KOBE - Joint Meeting: ICANN Board and ccNSO
Tuesday, March 12, 2019 - 11:00 to 12:00 JST
ICANN64 | Kobe, Japan

KATRINA SATAKI: Again, good morning and thank you very much to the Board for coming to our room.   It's always a pleasure, especially with pretzels.

Yes, we received several questions from the Board and we also submitted three, our questions to the Board.

Is there any preference from your side how you wish would like to be addressed? Should we start with your questions? Start with ours. Okay, great, excellent. Let's start with our questions.

Okay. So basically our first question was: What criteria do you use when you decide whether some activities are within ICANN's mission?

Yes, Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you very much. This is a very, very good question. And, in fact, this question would have been more difficult to answer prior to the transition.   But since the transition, the bylaws have changed, and the mission statement has been really expanded in

great details inside the bylaws. That actually gives us the criteria by which we measure, and there are many criteria in this.

So I'm going to give you eight for example straight out of the mission statement which we use to see if our work is within the mission. And then I'm going to give you a little test on the strategic plan. I will take you through that test and see if, for example, the proposed new vision that we're saying is consistent with the mission and if the proposed five objectives that we are mentioning are also consistent with the mission statement. So that's a quite important test.

So, for example, here are one of the eight criteria. The first one is if any of the Board actions are consistent with the stable and secure operation of the Internet and unique identifiers. That's one.

Is it consistent with the coordination of the allocation and assignment of names in the root zone of the Domain Name System?

Is it consistent with the development, implementation of policies concerning the registration of second-level domain name?

Is it consistent with the policy with respect to gTLD registrars and registries concerning Open S interoperability, resiliency, security, and stability of the DNS?

Is it consistent with the facilitation of the coordination, of the operation, evolution of the DNS root name server system?

Is it consistent with the coordination of the allocation and assignment of the top-most level of Internet protocol numbers and autonomous system numbers?

And is it consistent with the collaboration with other bodies as appropriate to provide registries needed for the function of the Internet as specified by the Internet protocol standards development organization?

And more generally, is it consistent with the policy developed through the bottom-up consensus-based multistakeholder process?

So those are some eight criteria that you pull directly out of the mission statement.

And, by the way, the Board is being very deliberate in ensuring not only that our actions are consistent with the mission statement but are consistent with the bylaws, for example, in handling GAC advice or handling any other advice in terms of the core values, the commitments. We make sure that all of these, whenever we take an action or make a decision, we're consistent with those.

So we do have those criteria's, and let's take now an example of the new strategic plan, all right? Now that I have listed some of

those criteria, you tell me whether the strategic plan is consistent with the mission or not.

So, we're proposing, for example, a new overarching vision statement. The overarching vision statement says to be a champion of the single, open, and globally interoperable Internet by being the independent, trusted, multistakeholder steward of the Internet's unique identifier system and by providing an open and collaborative environment with diverse stakeholders, come together to undertake their business. You can see that every word in there is consistent with the criteria that I've mentioned to you.

If you look at the five objectives, strategic objectives, the first one: Strengthen the security of the Domain Name System and the DNS root services. That's consistent with the criteria I've just mentioned to you.

Improve the effectiveness of our multistakeholder model of governance, it's definitely consistent with.

Improve the unique identifier systems for which we're responsible for the security. That we're consistent with.

Address geopolitical issues impacting ICANN's mission. So that is definitely consistent because we have the mission. But if there are geopolitical issues and legislation that impact this, we must be able to anticipate and address ahead of time.

And, finally, ensure ICANN's long-term financial sustainability because without it, we can't perform all the other actions in the mission.

So you can see how the vision statement and all the objectives are consistent with the criteria defined by the mission statement and the bylaws. I hope I've answered your question.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Are there any questions -- additional questions from the audience, follow-up questions on this? If no, thank you very much.

Let's move forward to the next question then. It was around confusing similarity.

Just to give you a brief intro, background to the question, yeah, when we started to -- working on this IDN ccTLD policy decided to try it and that's how fast-track process was introduced. And I think this year is going to -- we'll start -- or we can celebrate ten-year anniversary of the process. And maybe that's a good point where we could say, okay, we've tried it and now we should start working on the real IDN ccTLD policy.

But during these ten years, we've learned a lot. And one of the things that we've observed -- observed is that the -- originally in 2009, the process and procedures for evaluation of strings of the

new gTLD round -- that's not just about -- probably we shouldn't be talking about IDNs only. But initially it was expected that the new gTLD round and the overall policy for IDN ccTLDs will be consistent. But during these ten years, we have noticed that due to some incremental changes to the fast-track policy, we see that apparently the gap is growing. And yesterday we discussed this with the GNSO Council. So we thought that we could probably establish a joint working group to try to address many of those issues that are here.

