SINGAPORE – ICANN Strategy Panels & the Planning Process
Monday, March 24th 2014 – 15:15 to 16:45
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

THERESA SWINEHART: Looks like we're ready. And, according to Alice, I'm driving. First of all, I just wanted to acknowledge Alice's incredible work on the strategy panels themselves and keeping everything orchestrated and moving forward and coordinated and just really running with the program. I just want to really publicly acknowledge that. So Alice, thank you.

[Applause]

There's a lot of projects going on. So it's very much appreciated.

So this session is going to be on the ICANN strategy panels and the planning process. And I'll do a quick introduction of where we are with the strategic planning process and schedule and then actually turn it over to the chairs of the panels to go through their outcomes, their thoughts, and to open that up for questions and answers.

Unfortunately, I have a meeting that had been scheduled at 4:00; so I will step out at a few minutes before that.

But Pindar has been kind enough to offer to handle the closing of the sessions, so thanks and apologies about the last minute schedule.

So let's see. Of course, I have to figure out what direction to point it to. Maybe not? No, no, maybe. Sorry about this. Good? Okay.

So just a quick run through on the agenda. I'll talk about this for just a few minutes, and then I'll give some time back to the different strategy

panels. The first one will be on identifier technology innovation. The second will be on public responsibility framework, the third on ICANN multistakeholder innovation, and then the fourth on ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem.

And I just wanted to thank Beth Noveck and her team. I realize it's an odd hour of the day for her to be conferencing in to this. So thank you for the remote participation on that.

So we'll go to the strategic plan. We're having a little bit of an issue here.

Okay. Sorry about that.

So the strategic planning process was -- the dialogue for that was begun during the ICANN meeting in Beijing. And there's been an iteration of input into that process. And we're now in the next phase of it. It's very much focused on vision, mission, and then has focus areas. And that planning process has been collaborative and has been engaging the community.

The objective, really, with this iteration of the strategic planning process is that we really capture what we need for moving forward in a very cohesive and constructive way which can then be built upon. So we're looking at the five years for fiscal year 2016-2020.

So let's see here. Okay. There we go. I'm sorry. This is just really a little difficult. Okay. So the process in the schedule, just so everybody has that, we've had some feedback and a little --

>>   We've had some feedback.

[Laughter]

THERESA SWINEHART: Okay. Let's try this again. How is that working? We'd make a good comedy show here. Okay.

So we've had some feedback around the strategy panels and the timing and the context of the strategic planning process. And I just want to reiterate here that the strategy panels themselves, as they were put into place at the ICANN meeting in Durban and announced and then their work began in the fall, were really focused on areas that had been identified in the initial strategic planning phasing at the start. There were themes that were coming up from community dialogues and seemed to be ones that could -- warrant a little more discussion. And, as those strategy panels were put into place, also realization that they could be very important for informing the strategic planning process.

So the public comment period on the strategy panel reports, which you'll get the opportunity to hear from the respective chairs and have questions and dialogue, obviously, with them, are now out for the public input and community input and dialogue through the 30th of April 2014, obviously.

And the public comment period for the draft strategic plan will then be from April through May. And the timing of this is such to ensure that the input that's received from the dialogues surrounding the strategy panels can very well be captured on areas where it feels the community might feel that it helps inform the strategic planning process, that that

can then be captured during that phase, the April through May 2014 period.

The finalization of the strategic plan, again, will be out for public comment and input in the period of June. And then the review and approval of the final strategic plan by the board in June 2014.

So that just captures a little bit of the process area.

On the strategy panels outcomes and their work, I think that there's many new fresh ideas. There's also many ideas that have been iterations of community dialogues that we've heard in different places. So I think it's a very useful way to continue these dialogues on the thematic areas that they were focused on and, you know, help us think a little bit further about ideas, new initiatives we might want to take, how the organization might evolve, or where people want to try different areas and test them out. But, again, they're out for comment at this period. And I certainly look forward to hearing from the panel chairs on, first, their observations and recommendations; but also then the dialogue with the community here which is a wonderful opportunity.

So not to take any more time, let me hand it over right away to Paul Mockapetris, who is very kind to chair the strategy panel on identifier technology innovation and I think had some very useful and interesting findings out of that. So, Paul, I wish you luck.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: Theresa, I'll wrap up. Is it these two?

THERESA SWINEHART: No, it's these two.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: Just a little lag. Hi, I'm Paul Mockapetris. And the panel that I chaired was dealing with identifier technology and innovation. The name of the panel might sound a little awkward, but what we wanted to do is to try to be broader than just talking about the DNS.

Because there's a wide variety of identifiers out there. And they all have interrelationships that mean that we need to think about them in a more integrated kind of way. So that name was purposeful. Unfortunately, there's many more classes of identifiers than we had time to address. So most of what we did was, in fact, related to the DNS. But we can see lots of other directions.

I want to thank the people on the panel. They came from a wide variety of organizations. Jari is chair of the IETF. But everybody participated as an individual rather than as a delegate from a particular organization. But we had a pretty broad brush from multiple continents and so forth. Also want to thank Elise Gerich who was my executive sponsor and sort of held my leash when it was necessary. And, if you look at the panelists, I'm sure you can be confident that they have a number of different points of view. So some of the recommendations are supported more widely than others, and I'll try to give a little flavor for that. But there's a few that we all can agree on. When we talk about what's happening with the DNS, it's a Darwinian kind of struggle because -- it's this thing. We can just turn it off. There we go.

-- because people argue about the merits of certain ideas and whether or not what's going to happen to the DNS, what's the roadmap for the next 5 or 10 years. I think there's a number of factors favoring expansion and a number favoring contraction. And, just to go through them briefly, the DNS is the one naming system that pretty much exists on any device that's connected to the Internet, whether that's your cell phone or your computer or your Nest thermostat. So that legacy base means, if you want to go deploy a new application and you happen to need a distributed database that can serve a billion clients at the same time, it already exists and it's there.

So people have naturally tried to put things on it with different measures of success.

For example, there was an attempt to route all phone calls, the E.164 ENUM initiative. There was an RFID initiative. There's a mail routing that we all know and love. And there's also the spam suppression that pretty much takes advantage of DNS as a database all because the technology is out there and you can use it. There's the new TLDs. And, obviously, there's a lot of people who are going to put a lot of energy into figuring out ways to be innovative in the context of the DNS.

Whenever you add a new capability, potentially, there's a new set of applications that you can address.

The most obvious one out there right this moment is DNSSEC. Now, it turns out that the original theory, that you wouldn't put any information into the DNS that required security, we woke up one day and said wait a second, all these host addresses and mail routing and all the other information really does require security. So we came up with

DNSSEC. But I think now that we have DNSSEC, one of the most clear ways to think about exploiting it is for high value information that you can now distribute in an authenticated kind of way.

Is there new data we can put in the DNS? We put about 60 data types in the DNS of which I would say less than 10 data types are universally acceptable, so that there's some growth that's possible there. And then, more recently, there's been a bunch of people who have said we're going to sort of integrate with the DNS. There's multicast DNS, which is an initiative that came from Apple that's used for bonjour and sort of auto configuring in the local environment. And there's similar initiatives going on to do home networking. There's people who are going to do privacy. There's the onion folks. There's the Namecoin people, et cetera.

And one of the real questions we're going to have is whether or not the notion of a domain name includes these other things in the name space that don't obey quite the same rules and whether it's better to be inclusive or to try and preserve commonality.

One of the big questions that we wrestled with was: Is there a way to make the DNS more consistent in the responses that it gives? The most well-known example of consistency issues is the collision issue that -- we had a separate session for that. But there's also each browser vendor attempts to do better heuristics about matching what you type in your browser bar to domain names. And the side effect of this is that no two browsers work the same way. At any rate, there's lots of factors favoring expansion.

On the contraction side, the user interface is favoring just sort of free text. And the user interface, if it's spoken, is probably not going to be domain names. There's people who are also using bar codes and the like.

