about the carbon footprint is extremely well made as well. I think we've all had a little bit of a circuit breaker and chance to reflect on lots of things this last six months.

Matthew, I think you might have a quick comment, and then I'm going to go to Leon.

MATTHEW SHEARS: No, go to Leon. Please.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. Leon.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks, Nigel. This is Leon for the record.

You know I like to be an optimist, Katrina, and I know that this is a challenging situation. We have faced many difficulties in carrying on with our work and our mission, but I also see opportunity. And the opportunity that I see is that we have been used to wait for public meetings to hold these kinds of sessions. Like, for example, the Board and ccNSO session waits until we have a face-to-face meeting or a public meeting for it to happen. But under this new setup, under this new setting, I think we can

take advantage of the situation and say we don't need to wait until a public meeting is scheduled to have a session with the ccNSO, or a part thereof from the ccNSO, in case there are some pressing issues we need to discuss or just in case we want to catch up on different topics. So I guess that's also an opportunity.

So I think that the survey that has been circulated and the input that you can provide to that not only in the survey but in -- you know, in informal channels for formal channels as well would be very useful and very valuable to help us, along with org, to determine which would be the best way to, you know, adapt to this new situation. But let's also see the opportunities that we may be creating here.

Thanks.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you, Leon. Thank you for the optimism.

Do we have any more comments or questions on this topic?

Deadly silence.

Okay. Katrina, do you want to give us the next question?

KATRINA SATAKI: I'm really sure my colleagues, my fellow councilors, they have something to say. I don't know; they may be too shy to do that.

Colleagues, please? No? Nobody wants to add anything?

Okay. If not, then -- yeah. Nigel, please, go to the next question.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Okay. I don't know the question in front of me at the moment. Chris, do you have that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Let's just check-in. Katrina, have what we discussed out with both those two bullet points on the currently displayed slide as far as you're concerned?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. That's our question -- those are just -- those are --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So in that case, I believe that we're moving on to the Board's question for the community. And I think, unless I'm very much mistaken, Matthew is going to take that question and -- or start that discussion, I should say.

I think that's right, isn't it, Matthew?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes. Thanks, Chris.

I'm not sure, is there another slide or...

Yeah. Okay.

So this was the question that the Board put to the community for this meeting. And perhaps just by way of a brief introduction, I'll just summarize kind of where we are in a couple of strands and then open it up, because there are a lot of board members who had contributed and will, and I'm sure there are questions on your side as well, Katrina.

So specifically on the work that we've been undertaking over the past year and a half, two years on enhancing the multistakeholder model, let me just update you where we are on that, and then we can broaden the discussion.

So that process -- the public comment period to that cross concluded. We are in the final stages of the report that will be issued in that process. And we are moving into the implementation stage for the work of evolving multistakeholder model.

And we are -- just as a reminder, you will recall that there were six issues that were put to the community for consideration, and the three issues that were considered to be the priorities for the

community were those on prioritization, scoping, and consensus. Those three issues are being taken forward, as are the other three as well, but the three that was prioritization, scoping and consensus were considered to be the most important, so they'll be taken forward and worked on first.

So that's all moving into the implementation stage, and a lot of that will now reside with the Implementation Operations team in ICANN org, which is the community forum. The work -- the next stage of work on that is actually to develop an evaluation methodology because we can't know if the effectiveness of the multistakeholder model has improved over the period of the strategic plan and operating plan unless we have some means of assessing it or evaluating. So that's the next piece of work that we'll be undertaking, and much of that will rest with org.

But I think what it does is a couple of key things here -- actually, let me just backtrack because I think the issue you raised initially about the sustainability of the model is absolutely essential to how we become more effective in our multistakeholder model. So there are dimensions of this -- of the COVID challenge and the remote challenge and however many years that this will be the way we're operating now that will have an impact or could have an impact potentially on the

effectiveness of the model. So it's something we do need to take into account.

