

20140131_STRATEGYPANEL_ID850936

Alice Jansen: Good evening. My name is Alice Jansen, and it's a pleasure for me to welcome you to this Strategy Panel on ICANN's Multi-Stakeholder Innovation Webinar.

Before we begin, I'd like to briefly remind all participants of housekeeping items. This webinar is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. This session is being streamed via the Adobe Connect Room. If you intend to be called up for questions, during the Q&A, please join the Adigo Bridge.

Your lines are currently muted, and will be muted throughout the presentation. You may submit questions or comments via the Adobe Connect Chat during the presentation. At the end of the presentation, you will be given the opportunity to voice your comments and questions during the Q&A. All lines will be un-muted for the Q&A. If you are on the Bridge, please remember to mute your computers once the floor is open to avoid echo.

If you wish to speak during the Q&A, please raise your hand in the Adobe Connect Room to be added to the queue. Should you not be speaking, please mute your line using *6, dial *7 to un-mute. The slides, recording and transcript will be available following the session. You may find the housekeeping invitations in the Adobe Connect notes file.

With that, we'll turn to Beth Noveck, Strategy Panel Chair.

Beth Simon Noveck: Greetings. Thank you, everybody, for joining us, whatever time zone you might be in. We appreciate your taking the time to participate in this webinar about the Multi-Stakeholder Innovation Strategy Panel. This is for us, not a final, but an interim conversation in which we hope to brief you on where we are at in our deliberations, discussions, and research. To let you know more about what we've heard and learned, and to point you to the initial proposals that we have put up in draft online about which, we'd very much want your feedback and help.

So let me first turn to and thank the members of our Panel for joining us. I'll ask them to introduce themselves on the phone. I believe Joi Ito. Why don't we start with you? If you would be so kind as to introduce yourself and to tell us about you, and give a few words on the Panel by way of introduction.

Joi Ito: Yes. My name is Joi Ito. I served on the ICANN Board for three years many years ago. I'm currently the Director of the MIT Media Lab, and served on a number of Boards, like the Knight Foundation, MacArthur Foundation, Sony and The New York Times. And I have a -- obviously a deep interest in international affairs as well, and have been, so personally working on ICANN issues since I've left the Board, but I'm very interested in reengaging and trying to help move this to the next stage as we had, although (inaudible/audio skip) working on the Board.

Beth Simon Noveck: Thank you. Alison?

Alison Gillwald: Hello. Alison Gillwald from Research ICT Africa, which is a Africa-wide ICT Policy and Regulatory Research Network. We have been primarily involved with some fairly basic issues of national telecom and forecasting governance, that have become increasingly involved, I suppose during the IGS years, with issues of global governance, and the position of Africa within the context, particularly with regard to multi-stakeholderism.

I also have a Professorship at the University of Cape Town. Management of Infrastructure Reform Program, and some of our research on global governance was also done through that, in that context. Thank you.

Beth Simon Noveck: Thank you. Geoff Mulgan, are you on the phone?

Geoff Mulgan: Yeah. Hi, Beth. So I'm Geoff Mulgan. I currently run an organization in the U.K. called NESTA, which is the National Endowment for Science Technology and the Arts. I've got a background both working in governments and in social innovation, social entrepreneurship, and so on. And I guess, very interested in how you design organization and structures, and governance, and get them to work. But I don't know a huge amount about ICANN.

Beth Simon Noveck: Now you do. More than you knew before. And we also have on the line, but listening in Gourd Yang (ph), in China. Due to the late hour, and small, sleeping children, he's going to participate, I hope, through the chat room, so you'll look for him by text. If you want to introduce yourself there. Gourd (ph), if you can, and want to speak, we'd love to hear from you, but we understand if you are going to participate in the chat room, which will, I think, afford people anyway a chance to talk more with you.

And I believe Stefaan Verhulst, who is the Director of Research for GovLab is also in the chat room and will be participating in the conversation.

Karim, are you on the phone? So Karim Lahkani, a Professor at Harvard Business School, Innovation Expert, unfortunately couldn't join us today.

Bitange Ndemo, a Former Minister of Communications of Kenya, also trying to join in, and may still join the call. We are having some telecommunications difficulty trying to connect with him. But we are really grateful to all of the illustrious members of the Panel, who have given of their time to serve over the last many months, and weeks, to participate in this important exercise.

Let me also invite to introduce themselves, those who are sitting with me here in New York.

Antony Declercq: Antony Declercq. I'm a Research Fellow at the GovLab, and I've been supporting the Strategy Panel with research support over the past few months.

Jillian Raines: And I'm Jillian Raines, and I am a Legal and Policy Fellow here at the GovLab, and also providing research support to the Panel.