But, anyway, we would like to hear your opinion. First, should we strive to harmonize string similarity review under the two processes, under gTLDs and the ccTLDs?

We personally see a lot of value in harmonization. We think that it would help -- at the end, it would help end users so that they only don't get so confused. It would help applicants. We believe it would really help anyone to have this harmonized approach.

So what they're using? Maybe you see CCs -- ccTLDs and gTLDs, at least this evaluation of the string similarity, as two different processes. And if you agree with us that a harmonized, consistent approach could help, what are your views on how we could proceed with that? Both are developed under different PDPs.

And, yeah, so what is the Board's view on an effort like that? Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. So I think -- well, first of all, ten years, really? Wow! Seems like yesterday.

I think that harmonization is probably sensible at least to aim for. If you think about it, the reason for -- you wouldn't worry too much about it in the ASCII world because there are some obvious differences between ccTLDs and gTLDs.

But in the IDN world, given that there's not -- there's no character limit in the sense of two characters and so on, then there may well be reasons to treat them both the same way. The challenge for the ccTLD world, of course, is that each ccTLD is really entitled to do things their own way. So I think the ccNSO itself would have to agree that this is a matter that does require a global policy for it and then decide whether or not it wants to harmonize that policy with gTLD world.

But I would encourage you to do that because I think it's something that would make it, as you've said -- would make it easier for everybody across all of the various different IDN TLDs.

As to how, well, we've come across issues before where we don't seem to have a mechanism for dealing with it. And as far as I can remember, we've never had a joint policy development process. The CCWG structure that we used in respect to the transition, we've sort of decided isn't really a policy mechanism because policy needs to go through the supporting organizations that are

relevant. But I'm fairly certain that if the Board -- if the Board was asked if it would be -- it would be comfortable with a joint GNSO/ccNSO policy development process, we will probably find a way to make that happen and help to make that happen.

I caution that it might be an interesting experience for a number of ccTLD people to get themselves involved in a policy development process with the gTLDs. But leaving that aside, if there was a way of doing it, I think that would be great.

But the alternative, I think, is that you -- alternative, I think, is that you try to bridge -- you're under two separate processes and you try to run a bridge between the two so you have effectively an -- if you like, a sort of negotiating committee that sits in between the two processes and their job is to try and harmonize, if possible. But it's a real challenge.

And I wouldn't want the actual work itself and the requirements to get it done, as you said, to move away from the fast track and get the real policy to be slowed down because of a desire for something to happen that may not actually be in our control. So maybe the ccNSO should take the view that that -- that they should be proceeding anyway. But if there is a way of harmonizing, I think that would be a very valuable thing to do.

EN

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Any other comments around the table or from the audience? If not, then we're ready to move to question Number 3. It's about the progress on the IANA function review.

During our Barcelona meeting, we informed the Board about our situation that despite multiple attempts to form the team, select three members that match according to the bylaws, two ccNSO members and one nonmember, so all our attempts failed.

Nevertheless, we still believe that according to the bylaws, ccTLDs are the direct customers of the PTI, should be fully represented on the IANA functions review.

So the question to the Board: How can we ensure that all three ccTLD members are there? That's one thing. Another thing -- and here probably should give an update to the community. During our initial discussions, Chris has already asked ICANN legal to provide their advice, and Sam did so. Thank you very much.

So, basically, the process to change fundamental bylaws -- and the change is really necessary because -- this time it can wait perhaps. But if there is a need for a special IANA function review, then we need to act quick. And if we need to chase nonmembers to get them involved, then it can really slow down the entire process. And that can be very harmful to all ccTLDs, not only ccTLDs actually, but all registry operators.

So, yeah, now we know what the process would be. The ccNSO needs to write to the Board. The Board will -- of course, rationale for the change. The Board would then ask ICANN legal to provide suggestions for the change and then those suggestions should go through the process of public comments and everything.

Including -- well, since those are fundamental bylaws that need to be changed, according to this new empowered community regulation, this calls for approval action. And that means that we need support from our other decisional participants.

Yeah, during the meeting with other SOs, we already -- already highlighted the need for the change. So they are informed about the need and the rationale behind it.

Anyhow, are there any additional comments? Yes, Nigel, please.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yes. Thanks, Katrina. We're going to answer this in two parts. I'll deal with the first bit, and then Chris will deal with the second bit.

Board understands really that the only remaining issue in the composition of the review team is filling this non-ccNSO member seat. We know what the challenges are. In fact, I think in a way it's a tribute to the ccNSO that you've managed to grab in so many people who are interested in the policy development process.

And there aren't any non-ccNSO member seats, people that have been that active.

So the composition of this team is decided by the community through the transition procedures. And the Board is not prepared at this time to decide that a seat that was assigned for a particular type of ccTLD manager that's a non-ccNSO member could or should be replaced by a different type of ccTLD manager, i.e., a ccNSO member.