The issue of prioritization is foremost in the Board's mind. Of this there is absolutely no doubt, and that's where a lot of the focus is going to be over the next year. As you well know, within the ATRT3 recommendations, there's a recommendation to establish a prioritization process. So this has very much come into the fore. And it's a part of a huge amount of work that we have in terms of prioritization, streamlining, ATRT3, PDP 3.0. All of these are coming together, and hopefully the product of all these processes and initiatives will be an enhanced and increasingly effective multistakeholder model in ICANN.

So that's just kind of the context. And what we're really looking for in this question is from the perspective of the ccNSO, what are some of the key issues that you're facing around this or what kind of -- as we put in the question, what opportunities are there for acceleration? So we would be very interested in hearing what you -- your thoughts on that. And I'm sure other board members would be delighted to jump in as well.

Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much, Matthew.

ICANN
COMMUNITY DAYS 69

Any of my colleagues would like to start?

If not, I will start, and then they will join a bit later, if they are too shy.

Yes, of course we have discussed all these issues of prioritization and how to work, how to structure our work, especially taking into account this new situation. And of course our priorities have had to change. We had to more think about the ways to get community engaged even in the times when we cannot meet face to face. And that actually gave us opportunity to get more people on board, such people that probably never attended face-to-face meetings.

At the same time, I would say that prioritization in itself is a very complex issue, because when, for example, ccNSO talks about prioritization, we talk about how we prioritize our work. Everything that we need to do. Maybe ICANN org talks about prioritization, how they are going to structure their work. The Board maybe has yet another view on prioritization.

So perhaps there is no common view on how we view prioritization, how we put all of those priorities together. And, actually, another -- another aspect of this multistakeholder model is -- well, personally, what I see, this complexity of certain things in the ICANN environment. For example, Annex D, not

ICANN 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

(indiscernible) Annex D. That complexity of the work makes this multi -- the work of the multistakeholder model very difficult because not only people have to get through the complexities of, for example, Annex D. They also have to follow the rules very closely or our empowered community thing doesn't work.

That was one thing. And I saw Stephen's hand up. Stephen, have you changed your mind?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: No. I agree with you with regards to the complexities with Annex D.

I was wondering about the evaluation methodology that the board seems to be undergoing, if I understood the remarks earlier, and wondering when that would be complete.

But to go back to your remarks regarding Annex D and its complexities and its inhibitions, shall I say, with respect to the ability of the empowered community to react to various actions that ICANN Org/ICANN board takes, might it be something to consider -- and I hate to propose this on so many levels -- a Cross Constituency Working Group to try to dive into the complexities and the time constraints in Annex D and see if we can't sort that out and come out with a better work product at the back end?

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: If I might interrupt, it's Chris.

Stephen, for the benefit of those who may not be quite as familiar, would you just very briefly tell us what Annex D covers.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: It covers approval actions, removal action- -- approval actions --

KATRINA SATAKI: Rejection actions.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Rejection actions. Thank you.

Kicking a board member, kicking out the entire board. And it just goes down the rabbit hole from there, is a short summary. And it has horribly constricted time constraints on the part of the actors to do what they need to do. And everything is geared towards Los Angeles time instead of UTC. It just goes on and on. It's a nightmare. It's really bad sausage-making.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Stephen. Does anybody want to comment on that?

KATRINA SATAKI: Göran has his hand up.

GÖRAN MARBY: I will not comment on what Stephen said, because he is more of an expert than I am on that.

But just a comment. This is a very interesting discussion. We did -- as I think we said, we did a reorganization within ICANN Org, and, actually, for the first time ever, set up a planning department within ICANN where we try to better have an overview of all the things that ICANN Org has to be done so we can plan the time.

ICANN Org is on the other end of the ketchup bottle. When the ICANN community has made its recommendations, decided about its reviews, goes through the board, it ends up at ICANN for implementation.

And with the amount of things that comes out of the multistakeholder model right now, we need to plan. And planning -- the other word for planning is actually "prioritization." We can't do everything at the same time all the time. We need to figure out ways of doing that.