Beth Simon Noveck: Great. Thank you, everybody. I'll ask people to please chime in actively in the conversations. So as you know, and this is reiterated on the slide, and the first slide on the slide deck has been circulated. We were given the charge in the charter that summer (inaudible) which you had back in July, to try to propose new models for how ICANN can conduct international engagement, consensus-driven policymaking, and what are the institutional structures that then might create a support to enhance functions.

And specifically we were asked, not only to think about institutional redesign, but to also think about the internal practices, processes, culture, and other changes that might be brought to bear to help realize the values of ICANN and of a free and open Internet, and to help think about what it means to govern a shared public resource like the DNS in a participatory and open session.

What essentially a 21st Century institution looks like, and how we take advantage of the new tools and techniques that are available to us today, very much thanks, to the same technology, to enable us to govern more effectively. As all of us know, this is a Holy Grail, this is a question that not only ICANN is wrestling with, but every government and NGO, and other organization around the world is trying to think about, is how to update, and upgrade and render its systems and processes in institutions of governance, so it's more effective and more legitimate.

So let me just say a little bit, and invite the team to help us say a little bit about how we went about this process. As many of you may already be familiar with this, but what we try to do is to make this a very open and consultative process consisting with the values and suggestions that we are trying to make for ICANN itself. We initially ran, during December, and launched at the Buenos Aires Meeting back in the end of November. We launched the beginning of a three-phase consultation process. The first one of which was to generate ideas. To simply put out a blank slate and ask people: what ideas do they have for how to create a 21st Century ICANN?

We created some guidelines and some suggestions, but we left it very much open-ended in an effort to hear from people what was on their mind. Ideas that would be relevant to our Panel, many ideas that were suggested that might be relevant and provide the input for some of the other panels.

So we wanted to hear from people both within and outside of the ICANN community, and we complimented that with interviews, with background research, and with a lot of work, particularly thanks to Jill and to Antony and their efforts to try to get in as many ideas as possible for the Panel consideration to allow us to get to the second stage, where we are at today. And this is all portrayed in the graphics that you have and the slide, in the three-stage brainstorm slide that you have in front of you now.

So we are now at the stage that most of you have been waiting for to say, come up with a draft. Tell us what your proposals are, tell us what your suggestions are, and we've now put this up, today, online for your feedback and reaction, and we very, very much want to know what can we -- how can we enhance this? What can we improve? How can we deepen the ideas that we suggested? What other ideas now that people have -- can read these? Things they call to mind, what are the suggestions that people have for how to create the 21st Century ICANN.

I want to point everybody to the GovLab.Org, again that's the GovLab, G-O-V-L-A-B.Org, and you'll find the very first post that's up there and it's linked to. It's titled: The Quest for a 21st Century ICANN, A Blueprint. In which, what we have done is to layout a summary of the process, of the goal to this process, and 16 specific proposals, in brief, that we are putting forward at this second stage of the process, and for how ICANN might create -- constitute itself in ways that are effective, legitimate and evolving.

The idea of -- just in terms of process now, is to take each of these 16 and flesh them out in short proposals that we will put up one every few days, and which we will actively solicit feedback and comments. We will be taking each of the short paragraphs you see here and turning them into a much longer draft for input and comment, with an eye towards, then, putting up a final draft of the Committee's report in February, and which, again, we will ask for help in the drafting and in the comments, and come back to you for more input before we could make a final product, if you will, and that reflects and represents the Committee's deliberations.

So we are very grateful to everybody who has given input into this, and to helping us, get us to this point. So we will -- let me just say one last word about the proposal blueprint and what guides it, and then turn it over to members of our Panel to help share with you more about what some of the proposals and what motivates them.

We tried really to think about and to frame our work around the concept of what really it is, what are the key principles of a 21st Century global organization; we are trying to go ahead to the slide Alison has called The Quest for a 21st Century ICANN, the Proposal Blueprint. You will see that we try to bucket these proposals into three large containers, if you will. One is that any kind of public interest organization in the 21st Century has to be effective. The work that it does has to -- it has to work, it has to be able to solve the problems, make the decisions, do the work that it's set out to do in ways that actually solve the problems in front of it.

And what's underlined under that, a series of values that we think are consistent with what it means to be an effective organization, to be smart, to be transparent, to be agile, and to be cost-effective and efficient in how the organization works. At the same time, to be a 21st Century organization, one has to not only be effective, we not only have to solve problems but has to do so in ways that are legitimate. That are inclusive, that are accountable, and that abide by the principles of (inaudible) seniority, making decisions at the lowest possible level, in the most decentralized way possible to achieve the best possible outcome.