We do understand the challenges associated with identifying a qualified volunteer from a non-ccNSO ccTLD, and the matter is on the Board's agenda and will be considered on Thursday.

Chris, if you want to talk about the fundamental bylaws side.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yeah. Just to say that in respect to the point about making the permanent change, we understand that there are a number of bylaw changes that various SOs or ACs are ready to bring to the table. Some, not all of them, would be fundamental bylaws but, nonetheless, there are a number of bylaw changes, sort of logistical small things, not major stuff. And we think that we can probably make a small sort of bucket of those to deal with them all in one go, obviously splitting the ones that are fundamental from the other ones because it's a slightly different process.

But I'd encourage you to think about whether there's anything else -- and I can think of at least one thing because, if I remember correctly, we have a challenge with a definition of what a ccTLD is.

So I think we could -- we should gather all of those together as quickly as possible. Don't worry too much about if you miss things because this is not the only time it could ever happen. But it would be good, I think, if we're going to go through this process, to pick up anything else that needs to be done and dealt with.

In respect to the actual review team thing that we've talked about, the one thing I can add to what Nigel said is that -- because I was in a meeting that Nigel wasn't is that Keith Drazek who is the chair of the GNSO Council has agreed to go back to the GNSO and see if it is possible to persuade any of the -- any of the parties who have a problem with -- with making an exception in this case to the bylaw and allowing three ccNSO members. He's undertaken to try to do that and see if he can get -- oh, you have an update on that.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. Thank you. We had a meeting with the GNSO Council yesterday. This was one of the things that we discussed, well, very briefly, as it was the very end of the meeting. And, apparently, Noncommercial Stakeholder Group today is going to

discuss the issue. And taking into account the fact that without the third representative from ccTLDs, we are not going to move forward and taking into account that we are going to pursue changes in the bylaws anyway. They might reconsider their position -- reconsider their position. We'll say that. So that's a small update on that.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Excellent. And in the meantime, obviously, first, for transparency, et cetera, if you could continue to see if you could solve the problem from -- within the ccNSO by finding someone, that would be great. But I think we're on a road where at least, I think, there's a level of cooperation happening to try and fix the issue for this particular thing. And then we have a pathway through for fixing the issue for the bigger thing, which is the changes to the bylaws.

I think we should try and set a time line to get that -- to get that started. So I think one way of doing that is to get the first batch in. So if we get the first batch in from you, then we can then go back out to everybody else and say, Okay, you have got a month to tell us what yours our and we're going to start the process, whatever.

So start the ball rolling by coming back to us with a list, and that will be fantastic.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much.

Yes. As you mentioned, we have a second thing, too. It's the definition of ccNSO members or who can become a member of the ccNSO.

Yes, thank you. Now we can go to your questions then, if there are no more comments on the questions that we asked the Board.

Okay. Then we go to your questions. And the first one was what the Board, ICANN org, and the community should be doing now to prepare for the successful implementation of all the plans that are now in front of us. And we were asked to make three suggestions as concrete as possible, one each for the Board, ICANN org, and the community. So we have some suggestions -- well, one per party. And actually one more for all parties.

So, first of all, when we think about the Board, we believe that the Board should ensure enough flexibility to amend the planned objectives and goals at any time without actually having to wait for the five years' period to end because DNS industry is very dynamic and -- well, Internet industry as such is very dynamic and changes need to be, well, implemented into plans.

ICANN org, I believe that they should ensure consistency of the processes and stability at the financial level.

And the community should start working on bringing more volunteers, new people on board who could implement work on the implementation of those plans from the community perspective.

And for all three, I think that all three need to monitor cost efficiency. And at least for us, I can say that we are going to do that.

Then the second question, second question actually was a tricky one. And when we discussed it, we realized that, well, we do not understand the question. No, actually -- I probably shouldn't say we did not understand the question, but the tricky thing was that different people understood it differently. But in the question, you ask how can we increase the likelihood that the important allies and partners work together are not on the same page.

So the first question we had: How can we ensure that our outside partners are on the same page we are if we are not on the same page ourselves?

Actually, I must say that opening ceremony yesterday clarified some of the questions and some things that we did not understand, for example, who those partners are, partners outside ICANN.

Well, first of all, apparently when you say "ICANN," you don't mean ICANN Board or ICANN org. You mean we as the community, all together.

So who are our partners outside? And, actually, I think, Goran, your opening speech, you mentioned, for example, regional Internet registries. But aren't they part of the community? So who are those partners? That wasn't entirely clear to us. And, yeah, again, we see those differently.

Well, if you see regional organizations as regional -- not organizations, regional Internet registries as outside partners and we see them as part of our community, there's already some misunderstanding within internally to ICANN.

