MONTREAL – Middle East Space - Evolving ICANN's Multistakeholder Model, A Middle East Perspective
Wednesday, November 6, 2019 – 15:15 to 16:45 EDT
ICANN66 | Montréal, Canada

CHERINE CHALABY: If we don't resolve these things, I think personally they will erode and tear into the fabric of our community. So, I think that's the main reason why we are addressing it.

The other reason is that we have made that commitment and that promise to the United States government and to the whole world when the transition happened.

One of the four principles—and in fact the first principle of the transition that we committed to—is that we will look after our multi-stakeholder model and we will enhance it and we will evolve it. So, by doing this, we are meeting our own commitment. So, this is critical, important, strategic, and essential work.

There will be naturally resistance to doing changes, but I think we are not going to progress unless we make changes. That's my only recommendation is make sure you keep pushing, pushing and we're going to improve it in a much better way. So, thank you very much for the opportunity to talk to you and [inaudible]. It's the last time I say hello and goodbye.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Cherine. Another friend of mine and supportive to the community is our President and CEO, Goran Marby. Goran has

always accepted to come to us to address us and to give us insights and encouragement. Goran, please.

GORAN MARBY:

See, Tarek ordered me to come here. And thank you, Tijani, for your nice words yesterday about our dear friend, Tarek. I can't claim then that I have a Middle Eastern background. I'm Swedish, as far as you can get. But I did, actually, a couple of years ago when I realized my chairman was Egyptian, I had Tarek as an Egyptian and also the head of the GAC was Egyptian, Manal. I said to the Egyptian [inaudible] minister, I consider myself as an honorary Egyptian. [inaudible] accepted. I'm Swedish, I take friendship when I can because nobody really cares.

So, thank you very much for your comments. I spoke with you about what I'm going to say again. I've spoken about this before and I'm going to say it again because I actually believe it so much and I think it always should be in the focus of what we're talking about.

The next billion users of Internet will not come from Europe, the US, where they already have Internet. The next billion users will come from places that doesn't have Internet today. Africa, Middle East, Asia, and South America.

That means that we, as ICANN, need to learn to adopt the system we're running so we can make it valuable for the next generation of users. I said before, and I believe in it, that the people who have access to Internet today are often the elites. They have money. They live in cities. Not in rural areas. The next billion users will have a very different

economic means and perspective of the Internet. They have to understand the reasons why to go online. And people are smart. They will only go online if they see the benefit of it. And if you don't have all the economic means to do it, you really have to make a choice.

Internet is both global … We talk about the Internet as the global thing all the time but it's actually very local. It's a village. Most of the time you actually do connect to people that are close to you, in your own language, in your own script.

We're often now talking about people that doesn't have English as a [concept], reading from left to right, know what a dot is. And I think that this ties in together with how we actually do work in ICANN because I think we need to be better of understanding the needs of the people who doesn't come to ICANN meetings, who doesn't even have Internet today. So, therefore, I applaud your help with us to change how we do things, so we can better think about the users that's going to come in, because they will challenge us to be able to do things. That's why things like universal acceptance, things like IDNs, local scripts, all of that is so important and should be really engrained in what ICANN does. So, thank you for your help, or actually your advice and guidance rather than help because that's what you're giving me. And I promise to come back here. Thank you very much.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Sure. We will not let you not come. Thank you. Thank you very much. Now, one of our community members is today our guest as the GAC

chair. Manal Ismail accepted to come to address us despite her very crowded schedule. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Tijani.

GORAN MARBY: So, you are here. Sorry. Unfortunately, I have to excuse myself together with Cherine because we are actually going back to a Board meeting.

MANAL ISMAIL: So, thank you, everyone. In fact, Tijani, it's not that I accepted the invitation. I'm part of the community. I'm sorry I have not been able to join earlier meetings. As you all know, the GAC meets throughout the week from 8:30 to 6:30 every day, so it's very difficult to have something else in parallel. In fact, I left them drafting the communique. I gave them assignment to resolve the DotAmazon issue until I'm back. So, we have a couple of minutes.