And finally, and this is, I think, perhaps one of the most important of the three, is that any institution has to be evolving. We have to approach this with a spirit of humility and a spirit of experimentalism. We don't know yet what works well. We don't fully have all the evidence to help us understand how opening up data, or opening up contracts, or using expert networks, or frankly, engaging in participatory processes, help to create, to solve problems and make decisions better.

And so we have to measure what works, we have to approach things from a perspective of pilots and experiments. We have to try new things and to be constantly vigilant about how we can improve what we do over the course of time. And so, again, under evolving we said, we need to be experimental and we also have to be learning, we have to be using data and use them to track what works and what doesn't, and be committed to a process of evolution enhancement and organizational reform on a constant basis.

So like I've already mentioned and as outlined on the next slide, we are going to flesh out each of the shorter proposals that you see in the summary document, into a one- to two-page-proposals, and then we are going to put them up on the Wiki for further comments.

So, let me pause here for a moment. And I wanted to first to see if there are any urgent questions in the chat room, invite people if they have any comments or questions, or following the chat on the back channel. But what I want to do is to invite folks from the Panel itself, to share with us a little bit of their perspective on the proposals that are in here, and some of the pilots and proposals that we suggested.

So I think if Geoff is on the phone, maybe we'll start with the one on Crowd Sourcing Oversight and Developing Metrics, and we'll come back to some of the others, so I'd like to get in some of the voices from the Panel on the phone first.

So if I can start with Geoff to talk about Crowd Sourcing Oversight, and then to turn to Alison to talk about some of the inclusiveness proposals that are in here.

Geoff Mulgan:

Hi. Sorry, I've only just rejoined the call, I dropped off. So it might be worth going to someone else first.

- Beth Simon Noveck: That's fine. Why don't we turn, then, to Alison, if you're still there. Do we have you on the line?
- Alison Gillwald: Yes. I am.
- Beth Simon Noveck: Great. So, Alison, if you want to tell us a little bit. There's a proposal in here about how to be more inclusive, and then thus more legitimate by broadening participation at every stage of decision-making. I'm hoping you can share with us a little bit about this value of -- the principle of legitimacy of the values that flow from it, and some of the proposals that we are suggesting. We'd love to bring in your voice on the call.
- Alison Gillwald: Thank you very much. I suppose the thing that struck me most about the proposals was -- and I suppose it's not so surprising, was how many of the solutions, or proposed solutions were IT-2 focused. And I think that, I think some of them are very exciting, and I think it would have been very nice to have Geoff talk about some of the exciting crowd sourcing proposals, and mechanisms for participation. And I think many of those two, in terms of opening this technical aspects of the organization in terms of -- I'm talking of things like procurement, and expert advice and that kind of thing.
- Opening up that sort of stuff online. There's a lot of potential there. Why I suppose I said that I was struck by how little, or how few human engagements, and human kinds of solutions, were present, was precisely because of the issues that we are dealing with. So the issues of legitimacy, but also, of course, based on greater transparency, greater accountability to the issues that the Multi-Stakeholder Panel is trying to deal with.
- So I think there are lots of real exciting ITT mechanisms or tools or instruments, to overcome some of the problems of simply being a virtual organization, or virtual structures in many ways. But I think what we really need to do is find ways of addressing the human dimension of ownership and participation and legitimacy within the organization. And I guess -- I think my concern was that -- there were some concerns simply at the purely connectivity level, about people being able to respond to those opportunities.
- So I think the kind of people who can, you know, just beyond tax, just from a connectivity point of view, the affordability of connectivity point of view, even now our own communications are being so interrupted by poor connectivity. So I just was under the assumption, certainly the people that (inaudible) -- certainly the people would feel comfortable with that, as a way to discuss, quite hard issues, was limiting for that kind of thing. So I think that two would be great, I think they can do certain things, but I certainly don't think they, on their own, can agree -- the really hard issues, the big issues that we need to deal with.
- And so we are in discussion with some very informally and -- well, you know, specific -- again, virtual calls, and virtual conferences, with local groups, including APC, Association for Progressive Communication, Google's local office here, and some university colleagues across the country and across the continent.
- We really came to the conclusion that perhaps, a really obvious and not really remarkable, or an extraordinary way of doing this, would be for ICANN, simply because without replication all these other large U.N.-type organizations, bringing people together physically, to engage, to debate, to account to them, so that you can source them, to allow them to take agendas, would be extraordinary costly and would duplicate what's being done elsewhere.
- So the idea was that potentially, ICANN could more formerly support multi-stakeholder processes like, likely the IGF, who are anyway struggling with making multi-stakeholder relevant by -- having decision-making powers and ensuring outcomes. So it's a very nice

talk shop but, you know, it would also strengthen it to be able to contribute directly to global governance and structures and institutions like ICANN.