Some people will argue that the ability to add new features to the DNS has stopped either because there's access points, DSL modems, cable modems, whatever, a lot of the existing equipment that will, for example, only deliver a subset of defined DNS protocol specifications, so that you pretty much have to stick in that narrow focus. There's commercial identifiers, you know, your -- Google and Facebook I think, both want to own all the users in the world with their own unique IDs. And that's a recommend commercial objective, but does it come in conflict here?

And then there's the rise of new systems from research. I think naming and name-based networking or information centric networking or content centric networking, there's about two dozen different research projects around the world that all view naming as being the prime basis for the next-generation of networking.

And so one of the things that I love to do is to take a look at these things and say, well, is there any great ideas that are in this next-generation that perhaps we can steal and retrofit it in? In any case, the future of domain names and so forth is complicated. And there's this Darwinian struggle, and we identified these factors.

What are the research drivers there? The names are, again, very hot. Name-based networking, content-based -- these are all projects that are either international or U.S. that are around the world. And, again, the

common theme is access by name and opportunistic caching. So one of the things that you find in these proposals is they say, well, we access content by name and we do opportunistic caching.

Now, those of you that are familiar with the DNS may have seen these principles back from 1983. We still do it. And the big difference is that we don't have the sort of larger chunk size that you want for distributing media.

So, in looking at the fundamentals, we're wondering whether or not there's expansion that's possible in this area. The common ingredients that you see in the research world are self-certifying or flat names, often times for privacy. Usually, there's a key infrastructure. And I think anybody that thinks about the privacy implications realizes that a public key infrastructure is a very high-value target. Because now you know who all the players are and you can start collecting their metadata, as the phrase goes.

So there's common things that we already have, and the question is how do we build on them? And, frankly, the bottom line here is that, if you're looking at the next generation of technology, I see two possibilities, one of which is that we can try and figure out how to accelerate the replacement of the DNS with some of these new technologies, or we can think about taking some of the best ideas from the research world and retrofitting it into what we have.

So the roadmap questions for ICANN, I think, are that they administer the DNS and it's limited by operational protocol and process kinds of things. I mean, one of the things that goes on is that the IETF disbanded the DNS extensions working group but has about, oh, I don't know, 6 to

8 working groups that is doing DNS mechanisms rather than protocol because the extensions group was supposed -- there's some sort of process issues there.

And I think the next question is should ICANN try and preserve and enhance its DNS asset? If ICANN was a commercial thing, it would say, gee, what we really want to do is expand one of those key assets. How do we do that? Can we think about ways to deossify what's going on and either have this enhancement or evolution to the research direction?

Hardening the root: This is, you know, one of the opportunities that everybody likes. The major opportunities here are generating the root zone file. People talked about how you can have very secure hardware to go do that. But the panel didn't see that that was something that they particularly wanted to work on.

You can think about upgrading and having secure components there. But one of the questions to think about is globalization via shared zone control. And the notion of shared zone control that we explored is one where you could have an automatic process just like you have in Bitcoin and a number of these other -- the technical phrase is Byzantine consensus kind of algorithms such that you could replace the operation by any single entity by a distributed algorithm and think about allocating the right process in the algorithm and then having everybody be able to watch it all happen without any particular single point of control and single point of failure other than the accuracy of the algorithm.

A second area was distributing the root file. I think we're probably going to think about the root zone as being an object, or at least one of

the things that we thought about was having the root zone be assigned an object. And you might say, well, wait a second. DNSSEC allows the root zone to be a signed object. It does, but it doesn't assign the delegation and glue information around the edges. So you need a little bit of enhancement. And, in essence, what happens then is you could have copies of the data distributed rather than worrying about having more and more instances of specialized root servers.

This is going back to the original ideas behind the DNS zone transfer mechanism where you say you're allowed to preplan the replication of information as a way to make sure that you have the kind of operation that doesn't depend upon other parts of the infrastructure.

Shared zone control: Again, what would we have? We'd have a workflow-like language that would allow you to -- multiple parties to specify different rights for different parts of the same zone. And I should say that, while I talked about this in the context of the root zone, this could be applicable for making sure that parent and child information was synchronized, forward and reverse zones were synchronized, or any different interrelated parts of the DNS infrastructure where different data is in different zones keeping it consistent.

For the root, again, make it possible to split control. The one thing we didn't want to do is to state any particular policy. I got a lot of feedback -- in fact, I think the most prevalent feedback I got was that, you know, the ccTLDs don't want any voting. And I said, well, the way you do that is you just say if any -- if the country itself wants to make the change, then that's the one vote it needs to move forward. So don't, when you

read the voting part of the proposal, get any ideas about how we're trying to change the rules. We're trying to make it possible to implement whatever rules you would like.

There's some limited history here. For example, various people have said or theorized, I guess, that zones should be signed with more than one key and then you can vote by the number of signatures. That's the N out of M proposal. And there's also a couple different ways of doing just DNSSEC synchronization that's in DNSOPs.

Rethinking the fundamentals: One of the things we'd like to do or my recommendation would be to take a pause after this study and think about or not there's a way to get actually together and have an architectural study about what's the way to think in an integrated way about enhanced DNS architecture? There's some ideas that have been kicking around forever. For example, why don't we have metadata that just defines the structure of a DNS data type? So, if we want to introduce a new one, we don't have to reprogram all the servers. They could automatically know that.

Some people at NL Labs, VeriSign and Paul Hoffman, have done a new asynchronous interface, an API to DNS, which is supposed to enable a lot of web applications that want to have aggressive asynchronous access to the DNS.

So, if we rethink the fundamentals, how do we make the whole idea worth doing? There's a problem here that, if you design an ultimate structure but it's too hard to implement or too hard to distribute, why are people going to adopt it? You have to make sure that you balance the benefit and the effort. So the recommendations that we came with

that are under consideration or input to the strategic process are to have ICANN as an exemplar to publish more signed data for reserved labels, et cetera. For example, some of you probably know that the reserve label list includes references to pdf documents that you get from the U.N. And, unless you can process a lot of different alphabets all at once -- I, for example, would have a hard time typing into the Punycode for the Arabic ones -- why don't we have these available for an online resource? Again, that is very critical to get it right. And we have DNSSEC to authenticate the data. Maybe we want to think about making that available. Think about having a study to define the vision for the next-generation. Prototype -- the open root publication, in other words, the ability to hand out signed copies of the root. Prototype the shared zone control.

And I think, lastly, we've heard or a lot of you I think are familiar with the collision work and the document about collision for IT professionals. I think what we need to do is to have some exercises to actually try that out in advance in friendly environments and to actually report the results of how well it works in practice.

So that's, I believe, the end of mine. We'll take a little bit of Q&A.

THERESA SWINEHART: We'll do about five minutes of Q&A. And then we'll go on to the next one. Unfortunately, I need to step out. But, if I can hand it to Pindar. My apologies.

PINDAR WONG:

So, if there are any urgent questions, please go to the mic. Chuck, you have one?

CHUCK GOMES:

There we go. I see the green light now. So okay. Thanks a lot, Paul. And thanks for the whole team for the work they did.

One of the things I noticed, when I read your report, is that it's highly technical. I'm not highly technical. So forgive me on that. But if -- could you go back to -- is it possible to go back to the recommendations slide? The -- how many of those recommendations would require IETF work before -- or are those recommendations more for IETF action than ICANN action?

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS:

Well, you know, I think in reality -- let's see. The first one here, ICANN could publish more of its own data certainly in signed format without -- there's no new developments there other than perhaps some formatting standards that might go through the IETF.

Certainly, the others would be done -- I guess the last one is also one that wouldn't require the IETF. But the middle three are things where we would certainly expect to be -- have IETF involved.

CHUCK GOMES:

That's what I thought in looking -- and that's fine. But, in terms of looking ahead to ICANN's strategic plan, now, first of all, would you agree with me that these are more tactical than strategic? Or maybe there's an overarching strategical direction that would cover those.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: Well, you know, I think that, if we're thinking about a vision for DNS in 2020, I think that has to be strategic, Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: Yeah.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: I think the other two are certainly things that we can do in the short term that are sort of directly related to the business that ICANN does and, as such, are tactical. But I think that both of them are things that could have a wider implication if used in a wider context. So I guess they could grow into strategic things.