So that's probably -- brings us to our first suggestion in response to this. While we believe that messages including questions need to be very clear messages with which we go to our partners, our allies, they need to be clear.

Well, maybe it's not true for all parts of our ICANN community but at the ccNSO level, we are very, very diverse. And the majority of us, we are not native English speakers. And, therefore, that's why we appreciate clarity of messages even more than native speakers do.

Are there any more comments? Cherine, yes, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you very much. So I'd like to respond to -- comment on, I think, the first question and then the second question because I think you provided very helpful things.

So just to put a context in order to engage us more in a dialogue, right, we have -- as I said yesterday, we're going to have in our hands three plans that will really shape our future. One is the strategic plan, which in itself is not executable. There's not much you can do with it. It just provides a direction, but we will have to believe in that direction.

And then there's a very deep and comprehensive, yet to be developed, operational and financial plan that really shows how we're going to execute the strategic plan. For every one of these five objectives that I mentioned, there is a mini plan inside the big financial plan.

And then it just happens that one of those plans inside it is improvement of our governance, the efficiency and effectiveness of our multistakeholder model.

So I really want to talk about those three things and talk about your suggestion, one each. We should have been clear, you are right, in our language. It would have been clearer to say one each for each one of these plans because they are different, right?

So let's take the first one, and your first comment applies to the strategic plan. So strategic plan is a document which ought to bind the stakeholders, the Board, and ICANN org together. We have the bylaws that binds it, but this is a document that really should bind us in our belief of where we are taking ICANN and in which direction we're taking ICANN.

So the issue for us is what you just said. How do we make sure this is not put in a drawer and forgotten about it? How do we make sure we all buy into that vision, the strategic objectives, and that we pursue it over the next five years and that we put all our will and effort in making sure we get there and not forget about it? How do we make sure that we revisit the plan every year or at regular interval and update it as the circumstances needs to be updated?

Be sure, like anything, this has not happened on the previous strategic plan. It was a very good plan, tailored for the needs of the moment. At that time, we were developing it with the transition in mind. And it provided us, if you look at the vision, all the objectives, about how do we become independent post-transition, how do we ensure that our multistakeholder model works post-transition, how do we make sure that we are global and international and, you know, not U.S.-based in our thinking, in our culture. So it had all of these things in it, but we've achieved a lot of these things.

And today we are facing challenges that existed before, but they've intensified much more. For example, the rise in cyber-sovereignty, that is now much more accentuated than it was five years ago. The rise in security threats, the potential increase in security threats, it is greater now than it was five years ago, right? The risk of fragmentation to the Internet, there is now, you know, a more accentuated risk and so on. So we are in a different environment.

And we have a much bolder, in my view, a much more decisive strategic plan that can really turn the ship in a different direction a little bit while preserving, of course, our mission and our sort of multistakeholder model. But there are challenges from outside we need to respond to.

So unless we believe in the strategy, unless it's a living document, we might just not achieve what we're trying to achieve.

So your first comment, you have to be flexible, you have to be nimble, you have to revisit the plan, you have to amend the plan, and you have to not wait five years to change it. We buy into this 100%.

The question for you, and not just the CC, but if you can help us with the rest -- how do we get absolute understanding and buying in of that strategy by the rest of the community so that we're all working hand in hand?

And I think it is not sufficient to say it was put out for public comment, the community has commented, thank you very much. The board incorporates the comment, and off we go. Because it will not happen. It will just be a dead document after this, and we will just leave it to Goran and ICANN org to implement some of the details, and we watch them.

But we need to really energize ourselves to follow this strategy. If we can just focus on this document first, and then we talk about the other ones, because your question relates more to the other ones as well.

So I see Roelof.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please. This is a lot of discussion. We do not need to be shy to ask questions.

Roelof, please.

ROELOF MEIJER: As to your last question, I think it's something that every organization struggles with. How do you make sure that your strategy, your vision is understood and carried by everybody in the company?

EN

And I think the best way -- it will never happen by everybody. But the best way to get close is by painting the picture and telling the story every time again. And show that you really believe in that picture, in that story.

I think you're doing that. Maybe you could do it more often. But I think that's the most effective way.

CHERINE CHALABY: So we were in a session earlier with another constituency that said, well, you must do a regular reminder every year to the constituencies of this is the strategy, this is where we're going. Right?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yeah.

CHERINE CHALABY: 'Cause people, they said their head is down, working on PDPs, working on CCWGs. They don't have time to really buy into the strategy, if you see what I mean, let alone read it.

And like you said, outside organizations, if you go into the top -- top, top organizations in the world, the moment you walk in the front door, if you ask the receptionist, what's the mission of this

company, they'll answer. If they don't answer, you know that the message hasn't gone through.

ROELOF MEIJER: Only because it's written on the wall behind you.

[Laughter]

CHERINE CHALABY: All right.