Thank you, again, for inviting me and thank you for your efforts, Tijani and Nadira. You've been doing a great job trying to mobilize the whole community and thanks to Hadia for holding a pen on this statement and everyone who has been involved and even previous submissions as well, as Cherine mentioned. New gTLDs and universal acceptance.

Frankly speaking, I think this is a very timely and relevant issue to the region here because, again, it provides a venue for members of the community from the region to say how we can facilitate their

participation here at ICANN. What are the challenges? How they would like those addressed and how we can do better in increasing and encouraging more meaningful participation from the region.

I would also like to thank Brian because this was one of the very clear and structured processes. It's not complex as other things. It was really very well structured and it makes it easy for people to get engaged and to comment on the process. So, thank you, again. And the webinars were very useful, very clear, very structured. So, this is also one of the things that makes commenting easier.

Before I conclude, I would like to say that maybe we shouldn't wait for a face-to-face meeting to have those submissions and it would be good also intersessionally maybe we follow on specific policy development processes of relevance to the region, and again with the same mechanism, with the same people, we can submit collective input intersessionally and not necessarily wait to face-to-face meetings. I'll stop here and over to you, Nadira.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, Manal, for suggesting the topic because we were challenging what to choose with this and support and thanks to Cherine for coming and all [inaudible]. Thanks.

Maybe some of you in the preparation for ICANN 66, Baher was sharing with us a lot about the webinars and he kind of reminding us every time about the preparation with Brian webinars. Some of you did attend and

ICANN 66
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

BRIAN CUTE:
Thank you, Nadira, and thank you all for your warm invitation. I'm privileged to be here with you today and look forward to a conversation about this it process. And as happy as I am to be here to share with you where the process is going and what we can do together, I'm more interested in hearing from you, not just today but after the session tomorrow when I present the work plan and when you have again an opportunity to comment on the proposed work plan, please keep these important inputs to the process coming. I welcome very much the comments that you offered in our last round. They are helpful in structuring the work that the community needs to do to improve the effectiveness and the efficiency of our working model. So, thank you for that.

Let me go back in time a little bit. Tomorrow at 10:30 I will be presenting the proposed work plan that comes out of this process but let me just go back to the beginning. How did we get here?

As Cherine noted, this work comes from the strategic plan for 2021-2025 and it is in the service of achieving the strategic objective on governance. How can we improve the working of the model?

I was engaged to work with the community to create two things, effectively, working with the community in a bottom-up manner. First, identifying the list of issues that are challenging the more effective and

efficient working of our model and you've addressed them very well in this last call for public comments.

Having identified that list of issues, the next phase was to develop this work plan. So, the purpose of the last call for public comments was to hear from you, among other things, how should we approach this work? Are there other solutions in the community that we could use to address these issues? Because with all the work that's ongoing, we would not want to duplicate work that's going on the community.

Also, who should take on the task of developing a solution? An important question. Which of our community members, entities? These were the questions that were posed and these were the questions you answer, and thank you again for your feedback on that. It was very helpful in shaping the work plan.

Looking forward, the work plan will be presented tomorrow. It will be published. It will become part of the five-year operating plan that will be put out for public comment in December, and therefore you'll have another opportunity to comment on it.

I'll share with you a bit of what I'll share tomorrow. The community has been very, very clear and what struck me along the way is the commonality of comment. No matter what stakeholder group—Middle East space or any other AC, SO, or stakeholder group—the community has been defining these issues in the same way, regardless of their area of interest. You're defining the challenges to the working processes and working methods and culture the same way. That's striking and that means something.

So, as we move forward in this process, I also have heard from the community very clearly that there is a significant workload that everyone is supporting and that workload seems to increase. And here come yet some more work streams. So, hearing very clearly this is important work. It serves a strategic plan and we have so much and now we have more.

What I would ask you to do is, as you look at this work plan and you look at the issues that you have defined, these are the issues that you as a community have defined and said very clearly this is not working so well; we need to fix that. You have much work.

If you look at these issues through the lens that these are the issues that will give us the tools to begin to break some of the cycles that are causing us to labor that will improve some of the processes that can get us to efficiency.