So I would -- I guess I would classify them both as tactical experiments that we hope might change the way we do business.

CHUCK GOMES: Good. Thanks. Appreciate that.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: Sure.

PINDAR WONG: Any other burning questions, please?

>>   Good afternoon. Thank you for everybody. It's been 15 years ago I suggest to --

PINDAR WONG: Sorry. Could you introduce yourself, please. Name.

>>   I'm sorry, yeah. My name is (saying name) Lee. Lee is the last name. I come from (indiscernible.) Actually, 15 years ago, I suggest two types of Internet address solution. At that time, the name is ITI. I changed it to (indiscernible) 2000. The one thing is gTLD type is multilingual. The second thing is just plain name. Actually, I came from South Korea. South Korea already provide the planning in the name solution. Is no problem already at 15 years. So I only suggest again in here I think for the name all over the world. Prototype of the name is good for every company, every user because (indiscernible) So this is very useful and very helpful to (indiscernible) So I suggest to ICANN again.

                            So, anyway, is there any opinion about considering research about the kind of solution and then discuss about more thing about that. Okay.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: I'm sorry. I'm not sure I understand the question. Could you try again?

>>   Yeah, ICANN -- I will suggest to contribute our solution to the ICANN.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: Okay. Well, you know, what we're doing is we're collecting feedback from the community. So I think the best thing to do would be for you to send feedback to ICANN about this existing solution. And maybe we can incorporate it.

>>   Okay. Yeah, I see. Yeah.

PAUL MOCKAPETRIS: Or send it to me personally, or we can talk about it afterwards.

>>   Actually, I cannot catch what you're saying. Exactly. Sorry.

PINDAR WONG: Okay. Maybe we can take this offline. James, you're here. Can you rephrase the question?

>>   So actually --

PINDAR WONG: Sorry. Can you introduce your name?

JAMES SENG: My name is James Seng. I'm one of the panelists in the ITI group with Paul Mockapetris.

So, in one of the discussions on our panel, we talk about alternative form of identifiers that's been used on the Internet and one of which being that the likes of root name system, key word system that's been very popular in Asia for a period of time. (indiscernible) is just one of these alternative solutions that's been discussed within the community and sometimes within the context of ICANN. Unfortunately or -- well, I won't use -- I shouldn't use unfortunately. My pardon.

However, the search system has not been endorsed or has been gone through the IETF process so, therefore, it has been discussed but has not been widely adopted. There are considerations I think as parts of this, and we should be looking at the solution. However, I do think that is not part of the ICANN process.

PINDAR WONG: Okay, thank you. Moving right along, Nii, are you ready? Can we have Nii's presentation, please?

NII QUAYNOR: Thank you very much.

Yeah, Nii Quaynor. And I'm speaking on behalf of the panel, which is very diverse from five continents, multilingual and wide variety of professions.

What I would like to say is that we are very grateful for the input we've received so far from the community but perhaps like Oliver Twist, we ask for more so that our recommendations will be much, much better founded.

In the interest of time, I will try and paraphrase quite a bit, but I'm sure you will get the gist of it.

The document has an outline in which the aims and definitions are made clear, and current work by departments and regional engagement strategies are also spelled out, and the initial areas of focus are also identified and followed by recommendations.

The aims, first part defines our thinking regarding public interest and details the target areas and audiences, promotes public interest by building out engaged stakeholders while advising on approaches to public responsibility and outreach.

In the definitions, the first part is really building a context which says that we are not alone. We are in an ecosystem. And the public responsibility is at the core of the work of ICANN and permeates all the work areas that ICANN engages in. However, we define the global public interest as ensuring Internet remains stable, inclusive and accessible by all, building trust in the Internet and in the Internet governance system.

At the same time, we specify the initial areas of focus, target topics, regions, and stakeholders, and try to point out what can eliminate friction to openness and accessibility.

Now, on the current activities -- The current activities for both departments, as well as for regional strategies, have a common theme, and the themes are capacity building, funding and partnerships, communication, awareness and engagement, and education.

With respect to the initial areas of focus, we see four key areas: education, localization and inclusion, next generation activities and inclusive Internet governance ecosystem.

So education, we see effective communication on ICANN's role and mandate as key, and an increase in accessibility to ICANN as very pertinent, and the engagement with academia and research institutions as very important.

With localization and inclusion, we like information to be accessible to non-English speaking so as to enhance participation in general, and we look to how better serve internationalization of the Web as very important in inclusion.

For next generation, we are looking at raising awareness and encouraging participation. At the same time, engaging that community with capacity building and awareness.

Inclusive Internet governance. We would like to see working with governments to build trust and participation in ICANN and in GAC, encourage evolution of the private sector and civil society players, working with governments to address Internet governance challenges. And we note that not all Internet governance issues are global. And ensuring stability of an open and single Internet that is globally accessible as very important.

Overall recommendations. We see strengthening regional engagement strategies, enhancing understanding of the links between Internet governance and development, strengthening existing Internet governance ecosystem and ensuring stable, inclusive and accessible

Internet. And support internationalization of Web and promote local content.

Strategy recommendations. Establish an external foundation to further fulfill ICANN's responsibility and objectives, and link Internet policy-making to development, and streamline the current public responsibility efforts.

Structural recommendations. Establish a department to guide approaches to fulfilling objectives, and that includes formalizing approaches throughout all the departments, build partnerships to strengthen serving the global public interest, and create public responsibility programs for the focus areas.

The department plan should include vision, mission, and mandate, in consultation with all the other departments. A five-year timeline with key objectives and milestones, work plan for first five years, including pilot programs, and conducting and collating research in support of the department's work.

And at this point, I thank you, and I'd like to take a few questions.

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes again. Thanks, Nii, and thanks to your team.

One. Things I liked in your report was that you, several times, referred to ICANN's limited technical mission, but I also found that a lot of your specific recommendations, not so much the strategic -- the ones that were labeled strategic, really tended to -- tended towards mission creep

for ICANN, beyond what ICANN's mission is. They were good recommendations, but I'm not sure they fit ICANN's mission.

I like -- On your slides, I like the way you broke out the strategic recommendations versus the others. Again, a lot of your recommendations, which may be very good, I think could be very good, are much more tactical than they are strategic. And just distinguishing between those I think is helpful in your final report so that it can more readily be used for the five-year strategic plan.

Thanks.

NII QUAYNOR: Thank you very much. We'll try and follow.

>>   Thank you. Jameson Olufiea (phonetic). I would like to commend the panel for the good effort they made on this topic.

I want to propose perhaps we could have another objective, since there's much emphasis on multistakeholder approach, bottom-up multistakeholder approach, that in fulfilling the public responsibility of ICANN, perhaps we can use the communities to do more of this as well. Like you talk about department, talk about the strategies, assisting regional strategies. How about the community itself?

So I propose a framework for community engagement tools, greater public responsibility, benefits realization for ICANN, using the communities themselves, engaging them to do that.

Then as the previous speaker mentioned, perhaps there are some things that we don't need to focus on, like the university, talking about ICANN University. I think, too, we can partner with others to get the messages across, but that is not our core mission. So it might not be necessary to ICANN to set up a university to drive its ideas.

Then, also, there's need to engage developing countries' governments. Because if you look at GAC, the majority of the participants are from the north, but from Africa, from least developed countries, so we need a lot of work done there. So maybe there is a way to engage the governments in developing and least developed countries.

And also involve local stakeholders, a lot of local stakeholders so they can push the message across. And talking about local stakeholders, maybe we can find a way to integrate ICANN message into school curriculum. I don't know how that could happen. The Internet is being taught in a number of junior schools, so maybe a way to talk about governance and ICANN mentioned there. So that could be quite useful, I guess.

And also, funding for research. You know, in language translation, you know, you talk about language barrier. So maybe automatic and more effective, efficient translation mechanism will also help to get the message across, you know, more clearly.

Okay. That's what I have now.

Thank you.

NII QUAYNOR: Thank you very much except that we never said we are going to build a university.   We said we will engage with academia and research institutions.   And I think it's very much in line with what you want, so I think we are okay.