So if ICANN could formerly support attendance by those currently marginalized from attendance at these meetings, and I use more that as very (inaudible) here, but more kind of filling the gaps, because in some parts of these multilateral agencies the civil society is missing in some parts, and civil society is overly-represented and you've got governments missing. And then, in perhaps fewer cases you've got private sector missing. But really to avoid -- to try and fill those gaps, but then claiming some space in these meetings to formerly engage on ICANN issues, pertinent issues. Issues that you want to raise, maybe connective issues that you want to raise.

Get feedback on those and then use these ongoing forums to give feedback to accounts on what has happened within ICANN. Institutionally, structurally, process-wise mechanisms, whatever the issue is related to, you know, regular meetings. And so claim a space within these multi-stakeholder forums to engage people and account -- and to listen to -- views and opinions, but also accounts. That was one of the ideas.

Beth Simon Noveck:

Alison, many, many thanks. And I want to particular call out and thank you for your service. We are very lucky, particularly, as you point out in the beginning, given how many ideas we receive from the public and how many ideas we had internally, they are heavily technological. And that spoke to this idea of how to take advantage of new tools, that you are also helping us to think about how to use new tools to be more inclusive, and to improve how we work offline as well as online, and reach those who are the hardest to reach, and include them in the process. So I really want to thank you for that and for brining this perspective.

Why don't we quickly now turn to Geoff, and then to Joi. Geoff to talk, maybe about one of the other specific proposals and we'll try to cover just one or two more. And then we'll wrap up our portion of things and turn it over to your questions, comments and concerns.

Geoff, are you ready?

Geoff Mulgan:

Hi. Well mostly if I could make a comment, which applies to several of them including the levels of success, participatory budgeting, and so on. I think there's an extra layer I believe in many of these. At the moment they have proposed a sort of -- completely open crowd sourcing, or indeed participation processes, which I think risks the play and methods that work in our geographical community, but probably doesn't work for anything global. And that it might be better to think of the different key communities who have a stake, and how do you reach each of them separately using these methods. And then, aggregate.

So taking measures of success there will be as a number of different groups for whom different metrics matter. They will range from people very much in the technology side, the businesses, the governments to enthusiastic citizens. If you mix them all together, et cetera, in any process, you have a big risk where the particular group will, you know, massively distort the findings or gain the process and so on.

So the usual lesson, that these are multi-stakeholder things and we need some with boundary lines around them. You can within that, you know, a business group or a concerned citizens group, have an entirely -- people can volunteer, learn to take part in discussion groups, and kick around with the metrics. But if you aggregate too much, you get actually a lot of noise and distortion. That applies even more to budgetary decisions, where a completely open participatory budgeting process will most certainly be captured by a very small number of vested interests.

Whereas, say, a better way of thought would be to be a more orchestrated, more managed process, than say the five or six key groups, and then you need a capacity for

synthesizing. And as we've just said, a lot that synthesis probably has to -- well, the third step has to evolve with a conscious outreach to the groups, or otherwise they definitely won't take part, if you just sort of build this and expect people to come. You'll get certain groups will come and others won't. And then, there's a fairly active process synthesis.

So with quite a few of the things on this list, I think they need disaggregation by community, probably as well, disaggregation by (inaudible) questions, and so there will be certain topics which are very well treated through very open processes, and others which aren't, only because of the technical complexity or because of the power interest involved. And then that's -- the next step is to define each of these for each of these.

Beth Simon Noveck: Thank you very much. Now, I think, let me -- in the interest of time, I think what I'll do, is let me turn it to Joi, to sort of give us his reflections, either on the specifics or just generally on the principles and the values and the process that we set out to get his thoughts. And then we'll start to move into a Q&A.

Joi Ito: Thanks, Beth. So generally I think the direction is great, and I would rather maybe make a comment on kind of the framing of the importance of this. I think that in a funny way ICANN has spent a lot of time trying to stay -- I mean, just to be blunt, kind of, to be the independent thing and not end up under U.N. (ph) and ITU, and sort of has been working on a very tough problem, in a non-governmental -- non-intergovernmental way. But I think as we look at the governments trying to rebuild themselves after Arab Spring, and we look at a lot of the failures in international relations, and just the complexity of the work -- the connected world, and the sort of breakdown of the idea of sovereign states, and statesmen negotiating with each other through diplomatic channels.

I think that we have the opportunity to really be a model for how all kinds of things gets discussed and settled. And so I think that, you know, in a way I think we have a very important role of coming up with solution for governance in general that other people can use. I think that one of the things -- I mean in some of these proposals I think a few things that are key is for instance, the idea of Agile. You know, you think about how legislation and treaties are currently put together, and the -- some of the things that we learn about how do we do design process. How do you do re-factor, and how do you use software and Internet, things like Liquid Democracy, and things like that.