When you think of prioritization of the work, for example, improving how we prioritize work here at ICANN as a community, so that we're not treating all work with the same sense of urgency. We're making clear decisions about should we begin another work stream or shouldn't we?

And doing that and making those decisions in a way where it's fully informed, where the community has a full view of all the ongoing projects as a resource and understanding what the resource allocations are and can make well-informed decisions about what we begin, what we stop, or what we choose not to begin.

So, prioritization of the work, as an example. This issue represents a tool that can be used effectively by the entire community to begin to break the cycles that are causing us to labor under so much work. And if you take that lens and put it over each of these issues, I think you will see the particular value that this work can bring to the community.

It is indeed a call for more but it has a very particular purpose and I ask you all to look at it through that lens. And I hope you can join us tomorrow as I present the work plan. Again, thank you for the wonderful inputs. I encourage you to come to the public comment period next time and provide more of your thoughts. Those will create the final work plan when this process is finished. Thank you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, Brian. In fact, your input here I think will direct the discussion for the new public comment. So, instead of having that comment in here, taking the comments in here, start thinking about the fixes and the tools to make it workable so we will have a community work, another engagement from the community [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Nadira. I have just two questions. I couldn't see him [inaudible]. So, I remember that the name of this process was the evolvement of multi-stakeholder model. Now we have moved to another title which improved the effectiveness of ICANN MSM. Why this move? You have moved from [inaudible] to another?

Another question. Are you working in accordance with the streamline organization process?

BRIAN CUTE: Restate the question, please. Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. The title of this process was, in the beginning, the evolvement of multi-stakeholder model. Now we have moved to another title which is next steps to improve the effectiveness of ICANN MSM. Thank you.

BRIAN CUTE: That was a title used for the last public comment period because we had shifted from phase one which was identifying the issues that were creating challenges and how we get our work done and turning to the creation of a work plan. So, next steps was to reflect that, that now we're taking steps to develop a work plan, which we have.

                               And your second question? I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Are you working in accordance with the streamline organizational process? There is another process which aims to streamline the organization of ICANN.

BRIAN CUTE: Thank you. Very clear. No. One thing that has been flagged in this process because it is important for all of us to pay attention to is that this is a particular work stream supporting the strategic plan. There are other work streams, the streamlining workstream. There is ATRT-3 which is developing recommendations. There is work stream two from CCWG Accountability. There is GNSO PDP 3.0 implementation which you referenced in your comments. All of those work streams are taking place in parallel. This work stream has a very particular purpose and what we need to be cognizant of is that we don't want to duplicate work. We don't want any of the work of those important work streams t be conflicting with each other.

So, in the report, I'm noting that those work streams are dependencies. As this work moves forward, we need to check at each step of the way as the ATRT-3 recommendations come in, as the Board asks the community how we will streamline reviews and manage work stream two, as PDP 3 moves forward. All of these pieces have to work in parallel and in sync. So, no, I have not been working with them, per se. However, I have been liaising with ongoing work streams to try to make sure that this work is focused, that it is complementary, that it's not duplicative of other work streams.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Brian is here. I think he's leaving.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Actually, it's a comment. One of the statements of [inaudible] is of concern to me. The MSM, if the concern is just to please the US government, this is way short from the initial plan. The MSM is to please the global community. So it's not only targeted to be able to fulfill the US government requirements. I believe that this was the statement as a misstatement by [inaudible].

BRIAN CUTE: So, in my engagement, I was asked to work with the community to create a bottom-up plan, period. And that bottom-up work plan is supporting the strategic plan and the strategic objective on governance was developed by ICANN through the planning process, Board, Org, working with the community. That is the exclusive focus of this work and the purpose of this work, I can assure you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: To move to the statement itself. Before moving, I have to commend the work of the penholder, Hadia. In spite of she's the ALAC representative in the EPDP and all the work they were being held in Los Angeles with the work. And according to the timeline we put as co-chairs, suddenly, "Oh!" Thanks also to her team. We have [inaudible] in person. We have [inaudible] and I hope Zakir is also here. Also, we have comments from the general community. Also, in our process, we follow the same style as ICANN in general. We have a suggestion of ideas, then voting which subject, which issue we want to handle. Then we have calling for team, calling for the team that they will select their penholder and so on. So,

I will give the floor for Hadia to present her work and the community work and will discuss it later.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Brian, for being with us. And Nadira and Tijani, thank you so much for leading the Middle East space and allowing for such statements to be possible.

as Nadira said, there were other contributors to the statement as well. So, [Chookri] was one of the contributors. [Hanan], Zakir, Fouad and Nadira and Tijani. So, those are all contributors to the statement.