In our thinking, the regional strategies are the vehicle for engaging the communities, and I think that will, perhaps, satisfy your interest in the points you have raised.   So we'll work on it and thank you for your input.

PINDAR WONG: Thank you.   Could I just ask Beth, are you ready to present?   This is Pindar.   I'll be flipping your slides for you.   Can you just tell me when you want to advance?

BETH NOVECK: I will.   Absolutely.   Can you hear me?

PINDAR WONG: Yes.   You have the next 15 minutes.   Just a point of order.   Although this session is scheduled to finish at 16:45, with your indulgence, there's no session after us, and in order for us to interact with you more, we'll be here to answer questions and we'll run into that.

So, Beth, over to you.

BETH NOVECK: I guess I won't get to go sleep tonight after all.   Thank you very much and thank you for indulging my remote participation.   I'm sorry I can't join you in person, and do let me know how the sound quality is, and I

will not try to overtax you by speaking too long as the disembodied voice. And thank you, Pindar, for advancing the slides for me. I appreciate it.

So if we go to the first one, I really just wanted to set the frame for the work that we set out to do, which is namely, to take to the earlier point, to take ICANN's remit as a given but to acknowledge the fact that there are a lot of discussions going on all around the world in this and in other activities to try to understand how do we create the most robust and effective distributed yet networked and coordinated governance mechanisms for the Net. And to even begin to have those conversations, the conversations that other people are trying to have, we set ourselves the task of trying to understand what are the new ways, what are the new strategies that we're learning about in this new technology era, in this 21st century, how do we actually make decisions? How do we solve problems? How do we work across a distributed space together in the world? Because it's only by understanding those mechanisms and the new ways that we can do and decide and work collaboratively that other people can then begin to answer these questions of what are the ways that we might effectively govern.

We had a wonderful panel, whose pictures you'll see on the next slide, who joined us from around the world, including Kenya and South Africa, from China and Europe, and one of our panel members who could be find somewhere between the United Arab Emirates, Tokyo and Boston on any given day. So we had all the typical ICANN challenges of trying to coordinate and organize our own group working across the distance, and I'm very grateful to these extraordinarily busy people who brought

a really unique perspective. And people had at least some and in many cases very deep knowledge and understanding of ICANN and of the Internet governance ecosystem, but all of whom brought an outside perspective in terms of a study and a passion for and an interest in governance innovations more broadly.

So our remit was really to try to take -- and you'll see our charter on the next slide, the MSI panel's charter, was really to try to look at what are the innovations taking place around the world in other domains, whether governments or NGOs, in the public and private sector, what are the new ways in which people are using technology to govern from the bottom-up? What are the ways in which people are working collaboratively? And what might we learn from those examples about the ways that ICANN might evolve the way that it does its own work?

The panel was very prolific in its output. We had a lot of conversation with people online and off-line, through one-on-one interviews, the submissions that people sent us and continue to send us, thank you very much, through meetings like this, and we hope that will continue, and conversations that they're having around the work that we're doing, not directly with us but that we might be helping to catalyze and to inspire; to make a set of recommendations that we'll talk a little bit more about today of essentially 16 concrete proposals for things that ICANN might consider doing that it could try to pilot that it could try to test, experiments, if you will, that we might undertake to try out new ways of working and deciding across a distance.

You'll see everything outlined fully on our Web site, on the ICANN Web site, on the panel page, and all of the links are provided in the slides and

will be provided off-line and are available in myriad places for people to follow along. So it is not too late to participate.

We have the benefit that not only do we have this wonderful group of people on this panel but we were supported by a research team, precisely some of those university-based young people that were just talked about in the last session, who work with me at the governance lab where we take as our mission this work not only with ICANN but with others of looking at what are the innovations, what are the new ways that we might govern in the 21st century.

The gov lab has worked along with the panel trying to provide research and support, trying to provide case studies and examples throughout the process.

Recognizing that many people on our panel and in other panels as well as the supporting team have varying depths of knowledge about ICANN, one of the first things we wanted to do was to make sure that we got smart as deeply as possible and as specifically as possible about the work that ICANN does in order that the recommendations that we would make, while necessarily brief and short in the time that we have while not necessarily specific enough, will at least begin from a starting point of things that could be applied in the workings of ICANN as it functions today.

So we developed a number of primers about ICANN, largely as a way to test our own understanding and to make sure that we're on an equal footing and equal shared understanding about what ICANN is and what ICANN does. We put out every week something we call the ICANN scan -- excuse me, the Internet governance SCANs, SCAN stands for Selected

Curation of Articles in Net governance, and I invite you to sign up because what we're doing is learning alongside everyone else, publicly sharing what we're reading, annotating the articles we're reading every week to get smart about the Internet governance ecosystem.

We made the work of the panel, if you go to the next slide, about process very open and very public. We've talked about this previously, and we launched this at the last ICANN meeting. What we did was to run a three-stage online process. First to solicit ideas widely, crowdsource widely, if you will, lots of different suggestions from people, and then to take what we were hearing, both online and off, and bucket them into a set of proposals which we were then able to refine into the 16 recommendations.

The panel's recommendations really break down, as you'll see on the slide labeled recommendations, into three areas. What we've said is, and we started from this notion that there are three overarching, overriding principles that we think characterize a 21st century organization. It has to be legitimate, it has to be effective, and it has to be evolving.

On the core principle slide we go ahead and describe that, in a little more detail, what we mean by that, but in essence what we tried to do is frame our recommendations, to group them against trying to achieve certain key goals.

So let me dive in with the few minutes I have left to talking a little bit more about the 16 proposals, and I'll try to just cherry pick a few of them to discuss from the list that you have in front of you, and we're

happy, again, to talk about any of them more in the Q&A or off-line and to continue the conversation.

So in the first place, an organization has to be effective. It has to actually be smart about solving problems in a timely fashion, achieving the core work that it set out for us, for itself. And we said in order to do that, perhaps ICANN ought to consider, as other folks have done, using, for example, taking better account of the new technologies of expert networking that exist to help an organization target and identify people no matter where they sit with deep expertise on a particular topic. Expert networking is becoming very much in use, particularly in the biomedical sciences, beginning to be widely used in the engineering sciences as a way to target and locate expertise and help it find you and find a problem that you're trying to solve.

Open data is another one of those innovations that's being adopted by governments and NGOs and even companies around the world, opening up the data that they hold, sometimes opening up the data about the contracts that they hold in order to enable other people to scrutinize it, both to the end of creating greater accountability but also to the end of enabling smart people to create visualizations, to create models, to do the analysis of that data to help figure out better ways to solve problems.

Obviously any organization also has to be legitimate in the way that it works, and we looked at a number of different ideas from rotating term limits to testing new kinds of voting techniques that might be tested. And these included both ideas for experiments and pilot projects to improve online engagement as well as to improve off-line engagements.

So new ways of thinking about face-to-face engagement that may be more efficient, more collaborative and more distributed, but still enable people to participate regardless of their level of connectivity.

And finally, we looked at some of the innovations that are also taking hold around the world, like citizen juries which use random groups of selected individuals to provide oversight and accountability over a bureaucracy.

Above all, and let me conclude with this, I think the most important recommendation of ours is to say that what we have to be, if you'll allow me to use the word, is to be experimental in the way that we work. That doesn't mean to be careless or to be reckless. Rather what it means is to take advantage of the platforms and tools that are available to us, to run tests, randomize control trials if need be, to run comparisons and pilot projects to really understand what works. Does it help us to govern better, to govern more effectively, to govern more legitimately, and to govern in ways that will allow us to evolve how we work if we try some of these new techniques.

So you can scroll through the slides which go into some depth some of the things that I discussed, but I think above all, the important thing is that we need to develop an evidence-based, real practical examples of what works.

So our goal is here, as we wrap up the work of the panel, is to take as much input as possible and to hopefully spur as much discussion as possible as to how of those innovations would app employ to the work ICANN does. We have the luxury of making recommendations and then step aside. To you is left the hard work. We hope that we can help with

understanding how best to meld some of these suggestions with the hard work that ICANN does on the day-to-day.