ROELOF MEIJER: But it's always much easier to repaint the picture if you were the person who drew it in the first place than after having somebody describe the picture, then draw it. So the ones who make the plan are much better at explaining it and remembering than the ones who heard about the plan. So it's -- yeah, it's repetition, I think.

CHERINE CHALABY: Yeah, but we are different.

ROELOF MEIJER: And true belief.

CHERINE CHALABY: We are different, because in the corporate world, the board, the CEO, the management can then say, "This is the strategy, and we're going to impose it and make sure that it's going to work. And nobody's going to do anything outside it."

Here, we need everybody to also believe in it.

ROELOF MEIJER: There is a difference, I agree. But imposing a strategy, even in a company, I think that's not a very effective way --

CHERINE CHALABY: No. Impose the implementation, not the strategy. Get the buy-in first. But then make sure you adhere to it. Sorry, I used the wrong word. I know the word imposing, that's not what I meant.

GORAN MARBY: We have a question here, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: It's more of a follow-on. Because there are thousands of people involved in this community, you're not going to get that sort of everyone answering, what are our goals, same ones.

But one thing that the board and the org could do which would help is to reorganize its reporting, its board meeting agendas, all

of the formal work that the organization does at the governance level in line with the strategy. So everything starts with, this relates to goal "X" of the strategy. Because when you look at -- if you're just talking about the strategy and then the business-as-usual work goes on, nothing changes, most of the business-as-usual work does link to the strategy in some way. So if you make those links explicit -- and I'm doing this in my organization, so I know what a big job it is.

If you can get that lined up, it can help more people because you're talking about it more often in more layers.

GORAN MARBY: Can I just make a -- Two things.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, please.

GORAN MARBY: If you would like to see how we follow up on the current strategic initiatives, there is something called the accountability indicators, where we -- everything we sort of do you can follow in more or less real time on the Web. We do spend a lot of resources to be able to give back to you in the community how we -- our projects are sort of listed inside all our goals and missions. And

so if you go into accountability indicators, that's a good follow-up. So we do follow up on everything.

And the intention, of course, when we have new initiatives from the new strategies, the sort of operation plan, we will do the same thing.

I know that not many -- and, unfortunately, not many people are looking at those. And it's -- I used them a lot, because it actually gives me a fairly good overview of where things actually fit into -- into the strategic plan. And it's also good for something -- if you don't think it actually fits into the strategic plan, at least let us know.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah. Thank you.

And, actually, following the discussion that Cherine had with Roelof about imposing strategy on an organization, there is a difference, and ICANN board cannot enforce strategy if the community does not support it.

ICANN org is maybe something different.

So the question to Goran, how do you ensure that all your employees understand the strategy, they are passionate about

the -- achieving those strategic goals? How do you ensure that they work on the same page? And for the community?

GORAN MARBY: How do I ensure that?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes. What do you do?

GORAN MARBY: I think that every ICANN meeting gives me a reality check if I do. Because if I don't, you usually tell me.

We work -- ICANN org's -- first of all, let's go back to the budget process. The budget process is actually -- it's a complicated thing. But down on a very low level, you can see every project that we do. And it goes through a process where you look in and have an -- opinions about it. And in the end, you, as the community, feel the empowered community actually makes the final decision about the budget.

And the budget is what we do. We can't do any- -- I don't have money outside the budget to come up with special things.

Then you have to do (indiscernible) about it. I am blessed, to be honest, to have a team that is very committed to our role within the ICANN institution.

We all do mistakes. We all do. But most of the work we do is directly related to supporting you, having people in the room, having I.T. presenting things, taking down facts. We don't spend -- It's not like we do many different things which is sort of outside the scope of this. It's, essentially, you tell us what to do and we do it. I mean, look at it -- and I like the question, Katrina. And you and I talked about this before. Because it's sort of -- it's easy to -- It was not clear, I have to admit, when I came in, this distinction between our roles. ICANN org's is -- we are here to facilitate the discussion within the community. That's one. That's what we do the most.

The second thing we do is to implement the decisions made by the board after, for instance, policy discussions within the community, reviews in the community. That is what we do for a living.

And then we have a checking point for that, and that is actually compliance. The compliance is the checking point where we see, for instance, that the policies that the community has, the (indiscernible) been implemented the right way. We don't do very much more than that.

So -- and, actually, I don't know what it would be.

There is one small task we do as well, which we are increasingly doing. And that is that we're trying to figure out ways to provide

facts to the community, especially when it comes to technical issues. And that's why you've seen more and more things coming out of OCTO, which is anything from (indiscernible) reports to more regulatory reports.

And so I think -- Do we do mistakes? Of course we do mistakes. But with the team I have -- and I'm really proud of it -- they are really committed to the mission of ICANN and supporting you. Not only the people in this room.

Thank you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you. You've said many right things. But I'm afraid you did not answer the question.