I was told to give everybody a few minutes to read this statement if you haven't. If you have, we can …. And I will just highlight the main points.

So, we mainly try tackling issue by issue. Looking at the problem and seeing if it was addressed by the current existing solutions that were proposed in the document.

So, with regard to the first issue, prioritization of work, from a strategic point of view, we don't see this as a part of the multi-stakeholder plan because ICANN's planning process addresses the prioritization in terms of go, no-go based on the five-year strategic plan and the associated goals.

But from another lower level and not at the strategic level, we do feel that prioritization of work is actually required. So, prioritizing ICANN's community activities, whether for example they go simultaneously or one after the other, elaborating on the benefits of each will allow for

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019
66

better allocation of resources, budgeting and could also help in the issue of volunteers burning out. So, in this regard, we see that prioritization is required, but not on a strategic level.

Precision and scoping. Again, this is a very important issue and on a regional level we find groups like the Middle East and adjoining countries strategy working group, Africa strategy working group. All of these, they do have inputs and they align their work ICANN's five-year strategic plan.

Through their work with ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement, there may be able to be of benefit in this regard. Better use of the existing groups and processes would be required. We see that PDP 3.0 presents possible solutions to the issue and therefore we do not consider this currently as part of the work plan.

With regard to the efficient use of resources and cost, again, proper prioritization of work and precision in its scope are crucial elements to the efficient use of the resources, especially in relation to the volunteerism. We see this issue actually addressed by proposed solutions and therefore not part of the multi-stakeholder model plan.

Roles and responsibilities and holistic view of ICANN. There is a need to review how the three basic elements of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, the Board, Organization, and the community work together within their defined roles and responsibilities to achieve ICANN goals effectively. We regard this issue as an essential element of the multi-stakeholder model work plan and contributions to this effort should, in our opinion, include all stakeholders.

Issue number five, representation, inclusivity, [inaudible] and demographic. We see that existing solutions like GNSO PDP 3.0, the cross-community working group accountability, and work stream two recommendations and ATRT-3 possible recommendation could potentially address this issue. So, we do not regard it as part of the multi-stakeholder model.

However, we suggest after … Because we see that input from different solutions, all of this contribute to the issue to the solution of the issue and we propose that after the proposed solutions are implemented, maybe an evaluation plan that aggregates the results of these solutions could be required. However, we do not see it as part of the model.

Culture, trust, and silos. The Middle East community recognizes trust is an issue that could hinder cooperation and working together culture. The multi-stakeholder model should be aiming to achieve equity and accountability between all stakeholders. And due to the importance of the trust issue, we do find that trust should be on the work plan.

Complexity, that's issue number seven. It is important to the development of work within the ICANN community, ensuring diversity and inclusivity. We see that it should be part of the working plan. We're not sure …

And this is in order to put it on the strategic level because we do realize that some of the solutions are there but we do not see it addressed at the strategic level.

And then, finally, issue number eight. Consensus. Again, we regard the work developed by or under development or implementation by PDP 30.0 could successfully tackle this issue. We see that focusing on consensus among stakeholders rather than participants could be a solution, and to that end, we do not see it part of the multi-stakeholder model plan as it now, as it is addressed by other existing solutions.

Finally, we see that having a well-defined multi-stakeholder model with clear working methods and processes ensures that ICANN multi-stakeholder model continues to serve the global public interest.