We've gotten already some very good suggestions and feedback. Some hard questions of asking how would you implement these in practice. Would any of these experiments be cost effective? How would we do them and how and where would they apply? And that's where we really hope to use the remaining time of the panel, is to use that feedback from you, and to refine our own articulations and recommendations to make them as concrete and as specific as possible so that as we present them, these recommendations to you the community, we can hopefully give to you blueprints that are as execution ready as possible, that are in a position for you then to take forward and implement and, above all, to test to understand what works.

So we're eager for the feedback. We're eager for the questions, and we thank you very much for the input that people have given thus far.

Thank you.

PINDAR WONG: Thank you so much, Beth. We have a few questions here, also for those of you online.

We have first, we have a line here, if I may, and can I take the first question, please.

BETH NOVECK: And you wouldn't mind identifying yourself when you speak.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks, Beth. My name is Marilyn Cade. It's a pleasure to be able to come to the microphone and make comments about this particular report. I'll have comments about some of the other reports as well.

I'm a little bit taken aback by ideas of experimentation that do not start from a very firm base of understanding the community very deeply.

And so I want to better understand, while I think the principles put forward about remaining adaptive and, et cetera, are really something this community can broadly embrace, I think I saw in the report a disconnect right now of understanding how we are getting our work done and the time and resources that we need provided by ICANN to us, the community, to be able to do our day-to-day job, particularly with the dramatic increase in work that we have.

Certainly new tools, et cetera, can be very helpful, but I think it has to start from a very deep understanding of where we are today.

And I'm nervous about experimentation when we have so little time to do -- to fulfill the day-to-day demands.

I heard some ideas, and maybe I misunderstood them, about laboratory experiments, et cetera, and I'd like to better understand how this would fit as we are trying to really ensure accountability. And would we be running parallel experiments while we're also doing our day-to-day job or is there another way of trying to stress test the ideas before any of them are taken any further and any more money is put into them.

BETH NOVECK: Pindar, would you like me to comment or should we take the remaining questions and then I will comment on all three?

PINDAR WONG: Yes, we have a queue, which is three deep. What I would suggest the following, if we just oscillate between those online, off, get all the questions off and then you can have one go at replying to them.

BETH NOVECK: Okay.

PINDAR WONG: So do we have any online questions? No.

So then the next in presence question, please. Can you identify yourself?

CHUCK GOMES: Chuck Gomes. Thanks, Beth, and to your panel for a lot of work.

First I have a logistical question. Unless I have missed it, I haven't seen the detailed description of proposal 9, which is the, I think, rotating term limits. And it may be a user error, but I have looked and looked and I can't find that one.

So I'll just leave that for the team to check on the Web site. But I have seen all the rest.

To be fair -- To be fair to the other panels, I think most of your recommendations are tactical, not strategic. But I can envision an

overall strategic goal for what you're doing. And that may be something you want to address a little more clearly in the report.

Your panel is one that I spent the most time on, and it was overwhelming. I think Marilyn hit it just a little bit. We're really drowning and there's so much to absorb.

Now, that said, there's an awful lot of good ideas. There's some, I think, that don't fit very well, but I commented on those. So I just -- you know, the ability to absorb all of this, and, in particular, on your recommendations, which are quite extensive, is really a challenge for the community.

But again, I thank you for your work. And even though they may not -- and this applies to all of you. Even though your ideas may not be strategic in all cases, they still have value, so I don't want to leave with the impression that they don't.

PINDAR WONG: Thank you.

Any other online? Do we have an online question? If not, next in line, please.

JOHN CURRAN: Yes, Beth. John Curran, ARIN. With respect to your liquid democracy items, delegation voting and similar, it actually is a very interesting technique that's suggested in the report. And I guess the question would be whether or not the panel has considered making that -- the

use of that technique be something used when there's deadlock as opposed to the normal mode of discussion.

Because in, for example, the Regional Internet Registries and the IETF, we try to get all the views and we try to work things out without actually any weight to the view, trying to figure out if there's common ground and understanding. But in the case where you really have a set of views that everyone understands each other, but people have different beliefs or value systems behind that present reconciliation, that's where a liquid democracy, some sort of voting or delegated voting might help.

And it might be a little more approachable to the ICANN community than suggestion of that technique all the time for engagement. Just some feedback.

Thanks.

PINDAR WONG: Any online question, Beth? Over to your feedback. If not in presence, your question, sir.

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Yeah, my name is Chris Chaplow. I'm one of a small team in the business constituency putting together the comments which will be filed in due course. It's lot of work, and it's a great document. I found it very interesting. But we got 16 recommendations there. And most of them are great ideas, and there's sort of a personal comment. There really will need to be some sort of prioritization or sorting out. Because,

otherwise, you know, if I've taken five or more ICANN staff members to be able to implement these things.

But the point that brought me quickly to the mic was the primers document, which I missed on the way through. And, if I picked it up in your presentation just now, these were documents that you wrote in order to explain what ICANN does to your team or your contacts and so on. So my quick question would be: You, obviously, felt there was a need to write those documents. Didn't those documents already exist in the ICANN sphere in the Web site or on the store. Thanks.

PINDAR WONG: Okay, Beth, you have the floor to respond to all the questions that were asked, please.

BETH NOVECK: Thank you. I'm cognizant of the time. And I don't mean the late hour. I mean we have five minutes for this section of Q&A. So let me try to be very brief and, therefore, disappoint everybody. So I think the -- I deliberately am provocative when I use the word "experimentation." It is meant to unsettle us all a little bit. But it is precisely because we are all drowning, precisely because we are -- and this is not a problem unique to ICANN. There is so much information, so much work to do, not enough hours in the day -- it's a challenge that every organization and institution faces ever more so today -- that it makes the need for innovations that much more urgent. It is very difficult and challenging to reengineer the plane while flying it, if you will. Doing, if you will, experiments in a real institutional and social setting with real people

who have busy lives and have to make hard decisions. And, particularly, where the outcomes of those decisions are extraordinarily significant and have impact on real people's lives and livelihoods is not something to be taken lightly.

It's precisely for that reason that the examples and models that we look to are ones that are in practice elsewhere in the world precisely in such settings. There is a lot of detail that necessarily had to be left out. You thought you were drowning under what we produced already. The amount that we have to digest and read as a group and as a team to really look at the way that these different techniques are working in different stages of decision making, whether it's at the outset when the problem has to be identified, it's at the point where solutions have to be suggested, where prioritization has to be made between different solutions or implementation has to happen or whether it's in a situation of a deadlock, as was mentioned, or where there's consensus, implementation assessment, all the different stages of decision making, obviously, different techniques work well at different stages of the process. So our goal, as we move this towards the conclusion of the process, is to, with your feedback and with your questions and with priorities and interest as articulated by you, to provide more detail, again, not to the end of overwhelming anybody, but to the end of providing guidance and know-how of what it would take to implement pilot projects.

Perhaps the word to use or the word we might use is pilots, because I think it's very important to be humble in the way we approach thinking about innovations not to charge things whole cloth without knowing what works. I think the wonderful thing is we have the opportunity,

thanks to new technology. And we have experience in this and other domains. I don't mean we alone. I mean the research community and the governance innovation community has experience with how to run these kinds of pilots in an existing real-world organization. So it's something we can and I think we will share more about. I think that suggestion just of how one does experiments, as it's sometimes called in the wild, as opposed to in the lab something about that methodology I think would be very usefully added here.

I did check. Proposal 9 is there on the Web site, Chuck. And we will send it to you, because we found your feedback on all the other proposals you were pushing us hard on questions of logistics, on questions of implementability incredibly useful. So we want to point you to that. We'll get you the link and share that with folks. But, again, I want to just emphasize we're only scratching the surface with regard to suggesting what might be possible. And, with feedback then from the community, I think there will be, you know, ample opportunity to take things to deepen blueprints for implementation on things people want to try.