GORAN MARBY: Katrina, that was not polite. That was not polite. I have to admit, I actually gave you the answer. I actually gave you the answer. Because you control the budget. You are part of the budget process. And I have no --

KATRINA SATAKI: No. They're switching the responsibility here.

GORAN MARBY: That's -- no.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah.

GORAN MARBY: It's the community's responsibility to have the final say about the budget.

KATRINA SATAKI: No. My question was, there is a strategic plan, there is strategy. And we all must be committed to the strategy. So if I go, for example, to some of your team members, do they know about the strategy? Are they committed to the strategy? That was basically the question.

GORAN MARBY: When it comes to the current budget, are you committed to the budget -- when it comments -- the current strategy needs improvement. We're now in the process of making a new one.

The way which they measure all our activities that we have is -- there's an open and transparent tool to do it. Does everybody know that all our missions and all the things we do? It's a fairly big document they're working on. But every decision we make within ICANN org is -- has to be in support of the mission. If

everybody buys into it all the time, I cannot say. But they actually do perform the work.

And why do I -- am I this passionate about this? Because it's a question that goes really to the heart of ICANN org's reason. Why do we exist? To support it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

Cherine.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. Thank you.

So the -- the second document which I want your input on is the operating and financial plan. And that really supports what Goran is saying. ICANN org is going to develop, with us, this operational and financial plan. It will have a detail of activities, dependency, phasing, everything needed to do to implement the strategic plan. In fact, ICANN org's work, all of their activities year on year has to be consistent with that plan, and that plan has to be consistent with the strategy.

In terms of the executive team that -- with Goran, they all worked on the strategy with us, so they all buy into it. And then every

department underneath that will execute the strategy through the operating and financial plan.

The question is, collectively, the plan is going to be very comprehensive and ambitious, because the -- the strategy is bold and decisive and has a lot of far-reaching strategy.

The question is, do we collectively have the leadership, the management, the technical skills, the change management skills -- there's going to be a lot of changes. Change management is very important -- the financial resources to make this plan a reality? There's going to be a detailed road map over five years. Do we have the people, the skills, the knowledge, the know-how, the money, all of it? You mentioned one of the things the community can do is increase volunteers. Yes, please. We don't have enough to execute this plan. Right?

You mentioned that ICANN org should have consistency. Definitely. Right? They do have consistency.

But there are other things in terms of leadership, in terms of skills, know-how. Do we have this, enough to execute and execute well and succeed and take ICANN where we want to take it?

We're looking for ideas. Do you agree with that statement? Or do you believe we have enough of that and not to worry about it?

And we cannot leave the responsibility for implementing this plan, the operating plan, all to Goran's doorstep. 'Cause you do every year. Every year, you work with us on reviewing. We take a slice of that road map for that year, we look at all the activities, all the budgets; right? All the priorities. And we work at implementing that.

You -- you in particular, the CC community, you give really a comprehensive look at the budget, and you have been doing this for a number of years. You look at the entirety. And that's -- we're very, very grateful for that.

So we're looking for ideas how to execute this plan successfully.

If you have ideas that you can help us on that, that would be great.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm not sure if this is the right moment to say this, but on the -- the going forwards on the plan and everything, we're -- there's a session on Thursday with the whole community to talk about the governance model and all of that stuff. And I think whilst the ccNSO could sit in its own -- within its own bylaw and just do what it does quite comfortably, it would be really helpful if members of

the ccTLD community would participate in the discussion at the level that we're having it at the moment and come to that session, with this being run by Brian Cute. Most of you know Brian. And really come and provide a ccTLD -- when it comes to processes, one of the things that's a real challenge for some of the -- for ICANN is the way that some of the processes are done. And many ccTLDs are, in essence, mini ICANNs. And if you have ways that you use process that has been effective in cutting down the amount of time that things take or how to deal with conflicts when they arise within stakeholders, et cetera, that input is incredibly valuable to the wider community. So, please, come to the session on Thursday, involve yourselves in the process going forward, and help us to do the work that needs to be done to -- to streamline the governance model.

Thanks.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

Any more questions from the community?

Yes. I see a question.

ROELOF MEIJER: (Off mic) by your last question.

My assumption is that money and expertise is not the problem in the execution of the plans. I think it will always be capacity, the number of hours, man hours, that we have available. And I don't think we will be able to get enough of those to do everything that is in the plan.

KATRINA SATAKI: Sorry. Person hours.

ROELOF MEIJER: It's an answer to the question.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yeah, but person hours, not man hours; right?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes, ma'am.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay. I stand corrected.

Mrs. Chairperson.

Where was I? Yes.

[Laughter]

So -- so I think one of the things that you still need in the operational plans is a priority-setting. And I think Brian Cute's session will -- or this whole project will have as one of the outcomes, that's my prediction.