So, that's it. I tried to highlight the main issues and I welcome any questions and my colleagues are here to help me as well. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is [inaudible] for the record. When developing this statement, we have to keep in mind that [inaudible] to the conception of you, the multi-stakeholder model adopted by ICANN which is based both on issue and constituency is very effective. This is based on [inaudible] view.

But what we mentioned in the statement is how to improve the implementation of this model. We have the … We are sure that the multi-stakeholder model adopted by ICANN is dynamic, very effective. But what we are trying to see here in our statement that we may improve the implementation of this model. Thank you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you. In fact, we still have I think, according to Brian, that's the third stage where these recommendations maybe make them into action to find solution and to be implementable. That's what we will be directing our work in the coming months.

SALLY COSTERTON: Hello. Sally Costerton from ICANN Org for the record. And for those of you I don't know, I lead Stakeholder Engagement at ICANN. I noticed with interest on issue four you make a very specific request about resources for my team. Sorry, it's issue three, efficient use of resources of cost.

You have here in your statement a very specific sentence and I wanted to just check that I understand exactly what in a little bit more detail about what the need is.

So, you say here increase in the financial resources allocated to GSE regional teams is regarded as necessary to develop capacity building programs and raise awareness required for more active and capable participation from the region.

So, my question to the group is what does that mean in practice? Because I want to make sure I understand specifically what is needed to make the difference that is articulated in this plan.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Probably that was my recommendation. In fact, because the community members, the first capacity building and policy

development – and I was one of the ones who was trained. It was conducted in the Middle East and the [inaudible] with the Middle East DNS Forum in Dubai. We were kind of a small group and also [Chookri] were part of it. It pulls us from one level to the other. It provides us the confidence to contribute to the policy in our region or with ICANN communities.

When it comes to, as a co-chair for this Middle East Space, when we call for a community member to volunteer even as observers, we are lacking that. In fact, we say the more capacity building on this regard, the more people we can pull from the region to contribute and be active, engaged.

SALLY COSTERTON: That is so helpful. So, just an even more detailed question because this will come to me. I know I will. So I might as well ask you while you're here. What I think you're saying is we need more capacity development. So, what we mean here is training sessions for the community which, for volunteers—well, from all regions, but specifically this region. And in this context, we have two different types of training and I think you've referred to both of the in your comments.

One is what we call knowledge building. So, education and training on a particular subject. So, it might be domain name security, for example, or domain name abuse. Any topic. A topic. And the other kind of training is a little bit what I think you're talking about which is what I call skill building. And this is much more about building confidence as individuals. You need both. Obviously, you need both because one

without the other is not very useful. But my sense is, if I'm correct in understanding this, that the things that make the biggest difference for the effective working of the multi-stakeholder model, which is the topic, is we want more training for in our region, hands-on training in both areas—in both knowledge building and skill building. Is that right?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Exactly. But also it's not the training. We have to give them the hands-on, the confidence. Okay, I'm trained. If I didn't go learn the [inaudible], if I dropped in the water and I couldn't swim.

SALLY COSTERTON: Yeah. So, how do we do that bit? How do we do the bit about dropping in the water?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yes. We also discuss about the volunteer burnout. So, this is … It's a problem [inaudible]. I don't have a answer. But at least encourage, provide them to be to such meeting that it will help them.

SALLY COSTERTON: Forgive me, and I will stop this, but this is a key issue, I think, from this recommendation. This will come straight into the Org. So, I want to be able to talk to my colleagues and say, "This is what this community means when they say this," so that we can put that into a budget. This is what has to happen, guys. I mean, this is what this turns into. It turns

into a budget request. And then we have to explain why this budget is more important than that budget. So, this is why I need to know.