I don't think we should be building a lot of the technology, I think a lot of the technology is out there, but I think if we are the first to implement it, in a practical way, I think that these -- and obviously, Beth, I'm preaching to the choir, because this is something that you already do as your day job, but I think that framing -- experiment that we are doing in the context of the future of governance more broadly, is very important, and also sort of interoperating with the tools that are being used and experimented with in some of the country building as well as well is the international relations work is essential. And I know you're doing that, but I just wanted to call that out.

Beth Simon Noveck: I don't think we can say it often enough, so I think it's a really important -- a really important contribution. I would just, sort of, wrap up the proposals, the special proposals to -- I mention again that we put up the summary of the 16 initial proposals. And they are by no means set in stone. We need to hear, now that you read them, I'm hoping that people will come up with 20 more, or help us take five off the list. But the help with that process, what we are doing is starting by posting two pages -- taking each of the paragraphs and turning them into initial proposals.

And we are going to put three up on line today. One of which will focus on the crowd sourcing discussion that you heard about from Geoff. A second that we'll focus on, some of the inclusivity and accountability proposals you heard about from Alison. And a third, we'll focus on the idea of how we might use expert networking technology. If you think about tools like a LinkedIn or other platforms that allow us to identify and make searchable people's credentials, skills, expertise, and interest. How we might use these

new tools to help us give ICANN and other organizations access to the best possible expertise to solve problems when they need them.

The possibility that we are fusing expert networks, for example, to connect the global computer science and engineering community, a much broader cohort of engineers and computer scientists and others, can currently participate today, into the process to ensure that when decisions are made they are done with the best technical expertise possible. And therefore enhancing not only how smart ICANN can be as an organization, but also how legitimate they can be.

So we'll put up those three proposals. And now let me turn you to the final slide in the presentation, and ask Jill if she would like to say a word about the process before we -- we are hoping to hear from people, before we turn it over to your questions and comments.

Jillian Raines:

Yes. Thank you. So, as Beth indicated we will be sharing these initial proposals up on line today, and we've, sort of articulated here some initial questions that we think could help move the discussion forward. But I would like to say that one of the things we would really benefit from going forward, the idea of taking some of the proposals we suggested and working with you and the community to figure out, where makes the most sense to try some of these ideas out, and how can we marry them to ICANN's day-to-day practices.

So, these initial questions, on the slide reflect some of the questions we have, as to how they do that, but we would also just generally like to hear ideas that you have. I encourage you to go to the posts that are up, and will be up shortly. Of course, we recognize that you'll probably appreciate a little bit of time to digest those and review them, and we are happy to reach out in other capacities to try to get your ideas in a -- on a timeline that makes it a little bit more convenient for you, but we also encourage you to go and share comments on the blog.

We also have enabled an annotation feature which allows you to comment or react, just saying that something seems problematic, or something seems like a great idea. Things like that are enable on the blogs that hopefully you can experiment with and play around with, and it will offer the community a chance to provide feedback in a new way.

Beth Simon Noveck:

And with that said, can we -- what's the process now for turning it over to questions and comments, and then coming to -- do we moderate them--?

Alice Jansen:

Yes. We will now open the floor, and the lines will be un-muted, and we will refer to the hands raised in the Adobe Connect Room to create a queue. Operator, could you please un-mute the lines?

Operator:

Listen-only mode, is now off. Listen-only mode is now off.

Alice Jansen:

Beth, I believe we have a question from Mikey O'Connor.

Beth Simon Noveck:

Great (ph).

Mikey O Connor:

Thanks, Alice. It's Mikey O'Connor. Mickey is the mouse. I think this was great, folks. It's a tremendous lunge forward from the fairly unformed ideas that I was looking at on (inaudible) website, so hats off to all of you on that.

I want to pick off sort of one theme, that Alison touched on and I really want to amplify, which is that this process up till now has felt very tools-focused, and I am really glad to hear Alison's point, that much of this isn't going to be about tools. I think tools can help, but goals first please. And so I'm going to paste a little blog post into the chat right now,

and as fate, I will tell you tell you that it's quite cold here in Minnesota, and you can look at the thermometer on that blog post if you want.

This is something I submitted to this group in an early form, and I wanted to bring it into the record now. It's talking about how we develop people, and I want to amplify something that I think Geoff said, which is that there is a layer between the hardcore and the whole world that we need to develop and this slide that I've just posted into the chat is sort of describing the process by which those people get developed. And most of that is not going to happen primarily because of technology. It's going to be hard work, person-to-person, and if we can focus on that, I think that would be great. Thanks, all.