I think we'll make sure, also to the final point, to recirculate those primers. I found it useful in all of my work to make sure that we are very smart and deeply engaged with the subject matter. As I've pointed out, the member of the panel have deep ICANN expertise, much more so even than I. And so -- but what we do with the primers is to share back and to articulate in writing this is what we understand to be the situation on the ground. And we found that very useful for testing our assumptions and make sure that we have consensus and agreement that we do understand the reality of the situation that we're dealing

with. So the proposals that we make can be informed and can be smart but still can be made with humility from the perspective of those who are coming with an outside lens on what might be possible in terms of innovations and governance. So I've overstepped my time, but I want to thank everybody for their comments. And I hope there will be lots more.

PINDAR WONG: Thank you, Beth, for staying up so late in your day to present here. And what I'd like to do is note the time that it's -- we have about 10 minutes before the official time.   There's no one else coming for the next session. And so what I would like to do in the interest of time is that we're going to move on to the strategy panel on ICANN's role in the Internet ecosystem. If you have a question, please start queuing at the mic. Because I think that's the interaction. I think that's why we're here.

Good afternoon. I am Vint Cerf. I've always wanted to say that. I'm not.

Thank you, Tony.

You can tell I'm not Vint Cerf, because I'm not wearing his three-piece suit. My name is Pindar Wong, and I'm one of originally 16 but 15 members of this group that worked on this project. Can I just ask those members in the group to stand up and identify yourself? Hagen, yep. Please if you can stand up if you've participated? Why am I doing this? Because we're here for the week. Each of us can take questions on our 68-page report. We're not actually going to be -- oh, hello. We're

actually not going to go through -- I'm not going to even try going through the details of our report. What we'll try to do in the next few minutes is go through some of the very high-level themes that can help you actually read the report and understand the cut and thrust of what we're trying to present.

Essentially, the way to look at our report -- can I just ask how many of you actually have read our report? Wow. That's -- that's great. In reading our report, Vint and I would like to just stress five of -- what we call the 5 Cs. Really, our report now is literally in your hands. We have 5 Cs to refer throughout the report. Central ideas regarding coordination, cooperation, the constellations of organizations that comprises the Internet governance ecosystem, the primacy of collaboration within this ecosystem, and the new one per the NTIA announcement, which is the importance of consistency.

So, if you've read our report, you will recognize some of our core principles which we call the 5 Rs -- reciprocity, respect. Literally, they're on your right hand. That's one way to remember it. And the 5 Cs really form this concept of hand in glove. And that's the way to look at our report. So, as we go through the next slides, if you can keep the 5 Cs and the 5 Rs in mind, that will help you make it through a quite detailed report that we've produced.

The first C, obviously, is coordination. The question is ICANN's role always has been and always is very clear. It's to coordinate these three issues. So I think that should be fairly straightforward. In terms of the internet governance ecosystem, instead of inventing our own definition for internet governance -- and some of us tried -- we did recognize that

there is currently a working definition. So, if there's any issue to do with the interpretation, perhaps evolving that definition might be the better one. So we took, basically, the World Summit of Information Society definition of internet governance as, really, our starting point. So, in looking at the internet governance ecosystem or the wider ecosystem, we wanted to look at models and the concepts involved with those models, knowing very clearly that all models are wrong but some are useful.

And so what we've tried is to look at the models that at least this group of people found useful and share those with you today. But, first and foremost, the panel very clearly identified the multistakeholder model as being the preferred way to go because thus far it seems to work and one of the key elements that affected parties should be able to participate in the policy development process.

So one of the key things that came out through this discussion is the primacy of stewardship above all else. The current term we use is internet governance, but there was a concept of stewardship before internet governance. We touched on ICANN's globalization itself and the importance of two clear themes, which I'll get into. One is the layering concept, and the other is the very distributed nature of the Internet that forms a web of relationships. Now, with that, we touch on our roadmap at the very end, which we'll get into, the affirmations of commitments and the very important issue of how the issue of accountability may change over time as the ICANN community and the wider ecosystem diversifies.

So two clear themes here. One, again, this is one of our models -- all models are wrong, but some are useful. From our perspective, we found this three-layered model of interest in very simplifying the where ICANN sits in this ecosystem, the primacy of technical interoperability. ICANN is very clearly in the technical layer, specifically in the logical layer. As we look at other layers, specifically, the nature of content and the social implications which we view as a new layer, then these overlayers, when we try to map the internet governance institutions that perhaps needs to be looked at. But it's very clear that ICANN sat in this layered structure.

One of the themes is layer. There's a technical history behind this. The other thing that was very important is to recognize that ICANN exists in an internet governance ecosystem is very, very diverse. It's very distributed. And, in some sense, it forms, as this diagram tries to illustrate, the constellations, these groups of entities that have a very specific focus. They are the center of their role. But it's this network of relationships, this constellation, again, one of the 5 Cs, which really is observation of the wider ecosystem. And we feel it's very, very important, because to dispel the nature that there's a single point that, if you take it away, the thing collapses. So the issue of constellation in a web of relationships is, again, one of the two core ways we looked at the different models that we built.

So, above and beyond before getting into preliminaries, we observed the primacy of stewardship. And I think Debbie if you can -- Monahan, nice to finally meet you in person. We were in a group that looked at stewardship. And, very simply, stewardship meant caring more for the good management and use of evolution of a shared resource than for

any individual stake in it. In many ways, it's about the people who are not in the room, who are not at the table that we're doing stewardship on behalf of.

So stewardship earlier created the opportunity for us to participate today. And in many ways we're not closing any doors for the participation of the next 1.5 billion people which will come online primarily in our report through Asia and also Africa and coming online in a different way.

So, moving along, in terms of our look at what would be sort of principles for good governance -- again, the way to remember this is the 5 Rs, the reciprocity principle, which is do no harm or threaten harm, kind of like a golden rule. Do unto others.

The key principle of respect. This is also respect for the honor and for the freedom of choice, the freedom and diversity to change your mind and to be very inclusive in doing so. That really -- that respect, in some sense, is a prerequisite for the cooperation for collaboration which has really built the Internet at the technical layer to date. Moving right along, the third principle is primarily a principle that has evolved from the engineering world. It's the robustness principle. It was coined by Jon Postel. Very simply put which is be conservative in what you send and liberal in what you accept.

So, when we developed -- the way that we worked, just for a little moment, is that the 15 of us who continued with the panel, we were divided into subworking groups. And so Alejandro Pisanty's group was looking at these principles. And, as you can see here, under these broad classifications of the Rs, there are, in fact, subprinciples. And they're

equally important. Especially things like technical rationality. The Internet has to work. Look at the technical rationality behind what you're proposing. But, in doing so, remember that you don't want to build structures which are too rigid. Why? Because the Internet itself evolves. And you need to adapt to that. And that's, again, looking at evolvability. But within your own task, as Hagen will know, we have to focus on business excellence. You have to deliver. Simplicity and scaling has been -- the Internet now is a billion times more than it was before. These principles we looked at in terms of the wider ecosystem. And we want to share this classification to you, so that perhaps it will be of use to you in your discussions going forward.

Now, with that, the fourth principle is reasonableness, which is, if you participate in these discussions and are subject to the general ways of operation, you should also be able to avoid capricious or arbitrary actions. And some of you may know all of these themes which are quite prevalent within ICANN -- the issue of the ATRT, the transparency, accountability, subsidiary and fairness principles, which we outlined details in the report. But, regardless, perhaps of what's necessarily in the bylaws, the theory, the last principle which is the reality preliminary, which is you've got to consistently test your theories and whether or not they actually conform to reality. So, in that regard, we've observed throughout the long evolution of the Internet that these bodies that have formed over time had a very specific form for the function that they had to achieve.

Above all, they needed to be effective and to also learn from, basically, history what works, and perhaps what doesn't. So within these 5 Rs, we looked at also the -- one of the very first things is looked at where,

within the ICANN's role, there needed to be cooperation and consistency. So our very first diagram here was to illustrate I think what everyone has been talking about this week which is the nature and role of the cooperative agreement between ICANN and the NTIA and VeriSign and also the contractual agreement between NTIA and ICANN.

