EVOLVING THE MULTI-STAKEHOLDER MODEL STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE #2 - GOVERNANCE ICANN STRATEGIC PLAN 2021-2025

WEBINAR

14 MAY 2019

BRIAN CUTE

The Eastham Group

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD LAUNCHED 25 APRIL 2019 TO 4 JUNE 2019

HTTPS://WWW.ICANN.ORG/PUBLIC-COMMENTS/EVOLVING-MULTISTAKEHOLDER-MODEL-2019-04-25-EN

- Develop an Issues List: https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/draft-evolving-multistakeholder-model-issues-list-25apr19-en.pdf
- Identify and describe issues that are causing ineffectiveness and inefficiency in the multi-stakeholder model
- Issues will also be consolidated and prioritized

GOALS OF THE WEBINAR

1. We will review the Issues List
2. You are invited to offer the following input:

- Describe the nature of the issue and specifically how it hampers the more effective functioning of the multi-stakeholder model.
- Provide a specific example that describes one or more of the issues that have been identified. Use fact-based examples only.
- Describe how the multi-stakeholder model would more effectively function if a solution or new approach to the issue could be implemented.
- Describe how the multi-stakeholder model would more effectively function while respecting the open and inclusive nature of the multi-stakeholder model.

ISSUES LIST

- Timing of decision-making: Our processes take too long
- Complexity
- Culture
- Prioritization of Work
- Demographics
- Recruitment
- Representativeness
- Inclusiveness
- Consensus
- Precision in Scoping the Work
- Accountability
- Transparency
- Costs
- Trust
- Roles and Responsibilities
- Efficient Use of Resources
- Volunteer Burnout
- Silos
- Work Processes
- Holistic view of ICANN
- Terms

ISSUES

1. PRIORITIZATION OF WORK

Community input: Who sets ICANN's priorities? The answer seems to be the community. When a lack of priority setting leads to dysfunctional outcomes, contradictory findings and general volunteer burnout, I don't think the community is a particularly meaningful point of accountability for the lack of priority setting.

2. PRECISION IN SCOPING OF WORK

Community input: If scoping is unclear or too wide open, it causes problems for working groups to actually focus and get their work done in a timely manner.

3. WORK PROCESSES

Community input: Lack of project management skills. Process over substance. Bureaucratic overload. Not able to stop redundant processes. Everything has to be reinvented or rethought or talked about in various venues.

ISSUES

4. INCLUSIVITY

Community input: Bringing everybody into the fold on every single thing doesn't work. Chairs feel they have to be inclusive; they can't discriminate, they have to treat every intervention as valuable as the other.

5. REPRESENTATIVENESS

Community input: Individual representation (desire to let everybody have a voice) v. representing a group. ICANN's legitimacy is questioned if stakeholders aren't able to contribute in a way that represents their communities.

6. CONSENSUS

Community input: Biggest issue is the lack of incentives for stakeholders to compromise. Perhaps a little bit of a better understanding of what we mean by consensus and how we get there. But it is something that we don't do well, and we don't really know how to do well.

ISSUES

7. EFFICIENT USE OF RESOURCES

Community input: All these other work streams that we commit AC members to dilute our resources to get our own work done.

8. COSTS

Community input: Need more transparency around the costs of policy-making and work of the Community and ICANN org.; 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 the wrong way to do it. It's unfair and it's not correct.

ISSUES

9. TIMING OF DECISION-MAKING: OUR PROCESSES TAKE TOO LONG

10. VOLUNTEER BURNOUT

These issues appear to be “symptoms” and not a cause of ineffectiveness and inefficiency.

Q. What are the specific causes of these symptoms?

ISSUES

11. COMPLEXITY

Community input: External complexity: governments involvement in developing legislation that impact ICANN (e.g. GDPR); new geopolitical issues.; Internal complexity: complexity of our teams, now we need the equivalent of a congressional research service or parliamentary service. We have staff but staff is overloaded.

12. DEMOGRAPHICS

Community input: Have a lot of new talent but we're not doing a good job of developing people to move them into other roles

13. RECRUITMENT

Community input: We are not bringing enough people in.

ISSUES

14. CULTURE

Community input: Something's broken in our DNA that we wait to be pushed and pushed hard by external forces. We're supposed to be the thought leaders.; Long series of crises and large issues that we have lurched between.; Should be passing on a positive community culture to the next generation.

15. TRUST

Community input: Within the Community we don't have that level of trust that we can kind of reach across the aisles.; One of the best ways to create trust is to include people in the picture. I think that there's a perception that ICANN wants everybody to work for them and come and tell us what to do and how to do it, but ICANN should be sending a message that we're here for everyone else.

16. SILOS

Community input: Tribalism. This is in relation to silos but it's not exactly the same. Being defined by who or what you are against. So that's a -- kind of particularly curdled aspect of silos.

ISSUES

17. ACCOUNTABILITY

Community input: I don't think the community is a particularly meaningful point of accountability for the lack of priority-setting. So I think a better answer, then, for the community is needed.

18. TRANSPARENCY

Community input: Need more transparency around the costs of policy-making and work of the Community and ICANN org.

19. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Community input: Understanding separate responsibilities and how we can find a way forward with that.; And the Board and the ICANN org end up with this really strange place where someone has to finally make the decision. In the end, it's the community that makes the decision for the empowered one. But someone has to make those choices.

ISSUES

20. HOLISTIC VIEW OF ICANN

Community input: We talk about reviewing the organization but there is no place where we have a holistic view of the organization where we can have a global view. That is one of the points that I think is missing.

21. TERMS

Community input: Could everybody decide that he or she does not have more than one or two terms in a row? So, for example, for the Board. If everybody could decide that we don't have several terms at the same time.

PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INPUT

- Describe the nature of the issue and specifically how it hampers the more effective functioning of the multi-stakeholder model.
- Provide a specific example that describes one or more of the issues that have been identified. Use fact-based examples only.
- Describe how the multi-stakeholder model would more effectively function if a solution or new approach to the issue could be implemented.
- Describe how the multi-stakeholder model would more effectively function while respecting the open and inclusive nature of the multi-stakeholder model.

EVOLVING MSM
UPCOMING ACTIVITIES IN THE PROCESS

- **Check the Evolving MSM site for updates:** https://www.icann.org/resources/pages/governance-plan-improve-multistakeholder-model-2019-04-08-en
- **Join the Evolving MSM email list:** https://mm.icann.org/listinfo/evolvingmsm
- **Submit your comments - Public Comment Process closes 4 June 2019** https://www.icann.org/public-comments/evolving-multistakeholder-model-2019-04-25-en
- **12 June 2019 - A webinar is scheduled to review the final Issues List, based on Public Comments, and to review the Work Plan document**
- **24 – 28 June 2019 – An Evolving MSM session will be held at ICANN65 t map issues into the Work Plan.**

The Eastham Group