And Matthew had said, why hadn't you done that before. It was -- we are in a special place when it comes to a lot of the things. There are so many things coming which are so complex.

So we hope that a part of this that we'll be getting with planning and we'll also be getting more transparent about it. And that has also caused a very interesting discussion with the board which may be Matthew will talk about a little bit more, with how we connect the org and the board.

One of the answers to this is that we have to build processes that are a little bit more transparent about the decisions that are made in time and aggregate them in such a way that the community can actually see the things that have been done over time. Because we want to avoid that ICANN Org, for instance, becomes a bottleneck because we don't have resources to do implementation.

So I'm very happy about this. I'm happy about it. And this also drives a little bit more focus on the implementation side of things going forward.

Thank you very much.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Göran.

I don't see any other hands. But just on the point that Göran raised, I think there is a growing realization that between the board and org, there needs to be a much closer alignment on the planning side. So you're familiar, obviously, that we have a strategic planning. But there needs to be a much better sense of alignment when it comes to the matters of work that we have to deal with, that the community has to deal with, and its implementation, and understanding how we can meet all the various targets and the goals of the strategic plan over the period of time. So with the current five-year plan, we need to be much more aligned and understand how that workload is going to impact the community and the board and org and also how we're going to be able to meet it. So that's an effort that's under way. And you will hear more about that during this meeting.

Thanks for putting that out, Göran.

Anybody else on effectiveness of the multistakeholder model? Any other thoughts from the ccNSO?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

Let's his old hand, I'm sure. But if he wants to say something.

MATTHEW SHEARS: No. Go ahead, please. Go ahead.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

So question, perhaps. How -- of the board -- When you talk about prioritization, how do you prioritize those recommendations that come from different sources? Do you look at the recommendation itself or you consider the source, one source more prior to another source? Or how does this process work within the board?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Katrina.

Maybe I'm going to call on a couple of board members to jump in here.

It might be interesting to hear from Avri, if she's there, just a little bit about the -- the streamlining process and how we've had to adapt that around the work of ATRT3, for example. That might give you a sense as to the work we do and how we -- how we prioritize accordingly.

Avri, would you like to jump in?

AVRI DORIA: Sure.

Okay. With the prioritization, and, first of all, you know, there's a specific project on the -- and a caucus working on the prioritization problem, which actually comes in two types. One of them is prioritizing everything that is on our table now. And then the other one is how to prioritize everything going forward. And between those two, how do you deal with changing priorities over time. Now, that one had a paper, and Becky can talk more about the details of that paper.

In terms of streamlining, that word is specifically referring to the review processes, both the specific and the organizational.

So we had had in the OEC a project going on trying to think through it, trying to find what would be a solution that gets us out of the problem of having nine reviews at the same time in some stage of completion. And, basically, when the ATRT3 took it up and when they accepted into their scope looking at the streamlining of reviews, we sort of backed off the process, waiting for them to come up with a recommendation, if they were going to do so.

They have now come up with one. So now we're basically taking that -- there's another caucus, the ATRT3 Caucus, that's going through all the recommendations that ATRT3 made and looking

at them for understanding, for, you know, consistency, for how they can be done, consulting with the shepherds at the moment, and so on.

In the OEC, what we've done is we've taken the part that they offered as a solution for reviews and basically are doing, you know, a -- almost a thought experiment, but not quite. It's if we accept this completely as it is written, first of all, how will it work? What does that mean in terms of all of our obligations? What does it mean in terms of things that would need to be changed in bylaws? Does it meet all the requirements that we've picked up out of community comments, out of questionnaires, out of conversations. Does it create any new issues? Does it create any problems?

We're very much just in that process at the moment, and it'll be going on for a little while, though we do need to give a response to the ATRT3 recommendations by December. So there's not that much time for all of this.

So it's a fairly intense period of work on it, though it has been sort of pushed until we'll get back to it after these meetings have ended.