So this slide is really -- the blue line here, given the recent announcement, is I think what's on everyone's mind. But, irrespective of that, one notes that it's been 16 years since the formation of ICANN that the U.S. government has minimally been consistent in how it carries itself and how it sets its example and challenge to us, the business community. So there's a great value in this consistency. And this aspect of consistency is not in our report. It's a new thing given recent events. And we wanted to characterize it and capture it here and share it with you here today.

So, as I said, there's different models. And we're just going to flick through a few different diagrams. Again, what we've looked at here is ICANN's role and from ICANN's perspective. And we do know some of you have other ideas on how, for example, these different models could be improved. So what I'd like to do is invite Milton Mueller, if you're here, or Marilyn -- we do know you have very specific issues dealing with these diagrams. As I said, these diagrams are not perfect. They're from ICANN's perspective. And we also stress throughout this document the concept of continuous iteration. Even when we published the diagram, our report very quickly afterwards based on our community feedback, we issued an errata. So we're looking forward to comments and questions between now and the end of April for other observations.

Again, literally, this report is in your hands that we would like to share, again, this most important slide of how we view the ecosystem, which is the web of relationships and as the real basis of the roadmap. Very simply put, as the Internet itself mirrors society, the governance roles should mirror the Internet in terms of its distributed nature. Why? Because that, basically, means the governance will be relevant as the underlying Internet itself evolves. So that web of relationships, this web of the institutions which comprise the ecosystem of which ICANN is but one part, it is the center for its roles for its responsibilities is really key.

So, in our roadmap, we talk about globalization as opposed to not internationalization as between nations to really recognize that, when you look throughout your window on the plane, you don't actually see the lines on a geographical map. How does ICANN globalize? How is it going to outreach? That's a very big theme this week, as is the issue to do with how do you consolidate and simplify the root zone management system and present it in a holistic way in spite of the fact that some of the aspects dealing with these processes are actually not fully documented? So a lot of our report is actually trying to document what we perceive as being some aspect of history.

And so we were very surprised to learn, for example, that ICANN has over 40,000 documents. Now, if pictures are worth a thousand words, how many actual pictures does ICANN have representing this? So these diagrams, these efforts by -- what we've tried to do is present these diagrams as a way of this community to take them, if it's useful to you, and try and build on them. So document this web of agreements and what we call this web of affirmations. We believe this actual construct, hopefully, should be of interest to you. Why? Because they can be

bilateral in cases where that makes sense to be. And also in the case of -- and uniform. So we posit in our report that ICANN and the governments themselves have a uniform, singular, if possible, Affirmation of Commitments. It was observed an Affirmation of Commitments is actually a commitment to the community. So we see this construct where mutually we affirm what we agree to take forward. But there's a catch. The catch is, before you affirm, think very, very carefully about how you're going to deal with the disputes that will inevitably come up, in which case the accountability mechanisms fail.

And so this afternoon's session at 5:00, I think we can be very prepared to talk specifically about these accountability panels that we posit. Because, again, because of the cross-border nature of the Internet, it's not clear to us in terms of the seat of jurisdiction or how that would work when parties beforehand get into dispute but they haven't agreed to where to actually resolve their dispute.

And so, with that, I would like to close and move on to questions and answers. And I do know Marilyn has a question. I think also Milton has questions and perhaps those also online. Now, I do also note, in the interest of time, that we've run after formal closure. There's no one coming after us. So, with everyone's indulgence, if I may, if we can go through the last set of questions. Please, Grace.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hi, this is Grace Abuhamad reading a question from the remote participation room by Louise Nasak. Her question is: Could ICANN prioritize outreach to the Pacific in its strategy planning process even

more? Perhaps take more capacity building in the role of ICANN closer to the region New Zealand, Australia, et cetera. Thank you.

PINDAR WONG: Can we get through the list of questions, and then we'll try to have a response.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I always like when my postings to a variety of other web lists make it to the author's eyes without my having to -- or ears without my having to come to the microphone. But here I am again.

I have two comments. And one is -- I know we have board members here. So this is intended for all of you as well as for the panelists.

There's a lot of ideas in all of these reports. And a huge amount of work has been put into it by the appointed participants to date in all of them. And I understand that. But there's also a very short time between now and when the community has to agree to a strat plan. And I don't think it's going to be in any way feasible to do justice to consider all of the recommendations and ideas that are in the four reports, including this one, which has some very interesting ideas and concepts in it and some areas that I think need some significant improvement. And I understand the comments that these charts were a place to start.

But I think that one concern -- and I want to be really clear about this -- is that these charts are in the wild now. Okay? So I know you footnoted them as saying, oh, they're just partial or just this or just that. But you

may not have even realized that in, one of your charts, the web of relationships, you showed the GAC separate from ICANN. You showed the USFTC and the EU and the U.S. government but didn't reference other governments. So you, without meaning to, you've conveyed concepts that are partial. And it's very hard to retrieve things from the World Wide Web. So I'd urge us to be very sensitive to how pictures can be -- or images can be misunderstood and perhaps misused.

But the other point that I wanted to make and focus on really is the idea of a web of agreements leaves me with many concerns. And I'm going to state three of them. First of all, I spend a fair amount of my time in other countries other than the United States. And I spent a lot of my time 17 years ago and 15 years ago helping to put together the support to found this organization and spent a lot of time with legal folks trying to understand what could -- what a legal basis could be and couldn't be. I think there are going to be countries that presently do not -- but the countries should speak for themselves. But my expectation is that there will be countries that cannot sign an agreement with a commercial organization without parliamentarian approval. And then you get into a situation where, in order to change that agreement, you have to go back to Parliament. You have to get reauthorization.

It can be a very complicated, complex, and even perhaps freezing situation. If you have a change of government and you now have a whole new set of Parliamentarians, you have to start over with reeducation. So I would really just urge us to think carefully about what it is, what problem we're trying to solve when we propose something like this. And, really, try to examine it carefully to think about how

flexible is it and does it really solve the problem for which it was proposed.

The second point is it's unclear to me, but it looks to me like there's some kind of expectation that other parties that do not hold a contracted status with ICANN might be expected to sign agreements with ICANN. And I'm not sure how flexible or feasible that is. I do not envision, for instance, how the business constituency at ICANN would -- we are not a legal entity. I can't figure out how we would sign an agreement with ICANN. So, you know, perhaps it's just that these ideas need further elaboration.

PINDAR WONG: Thank you. Last one, and I'll try to respond.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you, Tony Holmes, chair of the ISP constituency. I just want to make some initial remarks and then ask a question. There's certainly some concern within our constituency about some of the diagrams. And they've been referred to here before. We were somewhat mystified how, on the constellation, it positions ISPs -- and we have a relationship with the EU, we have a relationship with the ITU which I would question.

Certainly, as a provider of infrastructure, some of us have relationships with the ITU. But ISPs doesn't really fit there. It also shows that we have absolutely no relationship with ICANN. So I'm not really quite sure what I'm doing here. It also shows we have no relationship with the RIRs. So I'm not sure where we get our IP addresses from. So the whole

thing seems skewed. And we will be providing comments back on that during the comment period. But my follow-on question follows, really, a point that Marilyn made. This is now out there in the wild. And I assume that, if we put our comments in, there will be a further iteration of this document. But my question is -- well, A, is that going to be true that there will be an updated version? And then what would be the status of that document, and how would you view that's going to be used in moving the discussion forward? Thank you.

PINDAR WONG: Sure, last question. Online questions? If not, please. Go ahead.

>>   My name is Aiz from WORLD1 of Asia. I'm here just to underscore what my two learned friends just mentioned. Marilyn and -- and the question is, forgive me to say, because you know elementary wise, too much presentation is very much academic. You're moving into 21C but we're still 21 -- 20C dimension centric wise. So the question ideation and creation and whatever not, seems to be not what we're looking for. And a question of that, please, please be realistic. Because what you do is very much academic in nature rather than conceptualization and realistic form. So my proposition here is that please give us a little bit more time -- not extension, but I think that, if you would have forwarded us the (indiscernible) much earlier, then the feedback would be much more definitive. So the question here is I think that formulation is not forthcoming. And the question is a lot of the old baggage that we repackage and redesign and reconceptualize, but not

in real sense of the -- what you call it -- the problem solving dimension that we expect it to be. Thank you very much.