I think it's always good to have a plan that you cannot completely realize. Otherwise, you're not ambitious enough. But the fact that you know beforehand that you cannot realize everything should force you to prioritize. Make sure beforehand that you know, whatever happens, these two things, we have to do them this year. And if we get time constraints, these two we're going to drop and see if we can do them next year, or maybe we leave them out altogether. And that is something that is still lacking in the plans.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

Any responses to that? Goran, please.

GORAN MARBY: Priorities is actually one of the hardest things in ICANN. Because what you might think that you want to do important might

someone else in the community think is unimportant. And Cherine is probably going to say more about it.

I mean, this is actually one of the tricks that we have to figure out. And that's why I'm looking forward to Brian's exercise tomorrow. I mean, just -- in all the calls I had great consistencies. I said, "This budget is quite boring." Because it's a copy/paste from last year. Next year is going to be much more interesting. We have work -- implication of Work Stream 2, CCT, RTD2, --

KATRINA SATAKI: He means ATRT3.

GORAN MARBY: I never remember that one.

New strategic plan. It's going to be -- I mean, to your point, it's going to be -- We then have to make choices. And how do we -- how do we engage in the community, with the community and the board? And that's actually to make tough choices.

And how do we engage in reviews down the roads where we all think there are important things to do? I mean, Work Stream 2 had 100-something recommendations. And they all -- in a world where the funding into ICANN doesn't seem to be changing very

much, then we have to make decisions. And I think that we have to have open conversations how to do this.

Yesterday, we committed to have a session together with Jonathan about -- who -- what's his name? Sorry. Zuck. Zuck. Sorry. I'm sorry. It's Tuesday, or whatever -- to actually talk about it, how can we look upon reviews from a financial standpoint without -- without limiting the community members in that one to have a say about important things.

These are mechanics we haven't worked out. We have to do that together, to your point. So, basically, I do agree with you.

KATRINA SATAKI: Cherine, please.

CHERINE CHALABY: Okay. So I just want to bring back the conversation to those three documents, those three plans.

So on the first plan, you told us about the -- some very good ideas, how do we get the commitment and people to learn about it and to follow it. So there were a couple of ideas from Roelof and from Jordan, thank you very much, when you mentioned the need to make the plan flexible and adjustable. So we're going to take those ideas.

On the second plan, you mentioned that you don't think that there's an issue about knowledge, necessarily, but more about the availability of people. Right? And, therefore, we have to prioritize and make sure that everything is cost-effective and done in the right order.

The third plan is what Chris addressed, and Goran addressed, is about improving the efficiency of our governance model. And this is not just about policy development. It's about the wider governance model.

And the issue that is being discussed at the moment is the issue of priority and affordability. And why is that now an issue? It's because over the last ten years, let's say, our funding has been increasing. And whenever the board got recommendations, either through a policy development or a CCWG or a review, the board looks at the recommendation and sees if the process was right, was there consensus, recommendations are sensible, yes, approve, move on, and pass it on to ICANN org to implement, and cost was not an issue. Or it was an issue, but not a -- not something that would stop us from proceeding.

Now that funding has plateaued and -- but the recommendations coming up to the board are even greater in numbers, and we were faced recently with a situation where there was -- Work Stream 2 accountability came up with 112 recommendations, I'm told. CCT

review came up with 37 recommendations. Then we have EPDP's recommendation. Then there's the new Subpro recommendation. And the board is sitting there and seeing all of these coming to us. And we say, "Wait a minute. There has -- we can't spend -- we can't implement all of those in one go. There's no way. The money's not there."

So what do we do?

And to leave -- to leave the costing and the affordability and the priority to the very end after the community has spent a couple of years coming up with recommendations and go back to them and say, "Sorry." I think it's also the wrong way to do it. It's unfair and it's not correct.

So we have to find ways -- and we're looking for ideas -- how to bring the concept of affordability and priority back to the root where the recommendations are coming before they come to the board. And that is a difficult thing; right? It's a difficult thing to say will it change the community's attitude about the type of recommendation if it knew the cost of those recommendations? Not the cost of actually doing the work. It's the cost of implementing the recommendation.

So I give you, for example -- what was the budget, Bernie, about WS2, just to do the work? 2 million. But it could very well be that implementing the 112 recommendations will run into tens of

EN

millions over the years. I don't know. I'm not -- Please don't quote me. But I'm just giving you an example that it is not sanctioning the money to do our work. It's really approving the recommendations and implementing them over multiple years. It's not a one-time, because these things have a life in them. So -- and they increase the cost base of what we're doing.

So how do we bring into our work at the community level not just at the board level, the issue of affordability and priority? And how do we make it work when, as Goran said, what's a priority for one area is not a priority for another. So we're looking for ideas.