Unidentified Participant: All right. Thanks very much.

Beth Simon Noveck: Many thanks. It seems like we have a next question relating to it by Evan Leibovitch. What mechanisms are being considered to connect some of the ideas to the current ICANN reality? I think -- may I take that? I think one of the things that we are trying to do is, hopefully by posting these initial ideas, get some ideas from you as to how we can connect some of them as closely as possible to the processes that are underway at ICANN today. Trying to figure out which groups or key individuals would present the best opportunity to try some of these things out, that is out, that is one of the things that we are hoping, to take it one step further.

We have to apologize because, utterly unexpectedly there appears to be a fire drill going on in the background. So what -- you may be hearing the fire warden speaking over the loudspeaker. This unpredicted and alas, unavoidable, but we'll try to minimize the noise on our end.

Do we have a next question or comment in the virtual or the real world?

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Beth Simon Noveck: Yeah.

Beth Simon Noveck: So there was another question that came in during the course of the chat, the back channel chat, which asked about next opportunities and times and occasions in which we are going to present this work. I think, again, the important thing is that now we are going to have this, hopefully, active discussion online, to try to flesh out these proposals and to bring them in to a more final draft stage. And then we are absolutely amenable and open to presenting at future and further ICANN meetings, and in other fora, and hopefully members of the Panel will be speaking about the work over the course of the coming months.

So we welcome suggestions for when are the times to share, and with what audiences. And we will be definitely talking and working with ICANN staff to be sure that we disseminate the work of the Panel broadly. We will also be sending out updates and notices when new postings go up, so as we post these individuals, two to three pages about the specific proposals, we'll make sure that people get notified when new posts go up.

And while I'm -- while I'm also talking about mail going out, I also want to comment to people, that on a weekly basis, the GovLab as a result of the research we are doing for the process, we are sharing with folks what we are learning and we put up every week, something we call the SCAN, which is the Selected Curation of Articles In Net-Governance which you can subscribe to from the home page, if you don't get already.

Enough news about ICANN, if you'd like to get another compilation of really cool articles that we think are worth reading week one, I'll point you to that. We've already put

out our 11th issue, the 12th one going out today, and we invite you to sign up from the home page.

Alice Jansen: We have Maria Farrell in the Adobe Connect Room, who wishes to speak. Maria?

Maria Farrell: Hi. Thanks, Alice. This is Maria Farrell here. Yeah. I have a comment in response to the question: are there deficiencies and how do you see ICANN practicing multi-stakeholder governance? Do you think we should consider having? And I would say, yes, absolutely do. I think a lot of the proposals, well they seem in the draft paper, while they seem admirable on the surface, would seem to exacerbate a lot of the structural inequalities that we see with the current multi-stakeholder governance model.

And let me give you an example. A lot of the proposals are about Liquid Democracy or about crowd sourcing, or basically about your ability to put a lot of people in responding to a particular issue. Now in my experience on the ICANN staff for five years, and as a community member, I can tell you there are far greater capabilities of some of the business groups to get people around the world to respond on a particular issue, than there are, for example, those of us who are campaigning on the human rights end of things.

We are simply not as well financially resourced, and so when you talk about crowd sourcing and getting off to people, I see something that sounds, on the face of it, superficially to the (inaudible) demographic and it sounds like it makes a lot of noises, but actually what it could really end up doing is amplifying already about our great inequalities and people's abilities to participate effectively.

So I think that is a real, real problem, and unfortunately the proposals that I see here, really run the risk of exacerbating that, and I think it comes from failure to look -- take a very long, hard and ugly look at all the fundamental structural problems that we have in our accounts. And that those of us who are looking at things from a human rights perspective have a great disadvantage when it comes to time, money and the ability to coordinate.

And so a lot of the proposals here, I think, they might sound nice in a sort of a lofty technocratic way, where the only problem we have is simply to aggregate or sensitize people -- you know, the wishes of the communities that would like to find an answer, I think, in reality, we have winners and we have losers. The losers typically are the people who do not have the recourses, and the channels to go around and run around ICANN's decisions to the U.S. Department of Commerce, or the U.S. Congress.

And so there is not much details so we can to fix that problem, so I would really like the channels to look at that, and particularly when we talk about, should we organize the topic rather than the constituency. Well organizing around issues makes it a lot harder for those of us that already have a hard time participating to really get our voices heard, because it will just be drowned out by the (inaudible). That's my comment. Thank you.

Alice Jansen: Thank you. Next in the queue is Ken Stubbs.

Ken Stubbs: Thank you very much. My comments are tempered by approximately 17 years in the ICANN community. First of all let's start out with my concerns about the elaborations being far too esoteric and not as practical as they need to be.