PINDAR WONG: Okay. If there are no other last questions, I'd like to try and respond. First things first, I think the first question about trying to, again, look at greater outreach and involvement in building capacity in Asia Pacific, I would note in our report, one of the things we talked about growth, as we mentioned, is that we expect growth to come from Africa and Asia, although that's perhaps out of scope. I will leave that for the ICANN board to respond.

In terms of the second set of questions, we'll get to the legal basis of signed agreements and the difference of jurisdictions, I think what we're saying is, in fact, there's a 2-stage process. One is documenting what is done today that doesn't necessarily require a legally enforceable contract. One thing that we actually had trouble with is looking at the different legal jurisdictions because of the cross-border nature of these kinds of constructs. Obviously, there are examples here where -- and where a group, an expert group developed some kind of agreement. And then this community adopts it wholesale with a knowledge that there will be some kind of arbitration process. I think the UDRP comes to mind. I think there's experience with the ICC, and we've also tried to document some of that.

But point well-taken in terms of, when you move to -- if you could move to a stage where you can actually go to a legal agreement, what is the repercussions? If you oversolidify it and you lose the flexibility, what are the repercussions of that? But we also note that a lot of the current

mutual agreements, for example, with the root server system, it might help just to document, not necessarily move to a legally binding contract, but just literally -- you know, if people look -- if they think it's a black box, then if they want to say what's in the black box? And so, if you can begin to document that, then perhaps the issue of the legal enforceability, which we were not able to resolve, again, in the time available -- I think also -- Adiel, you want to speak to that? Again, we're all going to be here. For those on the panel, if you can stand up again. We'll be happy to individually take your questions. Adiel, you want to jump in?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: We have discussed that within the firm. And that's why we carefully use the word affirmation of commitment, not agreement or contract. Because we think we thought about what Marilyn just said. And we present this as a voluntary engagement of the different parties to engage with ICANN in a joint commitment on this thing. But this is just a document. That will be the base of discussion going forward.

PINDAR WONG: There are other issues involving agreements. When you two -- between the two of us we may agree to affect the third party. And so the third party problem, as we call it, again, we were unable to resolve that. I think that's something that we'll be very interested to move forward. But, in terms of, I think, the two questions if I may coalesce, of these diagrams are now in the wild -- Marilyn, you want to respond to that?

MARILYN CADE: Pindar, I do. I want to respond and also -- Adiel -- I'm certainly interested in thinking about these things. Some of you will remember that with Becky Burr, I coauthored the Burr-Cade proposal in 2006. But now I'm trying to also understand the enforcement aspects to such agreements. And so one other piece of feedback or question that I would raise to you is, look, the experience we have inside the community with the ability of the compliance team at ICANN to keep up with the enforcement challenges we have already, is, let's say that the challenge is challenging. And we're going to face huge expansion -- I was going to say problems -- expansion with the management of the vast numbers of contracts, et cetera. We're now talking about a new set of agreements. Agreements take enforcement.

Now, perhaps you're not talking about enforceable agreements. And, you know, and I'm -- I'm happy to talk offline about this. But, when you mention the ICC, you are talking about enforceable agreements.

Enforceable agreements bring costs. They bring penalties. And I, again, am not opposing. But we have to think through this. That makes huge changes in ICANN structure as well.

PINDAR WONG: Sure. And I think perhaps the business constituency certainly has views on this.

One thing that did come up through our work is just how incredibly diverse this ecosystem is. And so one size will not fit all. Again, people, if -- there may be different forms of -- we call it Affirmation of Commitments, and those may take different forms. And in our -- we

posit also these accountability panels, which should be agreed to beforehand, perhaps irrespective of whether or not, ultimately -- if you can't get agreement inside existing accountability structures, then perhaps you can move to that. I think there's a whole session at 5:00 on that. And we're happy to engage.

It's 5:00. Okay. So with that, if there are no other questions, just also on the -- this notion that these diagrams are in the wild, yes, they are. These are the diagrams that we found useful. We're just a group of 15 people. And we think that these themes that come up, these principles that we've identified, is of use. With respect to the question of whether or not we'll actually update them, I don't -- I think our report is presented for its worth. If people have issues, perhaps that could be -- someone could take responsibility for updating. We found these useful for our discussions, and we've shared them. An observation here before we close?

DENNIS JENNINGS: Thank you.   Dennis Jennings, Internet citizen I think is the best description.

Can I ask what is the status of these documents? Because they come to me across to me as very interesting think pieces or thought pieces. Yet there seems to be a concern from the questions that there are statements of intent or fact. And I just -- you know, what is the status of these documents? As think pieces, they're very stimulating and very useful. As strategic documents, well, they're not strategic documents. So that's my question.

PINDAR WONG: Sure, I think there were observations from an earlier gentleman that some aspects were technical. My understanding -- and please correct me, if I'm wrong -- there's an existing strategic planning process that these documents were to be provided to the Fadi and, basically, the board. And then again their treatment of that is up to them. I think this is part of the larger process. And would you like to add anything? That's my understanding.

NII QUAYNOR: Same. As far as I'm aware, we provide input to the strategy process. And that process will determine what makes sense or what can be dealt with and move it forward. So they are indeed thought pieces. And I'm sure the board will select which ones are maybe most appropriate for the time.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you. Whilst I appreciate the work you've done, I think you've heard here that there are a number of comments and concerns over the content of the document on various issues. And similarly to Dennis's question, I was questioning what the status of these documents would be.

But the other point I have now is that there's a 30-day comment period, where it's up to I think the 30th of April. What is the point of us putting in lots of effort to provide you with comments and respond if the documents aren't going to be updated? We're just wasting our time. So can you comment on that?

NII QUAYNOR:
I expect that we'll take into account the comments and revise the document. But what I'm not sure is what another round of comments or inputs to the community thereafter. So we take the inputs. We'll conclude the document, and then pass it into the process.

PINDAR WONG:
Yeah. One of the themes that we put in our report is the whole nature of constant iteration. So I think, as our panel -- as our group, it would be my expectation to have this ideally a living document where we can basically continue to improve and polish it over time. We do an analogy in our report in terms of the open software movement, open source movement where, you know, many eyeballs -- all bugs are shallow. So there are bugs, obviously, in perception, perhaps in communication. Nothing is perfect. But I think together with your suggestions -- and please do submit them -- I can commit, I think, from our group, to make iterations to our report. But that's our commitment and perhaps not necessarily ICANNs. Because this is our report of our group. We take ownership of that. But, obviously, this is -- we submit this to this community. And I think that's the whole purpose of this -- these sessions is to get your feedback. And I think you're quite right in the sense that what's the point if you're not going to update it. Erick.

>>
I'd like to confirm that I would certainly want us to update it. Because we got useful input. And it will improve the document, so we should do that.

I want to react to Dennis's remark.

I don't know about the other panels, but I certainly think that our document is certainly strategical. And there was a remark before that said we were going out way too far. We were not concrete enough. Which is kind of proof that this is a strategic document. We set out a set of principles in there to make sure that we indicated direction to move in. In my view, that's strategic. And, of course, that needs a translation back. If you accept those principles, it needs a translation back to concrete actions.

PINDAR WONG: Any other comments? And I want to just do note -- okay. So I've got a note here that reports will be fine-tuned in light of comments as appropriate. Records will go through the extensive community discussion. Again, I think we're starting that today. Also noting with, again, another example of a different views of, for example, this layering concept. There was a comment earlier, since I think Milton is not in the room, that the layering concept may not be as useful as different political economies have different analytical paradigm. So, if that is the case, welcome to develop your model which you think is useful. These are the ones that we found. We've looked at a large group to develop these principles, the 5 Rs and the 5 Cs. And, with that, if you could keep those in mind as you read our document and provide us feedback, that will be most welcome. So with that, Paul, would you like to have any last words? Nii? Thank you all very much. Those of us on the panel will be in and out. Please grab us if you have any further questions. If not, as Vint will say, we'll see you online. Thank you.

BETH NOVECK: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]