ROELOF MEIJER: I have another prediction about Brian's project as far as outcomes are concerned. And I think that one is, in my own phrasing, the community should learn to interfere less with the details and work on the high lines. Because I think, in general, we will all agree that we've come a long way and that this whole thing is working pretty well. So any review coming up with 112 recommendations, I think the people who wrote those should have realized when they were writing them down that they were asking an impossible question.

So one of the things that we have to do all together is create awareness that there's an end to both ICANN's money and its capacity, and that we -- that if every constituency or every

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
64
KOBE
9–14 March 2019

working group or every review would come up with 100-plus recommendations, that is asking for the impossible. So we will probably have to work towards something that is -- before you write down your recommendations, know that if you have more than five, we will ask you to tell us which ones are the five that you want us to implement within the next two years, something like that. Just an example.

I mean, I don't want to offend anybody in the working stream. But over 100 recommendations are, sorry --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: We should call it the Rule of Meijer measure. And then you would be to blame. You would be to blame for everything then. That would be great.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you!

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you.

Any other ideas on how to inject the idea of affordability and prioritization, not only at the board level, ICANN org level, but also the community level. Because we have to walk the talk. We

as a board have to demonstrate that we follow that, ICANN org follow that.

And I can see Bruce Tonkin, who knows all the answers, at the microphone. Bruce.

KATRINA SATAKI: First we have Jordan, then Bruce.

CHERINE CHALABY: Sorry, I didn't see you. My apologies.

JORDAN CARTER: It's all right. I'll talk to Roelof later about why he's wrong about the accountability recommendations.

Because mostly, they're about shaping things that are already done. They're not about doing new things.

But, anyway, I think the answer to the prioritization stuff is that if you ask each group to do priorities, you'll end up with an impossible list. And the only way you can reconcile it is by pointing back to the strategy. You have to just go, "That might be your priority and might be really important, but it isn't what the organization has signed up to do. And so we respect that it's important to you, but it's not what we're doing."

And that's the only way you can actually make the strategic framework bite. And its hard conversations, because people will wriggle around, and they will explain why, at five links removed, their project is going to be a great contribution to this goal. And you have to just say, "Sorry. That's bollocks. It isn't true. We can't do that.

But if you just do it on their terms, on their goals, you'll never get there.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you.

Bruce.

BRUCE TONKIN: Yeah, I agree, Jordan. I think -- Prioritization is not a new discipline. It's used by most organizations.

I think ICANN's reached a size now that it's not a small business. It's not, you know, ten people where you can do things ad hoc. It actually needs a more formal process.

If you think about a staff of about 500, if you think about 100 volunteers that are really actively doing work, that's 600-odd people, you actually have to use some structure. And picking up on I think both Roelof's and Jordan's comments, the first thing is,

you've got a list of ideas. That's basically what we get when we get these reviews. Similar, if I said, how would you like to improve outlook, and everyone in this room write down five things, and we added them all together, we'd then have 500 improvements.

Microsoft has a formal process for how it actually takes those things into account. And the first step is, you've got a list of ideas. The second step is, you've got to have a set of criteria by which you actually prioritize those.

So the first step for the community -- and part of that -- normally, when you're doing prioritization, one of your criteria is alignment and strategic plan. In any organization, that's the first one you start with. And then you might have three or four other criteria that you use. Then you apply that criteria to your ideas, and then you end up with a prioritized list.

So what we should really be saying is that when we get a review group, give us a ranked list. It's not that hard. There're very well-known techniques for doing it.

KATRINA SATAKI: Thank you very much.

Any final remarks?

If not, we have to -- Yeah, Lito.

LITO IBARRA: But it's an AOB. May I?

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes.

LITO IBARRA: Okay. Thank you.

I'm also a ccNSO member, as you know. And I received yesterday the call and the terms of reference for the ccNSO Internet Governance Liaison Committee.

I just wanted first to let you know that within the board, we have a Working Group on Internet Governance. We would love to engage when the committee's ready.

And second, I don't know if you would like to comment or expand on that a little bit just for the benefit of other board members around.

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, thank you very much. Just to briefly summarize the history of this group, as you may know, in Barcelona, we -- the council decided to withdraw from the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. But really realizing that there is a huge interest among ccTLDs to participate in Internet governance, we decided to change slightly the approach that we take by

establishing this Internet governance committee in which we would have community representatives. And this committee would work with -- be happy to liaise with your committee -- with this now engagement group on Internet governance and all other parties that are active in this field.

And, yes, I would like to encourage those who are interested to step forward and apply to this committee.

Thank you.

With that, let me thank again our guests today -- Becky wanted to say something.

BECKY BURR: I just think we should take a moment to acknowledge the stealth takeover of the ICANN board by the ccNSO.

[Laughter]

KATRINA SATAKI: Yes, great. Thank you very much.

Thank you.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]