So that's basically where we're at at the moment. And as you probably know from reading it, that there are substantial, you

know, issues with the organizational and substantial changes with them.

So once all this goes through, once again, you know, stipulating that everything could be accepted, so if everything is accepted, then many of the things that require bylaws changes would have to go through the whole defined bylaws process with reviews and the EC taking its part in those discussions, et cetera, until we did that.

So, really, anything that requires a bylaws change coming out of the reviews will also need to go through one more serious step to actually change them. And, you know, there will be consultations at that point, I would assume, but it's really too far in advance to sort of have planned those.

Hopefully, that answers it. But willing to dig in deeper where anyone wants.

Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Avri. That's very helpful.

I hope that was helpful, Katrina.

KATRINA SATAKI: Absolutely. Thank you very much, Avri.

Just on the same or similar note, the recent council webinar, we discussed the way how to -- how we could possibly make our own policy development process more efficient and effective. And one of the comments, so I just really wanted to hear your feedback on that -- one of the comments one of our councilors made, and some others, because at one point, when the final result of our policy goes to the board, the board has to approve it. And from observations made by some of our councilors, they said, well, apparently, the board gives more appropriate to policy development stuff that comes from GNSO, for example. Ours would be probably pushed a little bit behind to not being a priority.

So we totally understand that it's impossible to do everything at once.   I just wanted to hear your -- your feedback on prioritizations by SOs/ACs.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Sure. Thanks. I think that, Maarten and Nigel, maybe you want to jump in on this?

Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Oh, sure.

I think it's true that the GNSO has more time for policy development, it's because they develop more policies, basically. But we stand equally ready for you, and also for ASO. So rest assured that you have our full attention.

And I understand Nigel wants to comment on this, too. Right?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, thanks, Maarten.

I was going to say something very similar, but I was actually going to be a bit stronger.

I certainly would not let one type of PDP take priority over the other, particularly when it's the ccNSO.

It's certainly true that there's an awful lot more that comes out of the GNSO than comes out of the ccNSO. But it's very definitely equally important. In fact, the nice thing about CC PDPs is that they're few and far between. But they're always extremely important.

Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, thank you very much, Nigel. Thanks, Maarten.

Any other comments from my colleagues or from anyone else?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Katrina, I was going to suggest, if that's okay with you, that perhaps we ask Xavier just to spend a minute on his two functions, new functions. Because I think it lends itself well to the broader question of implementation -- planning and implementation, if that's acceptable.

Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, Matthew. Can you hear me?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, we can.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you.

Thank you for the opportunity. Relative to the topic of prioritization, as Katrina was pointing out, it's a complex topic, particularly in the multistakeholder model of ICANN that is open by definition and by principle. And that prioritization needs to

ICANN 69
COMMUNITY DAYS

happen in the context of the strategic plan, which directs what the ecosystem should carry out.

So just to specifically address the point of -- that Göran made earlier and Matthew just reminded us of, the organization has created two different new functions. One is a planning department. It is new from an organizational standpoint within org. It concentrates and regroups all the activities of planning that have been carried out by the organization in the past.

So from that perspective, it's not new, but what this planning group now intends to do is to evolve planning at ICANN towards a more collaborative approach of planning that gives us the opportunity to actually plan together as opposed to the organization proposing a plan that then is commented on by the public and the community.

And part of that activity of collaborative planning is to try to develop together a way to actually prioritize the work at the level of the ecosystem. And of course with the understanding that each organization has their own priorities which should not be a conflicting source of information but a complementary source of information.

So of course developing a methodology to prioritize is going to take the effort of the Board and the community, supported by

ICANN
COMMUNITY DAYS 69

the org. And this is something we would like to be able to do over the next few months. And then implement this methodology and approach for the next iteration of planning for FY23, because we are already about halfway through FY22 planning already.

So that's for the prioritization part. And the planning department is going to focus on this over the next few weeks and months.