Secondly, I'm concerned that the solution may be traded in such a way as, we are not going to do anything until we can do everything at one time. I think from a practical standpoint, we need to start by taking baby steps, implementing and, you know, from a practical standpoint as these steps are taken and the implementation is put in place, we are going to find that occasionally, we will have made mistakes, and will allow us for the opportunity for mid-course correction.

The other thing I'm very concerned about, and I am not as deeply involved as others here on the IGF issues, is I don't want this thing to turn into an ITU timeline type situation. I, frankly, as a member of the community, expect results on a timely basis. If I have to wait till the annual meeting for the year 2015 before I see anything concrete, and any specific implementation plan, I'm going to be very disappointed. I won't be the only one, because what that does is allow for back channels to be created and around processes to be created to try to accomplish what you guys frankly should be able to accomplish in a practical time period.

And the final suggestions is the problem of outreach. I sympathize with Maria. I think ICANN is going to have to develop a way of getting input in a practical way, and coalescing more often than once every four months. If that means you have to have regional meetings, then let's start working on budget items for that. I would much prefer to see a regional meeting in parts of the world where there are difficulties, and there are challenges such as in Africa, and in certain areas as well. And give them an opportunity to communicate directly with the relevant people. In other words, take your Panel where you can hear the people. Thank you very much for hearing me out.

Beth Simon Noveck: Many thanks. We will--

Alice Jansen: Thank you, and --

Beth Simon Noveck: Let's keep going so that we get as many comments as possible, and then we'll save a few minutes at the end for member of the Panel to, you know, offer any further replies.

Alice Jansen: Thank you. The next person in the queue is Elliott Noss.

Elliott Noss: Yeah. Hi. Thank you. I have two things that I wanted to put into the discussion. The first was a question, perhaps, you can answer when I finish, which is, will any or some or all of you be in Singapore, and have you sort of could possibly have spoken to Staff about getting a slot during the week to present and discuss some of these ideas?

The second thing I wanted to inject into the conversation, was a very specific thought. We are talking about some of the real concerns in the chat now, and I don't want to bring that into the audio, but I do want to suggest, when you are talking about connecting some of these proposals to the actual work that's going on inside of ICANN today. You know, I think it would be fantastic if we could take a working group and, you know, there are many going on at any one time and, perhaps, use some of the simpler principles in Liquid Democracy and put them into practice in the working group, and perhaps not even in a -- certainly not in a binding way, but in an informative way.

You know, I think that with all of these things, especially with something like Liquid Democracy, there are not real existence proofs in the world, and what we would need to be doing inside of an ICANN context with that, or any other new forms of governance, is we've got to find places to practice. And I mean, in particular, I'd love to -- Mikey, you and I maybe can talk a little bit about this in Singapore before. Mikey, is King of the working groups, and I'm that he can help us all to connect some of these ideas to the actual work going on. Thank you.

And if I could, you know, get perhaps a specific answer on the Singapore attendance question.

Beth Simon Noveck: Oh. Sorry. I've been -- I have to interject here. Just very briefly, to the specific question. Yes, we are planning to participate. We'll be talking, as we'll see, over the next few weeks as the discussion evolves online, what are the optimum ways to participate in upcoming meetings, so that's the plan. Right now, and very much, you know, given the timeline of the Panel -- well, first of all what the work group had done, is very much

informed by the specifics of ICANN, how ICANN works today, and what the specifics of practice are.

But how then do proposals get re-linked in back to what it means for the evolution of ICANN, will need to be obviously a more detailed in a longer-term process that happens in the coming weeks after these panels have to end. They have a fairly short timeline, and so the specifics for each one will start the process of beginning to work out what those could be in the discussion around these blog posts now, but the assumption is that that will have to continue going forward after the end of the Multi-Stakeholder Strategy Panel happens over the next few weeks. But yes, we plan to participate in that -- in Singapore and other meetings.

Alice Jansen: Thank you. The next question in queue is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Can you hear me?

Beth Simon Noveck: We can hear you in New York.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you. So just a few points basically. First I must say I'm a full supporter of the work that you guys are doing. I think that one of the things that ICANN hasn't done in so many years is to start thinking out of the box, and this really, definitely will be. Strategy panels, and so on is all about thinking outside of the box, and so it's about time that someone looks at this issues and tries to find some solutions or at least suggest some solutions, and so on.

I'm in full support of Maria Farrell's comments, what she described as some of the challenges that you are going to find with the proposals that you're making, assuming that most people are interested, are able to -- well, not only are interested but do they know about the issues? Do they understand the issues? Do they care about the issues? Do people have the ability to take part, the technical ability to take part? The fact the world is round, this sort of thing.