So, you're saying first we need to train people but we also have to provide them with access to meetings, to interact. They have to swim in the pool. So, both. Thank you so much.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Maybe others have more elaboration on the trainings because—

ABDALMONEM GALILA: I think the statement is talking about the current state of the Internet and the future from [inaudible] of the technology. I want to, for example, insight most of the [inaudible] to have a department of artificial intelligence. So, how is this new technology like AI will affect the Internet as a whole? That skills should be added among the [inaudible] or the workshop or [inaudible] inside our region? We don't want it to have our region behind. We want it all the time to [inaudible] what is going. Thank you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Any other comment on the statement or any possible future implementation? Thanks, Sally, for having—

SALLY COSTERTON:	Thank you for the detail. Very helpful. You know he's not going to be banging my door down. Just want to make this point. It's your fault, I'm just going to say.
NADIRA AL-ARAJ:	So, can we consider this as an acceptable statement? Because we kept it as a draft, by the way. It's not a final statement. I was expecting some community input from those who didn't work during the process of developing it.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	A thought that just came to my mind about your question about whether to consider this as a final statement, and then I'm reminded that there will be a session tomorrow at 10:30, so I wonder if you might want to hold this off until community [inaudible] Montreal attends the session tomorrow and maybe they will have more thoughts after the session. So, just a thought. I see Hadia is raising her hand.
NADIRA AL-ARAJ:	Go ahead, Hadia.
HADIA ELMINIAWI:	Actually, I raised my card to address this issue about whether to finalize the statement or not now. Baher's point about attending the session tomorrow is a good one, but also I was thinking that maybe if you take time to read it and maybe we leave a week or ten days so that people

are able to go back home and have the time to read it and maybe give us an update or tell us what you think about the statement.

Having said, the statement was put on the Google document for quite a long time for your comments and input. But I know that usually what happens, people get distracted by many other things and don't get really to look at this statement. But now that you're here and you've seen it, I encourage you all to go back, read it, and put your suggestions in there. Thank you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yeah, I could see the nodding heads about postponing it and taking the recommendation of both Baher and Hadia. I don't have to take the … Okay. I will not finish my statement because Rafik has an [inaudible].

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Nadira. Thanks, Hadia. So, with regard to the statement, I think maybe in addition to review based on the comment you heard or how things are going because I think, for example, one of the [areas] in the statement you mentioned, like the PDP 3.0, and there were some questions about it. But the thing is that PDP 3.0 sends this small team or implementation team and the communication to the different groups asking for input and [chairing] the existing – what was already delivered. So, it might be worth it to check what is there and to have an idea what is a [proposal] and so to make any adjustment to the statement. So, having enough time to do so, to digest, it's not just the recommendation but really what is proposed as implementation and

see how you can do what you need to tweak in the statement would make sense.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: So, I will depend on you because you are part of the PDP 3.0 and you can give us timeline, rough timeline, so we will give after would be the expertise maybe more [of the] time. Yes. When it will be ready?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. So, in terms of the timeline for the PDP 3.0, we already sent like 90% of the implementation improvement to the Council for review and that's why we are asking the wider community for input for this month. And we will have a public webinar on the 27th of November but I'm not suggesting that you adjust your timeline for the statement based on that.

So, there are already several of those improvements. I guess maybe the one about consensus is not ready yet because that one, what we call the Consensus Playbook, it was outsourced to an external provider and that will take some time.

But I can say that the whole idea is really to create a tool, or what we call the Consensus Playbook, to explain how to deal with the consensus and the level of consensus. It won't be just for GNSO users but it's by design to be used by the whole community because that's what was requested with the additional budget request.

But for the rest I think we can check the improvement. Yeah.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: I'm kind of thinking differently here because already the statement being provided as a comment. Maybe we move the statement to the … We kind of hold this and then we work with the second period of the third phase of the multi-stakeholder and then we finalize that.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, your suggestion is not to give it ten days but to wait until the work plan is out there. But actually I don't see this actually as a solution because this was a comment on what is going to be developed, is going to be the work plan.

So, I am with taking what Rafik just said because there are already now some recommendations with regard to PDP 3.0 and maybe some of them were not out at the time when we drafted the statement. So, it's worth [inaudible] get that.

And as Rafik mentions, the only difference could be with regard to the issue number eight which is consensus and this is where something is actually being done by PDP 3.0 and is actually not—at the time we wrote the statement, this was not seen by us and that's why we saw it as a part of the multi-stakeholder model work plan.

So, maybe we could look at those improvements and compare them to what we have in the statement and then finalize the statement.