The second department that's been created in the organization is the Implementation Operations department, and its scope of activities is to be responsible for the implementation of nonpolicy community work. In other words, reviews or Cross-Community Working Group recommendations. And under that scope falls WS2, the evolution of the multistakeholder model that we're talking about now, and of course all the reviews, once these reviews have submitted their report and the Board has adopted the recommendations that it has considered.

And so this entire scope of activities is under the responsibility now of the implementation operations. And I now supervise those two new departments, planning and implementation operations.

I'll stop here. I'm happy to answer any other questions there may be.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Xavier. Are there any questions for Xavier?

I think that puts it in a -- I think that gives a nice sense of the overall scope of work and how the structure and org is evolving to address some of these key issues, including prioritization and (indiscernible).

Avri, I see your hand.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, thanks. Avri speaking.

I just want to go back to the one point of would one PDP be prejudiced over another in terms of scheduling. And, yes, Nigel said he wouldn't allow it to happen.

As one of the people that's probably more associated with the G side than the CC side, I would say I can't imagine it happening. I think -- And I think we've already heard, I think some of the scheduling is driven by those things that have deadlines on them. For example, when it's one of the formal reviews and it

ICANN COMMUNITY DAYS **69**

says, "You must respond by a certain date," yes, that kind of thing may drive some prioritization.

Other than that, I think the things that drive it is how complex it, how difficult it is, how long it takes for things to be ready to actually go to a decision. Because pretty much everything that comes to the Board is going through a process, either in a committee or in a caucus or a working group or one other of those things that we're working on. And it really is what's ready to take the next step that seems to drive things.

But I would be totally surprised, and haven't seen it yet in, you know, my short time on the Board, the three years, I have not ever seen anything that even approached of, "oh, let's do their stuff first" type of mentality. Obviously nobody ever said anything like that, but I haven't even really seen that type of mentality, so I really don't believe it would happen. But the complexity of the work, the deadline on the work and stuff sometimes may, you know, drive things coming first.

Thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Oh, I see a hand from Stephen. Shall we -- Stephen?

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Thank you. I just want to echo Avri's thoughts on this. I cannot imagine a situation where, when the ccNSO -- and I'm in charge of probably the next thing you'll see probably coming our way. And as it's been rightly pointed out, it comes in frequently from the ccNSO, would be side-lined in preference of dealing with some sort of policy from another SO/AC.

So I have no concerns on this whatsoever. I thank Avri for her comments, however. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you very much.

Any other comments? Board members? ccNSO? (Indiscernible)?

Katrina or Nigel or Chris, should I hand it back to you?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I think we're done. Back to Katrina, I think.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Thanks a lot for your comments. Thanks for taking our questions seriously and answering them the way you did. It's really very reassuring.

So thank you very much. If none of my colleagues wants to add anything, then I'd like to thank you once more and get back -- give back to Nigel, Chris, or Maarten for the final closing words.

NIGEL ROBERTS: I think we pass it to Maarten, don't we, Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I might have a little something to say.

I just want to say thanks to the ccNSO. It is my last constituency day -- constituency fortnight as it's now become, session. So I just want to say thanks. That's all.

Back to Maarten.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: Yeah, and this is a remarkable point in time for that reason. I think most people around the table can't imagine a ccNSO board meeting without Chris, but we'll need to get used to that, and we'll miss you. Thanks for all you've done. And ccNSO --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm already building a tunnel. I'm building a tunnel to find my way back in.

MAARTEN BOTTERMAN: All to California, right?

And thanks also for having us. I think it's important that we do make this collaborative effort together.

And, yeah, if there's a history where the GNSO has been more active and more demanding of overall ICANN time, that makes sense in the model, but for sure ccNSO is as important to us and is an important part of the whole. And with you, I look forward to tackling all the challenges on our path, and unfortunately, tackling in the only way possible at the moment, which is in a virtual way until we are back to being able to move face to face again.

So thanks for your time, and looking forward to seeing you later.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thanks, bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]

ICANN 69 COMMUNITY DAYS