Languages, I think is something that I would actually add as being a major problem, and I'm a bit concerned that your Panel is primarily U.S.- and European-based, and very few people from Asia, from Africa, and from Latin America being able to provide you with the feedback that you need on a cultural side of things.

We are all assuming that people are vocal, and are going to talk and get involved and so on. And, alas, it doesn't quite work this in some parts of the world. So that's a concern I have. At the same time, I also have the concern regarding crowd sourcing, and I think Elliott expressed this. Elliott Noss expressed this in the chat, reminding us of the darks days of ballot stuffing which happened in the past, and I hope that you're not thinking that we can go back to this, and suddenly have a free-for-all, everyone on the same level input not the system, which results in some kind of cacophony.

And therefore the more powerful people being able to speak louder than the others whose points of view are totally then falling over by the wayside. And of course, when I mean most powerful speakers I also mean with regards to the funding of those people being able to come to ICANN meetings, being able to spend a lot more time on issues than people who are not directly involved with us.

And finally, I also wanted to comment on a danger of thinking that technology will save the day. Technology is the tool, and involvement is actually a social matter, so I would really suggest to the Panel to look at these social matter that brings the involvement, or doesn't bring the involvement. The technology is something that, unfortunately, is different in different parts of the world, and whilst in Western Europe and in North America there might be a very fast road, and good telecommunications . In other parts of the world, by now, you've been for nearly an hour on the call, by now they would have

had their call (inaudible) 10 to 15 times, which makes it a lot, lot harder to take part. That's it. Thank you.

Beth Simon Noveck: So we have a few minutes left, why don't we see if we can get a few more comments, and then we can move the discussion online, in large part, because we've had you mute because the fire alarm has been blaring in the background here, but we don't know how -- if we'll be able to make ourselves heard. But let's see if there's one more comment, and then I'll ask Joi and Geoff and Alison, if they have any parting words. And then we'll move the discussion online to the blog, in the comments there, and then hopefully we can get some robust and open discussion going, and keep it going in between this and future calls and meetings.

Is there one more interjection, or anybody waiting in the queue?

Unidentified Participant: No.

Beth Simon Noveck: Well then let me ask -- I propose -- the comments, I think -- Alison, are you back, or are you disconnected? I think we might have lost her. Let me see if Geoff has and any closing words, or Joi, before we wrap up.

Joi Ito: This is Joi. I can make a few comments if that's okay.

Beth Simon Noveck: Please. We are going to go back to mute here.

Joi Ito: Yeah. So while I appreciate some of the concerns raised about the difficulty of voting and not relying on the tools, I do think that -- and I think Elliott posted this in the chat -- a lot of the concerns about inclusiveness and engagement, are being studied and addressed by both technical researchers and others. I think Jim Piskins (ph) deliberative polling where you take a random sample and you force people to deliberate. Had shown really interesting results. I think then folding that in with some of the concerns that Liquid Democracy is trying to test, I think it's definitely worth a test.

Maybe we don't want to connect it directly to the main jugular at the beginning, but we have a lot of issues at ICANN that we need to discuss, and I think at our -- at the Media Lab we have a center-specific media, and specific engagement, engaging those people in place that don't typically engage is, we have dozens of projects working in the space, and I -- you know, it's an area of huge innovation and there is a lot of funding going into it now. So I think that just kind of writing off, using your tools to establish connections with people who aren't normally engaged I think is -- Again, I don't know.

I think connecting it to the mainstream right away may be difficult, but I think using it with a working group or something like that, I think may yield a lot of learning, and I think we can also create a lot of data, because we are usual -- we have real issues that can feedback to the community of academics and researchers that are working on different forms of governance. So I think experimentation, capturing the learning, and trying it out on different parts of ICANN is something that would contribute to us as well as to the community.

Beth Simon Noveck: I couldn't have said better myself. So I think, unless there are further concluding remarks from members of the Panel, in the interest of time it's now -- we've gone the full hour, and I want to thank people for their active participation, and I want to thank also the ICANN Staff for helping us to organization and set this up, and allow us to speak with you. We will circulate again, on the links to the posts as they come out, but you can find the first on the www.govlab.org, you are welcome and encourage, please, to steal and repost, and put out links to it.

Most important though, we want to have an open and frank conversation and to get your comments and feedback. And there's a post going up now, it's up now, is the 16

overviews, and we are putting up three more in-depth proposals. Again, it's a first foray into an ongoing conversation about how to transition from idea to actual practice and implementation for ICANN.

Thank you very much, to everybody to participating and we will make ourselves available online and in person to do this again. And thank you very much. For your feedback.