As for the work plan itself, that's another comment. That's a different one.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Okay. I've got your point. [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Nadira. Hello. Thank you very much for this work. It looks great. So, I have a couple of comments which I will put in the Google Doc later. But one of the issues that I see—and I don't know if you agree with me—with this evolution of multi-stakeholder model and Board and the consultant coming up, like they go to silos and ask different communities about their opinions and then they synthesize all this together, and then again provide it to the community to comment. This process itself for me is problematic because we are not, as a community, with all the stakeholders getting together to discuss and agree on the thing. In our silos, we are feeding into this process.

So, for example, I don't think in the paragraph in the beginning that the community all together as a whole identified these issues. We are in our silos, right? So, this is one of the issues that I have with this process. I don't know if you want to mention it if you think this is problematic. Go ahead. Do you want to …?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: You're talking about issue six, right? Which is about the silos and [inaudible] culture.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, I'm actually talking about the whole process.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: The whole process of starting from the community coming up with the issues with identifying the issues?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: In their silos.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: In their silos. So, you're addressing the whole process from the very beginning and the whole issue from the very beginning. However, I'm not sure … This, by the way, could be a very valid point. However, I'm not sure how this would fit with the statement as it currently is as the statement actually addresses a very specific point in regard to the issues already identified and how those issues could be resolved.

Your point could be a valid one but I don't know how this statement could actually tackle it because it's kind of out of the scope of the statement.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Maybe Brian has an input here to this point.

BRIAN CUTE: If I may. Thank you. And let me present exactly how I've conducted this process from the very beginning, to respond to your questions. First of all, at the beginning of this process, which was in Kobe, my first step was to review all of the transcripts from ICANN 63 in Barcelona where

Cherine and the Board engaged with the community and asked the questions about these issues, that there's clearly, hearing from the community, that there are some issues that need to be addressed to improve the functioning of the model.

My very first step was to review all the transcripts—I had no meetings with stakeholders—and to glean from those discussions that happened with Board across the community. What were the issues that were being identified? And when we had our meeting in Kobe, I presented 21 issues that I had gleaned from those transcripts.

In the beginning of this process, which I have run through public comment, was that the community in Barcelona said there's 21 issues and we engaged in an open conversation in Kobe in session where I asked: are these the issues? Are there more issues? Help me define these issues. Tell me what the real nature of this problem is.

We moved from that session, taking that input in open session and I put out a call for public comment, where again I asked, please, further define these issues. If you can suggest how they could be consolidated because 21 is quite a large number and we all have a lot of work.

How could they be grouped? Are there some issues here that have a logical inter-relationship, and therefore if a solution is to be developed, should they be grouped? This was through public comment.

I then took the public comment, reviewed it, created a summary and in Marrakech presented the consolidated and prioritized list of issues. We were down from 21 to I think about 12. Had a session with the

community where I said we're now at the point where we have a list that's been built on solid public comment and we need to turn now to develop a work plan and we switched our phase toward developing a work plan.

The following public comment, I asked the questions. I said, "Here's the list you've developed through public comment." And I asked questions. Are there solutions that could address these issues in other parts of the community? We do not want to duplicate work. None of us do.

If there isn't a solution and we all agree this issue needs to be addressed, who would be the right entity to take on the role of developing a solution? Would that be a particular AC, a particular SO, the community as a whole, the Board, the Org? Those were the questions.

Then, further, do you have any other prioritization for these issues? That went through public comment. That closed on October 14th. I have summarized those comments. I have used those comments in the entire community to create the proposed work plan that you will see tomorrow.

From tomorrow, with your input in open session, I will further refine the work plan and it will be published, and when it is published, it will become part of the five-year operating plan that goes out for public comment again. There will be another opportunity for public comment.

That is precisely how I've run this process. I will say two things. And I mean this. The process has not been perfect. There have been junctures

where I have been responsible for inefficiencies. That being said, it has come from the community and I have heard criticism that it has taken too long. We knew about these issues years ago. Why has it taken 11 months to get to this point? Well, it has because I've used the open mechanisms of public comment that we use here to ensure that the voices of the community are heard. It takes time. It's a bit painstaking but that is, in fact, how we have gotten to where we are today.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: [Varsi]?

[VARSAI]:   Thank you. So, this all going back to the community and coming up with a plan and all that, it's quite transparently you have told us before how you conducted this. But I am just critical of the process because if we wanted to come up with a multi-stakeholder evolution plan, we should do it in a multi-stakeholder fashion.

I want to sit down with Hadia and argue with her and sit down, come to consensus on what we really need to solve. Not that I in my silo. This is exactly the problem with the silos. My silos with people that think like me. I come up with a comment and then Hadia does it in her silo and then we all get together and then make public comments.

So, this is a process [inaudible] now. I have been saying this the whole meeting. Don't really have to put it in the statement if you don't think that it should be in there. So, that's [inaudible].

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I would just say one thing. Okay. No, no. The only place I could find this put in is under issue number six as an example addressing silos.

BRIAN CUTE: And I'll be very brief. Here I am in perfect agreement with you. One of the issues is silos and trust. I say to you if I could have gotten behind closed doors with the leaders of the ACs and SOs or done a series of meetings, as you suggested, which I haven't done, one of the challenges in that in the community—and it's been identified in this list—is trust. If I may … Those types of engagements themselves begin to raise suspicions. No, not yours. Not yours. I'm speaking generally, that the community has identified that trust is an issue. And being more efficient, as you suggest, in ways of approaching this, I completely agree with. I felt it was important to run it through the traditional public comment open processes because I didn't want this process to raise those types of concerns.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just to correct myself because I never said we should sit behind closed doors as leaders and then come up with something. No. I meant that we could have an informal working group that everyone could attend, so that we have a wide variety of people with different perspectives come to a conclusion that this is a problem we need to address and we all agree. That way. But I totally—I love your suggestion to put this in silos and trusting. And if I may make one more comment, thank you. No?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Because I want to give … I'll go back to you.

ROLLA HAZMA: Thank you. My name is Rolla Hazma from Egypt, ICANN 66 fellow. I'm speaking on my own capacity. I wonder, regarding to the issue number two, how to align the strategic plan of the Middle East and Africa with the global, especially that they are working on many issues for their own region and how to prioritize these goals with the global goals. Thank you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: I'll give Baher.

BAHER ESMAT: Thank you, Rolla, for the question. So, I'll speak to the Middle East part. I'm not sure if Pierre is in the room but at least for the Middle East region, what we have been working on as a community is exactly this very point of how to align our regional strategy with the ICANN strategic plan.

Our current regional strategist term ends by the end of this fiscal year, so it's June 2020. We started planning for the next phase of the regional strategy a couple of months ago and a new working group has been put in place to work on the new strategy.

And one of the very first things that we did was to organize two webinars on the ICANN strategic plan 2021-2025 for the regional community to better understand what is in this plan in terms of strategic objectives, goals, and so forth. So, we've done this with help from our colleagues at the MSI department.

Then, when the new working group was established, we've been having regular calls with them, so we had two calls so far and we're still … Discussion is still revolving around the same question. The last call was a week ago and one of the action items that we had out of this call was to try to draft a few questions for the working group to address and the questions are exactly about the trends, the challenges, the opportunities. And once the working group has this discussion and comes out with, again, some better view about these issues, they might also go and seek further input from the wider regional community. So, we're working very closely with the community on this very issue and we consider it to be a very important issue. Thank you for the question.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, Baher. I want to give the remote participant [inaudible] comment. Is it a question? Okay. Then I'll give back the question to [Varsi].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I would like to [inaudible] comment. I somehow [inaudible] of what the … Before you are here, at the beginning of this session, I asked Brian why he changed the name or the title of this process. At the beginning,

the name of this process was the evolvement of multi-stakeholder model. Now we are moving to another one. Next step to improve the effectiveness of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

I understand the position of Brian because he has a mission to achieve. So, he has the timeline that he has to follow. But I somehow agree with you that the scope of this mission or this process is not well-defined since the beginning. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII: Actually, I had not noticed that and now that I notice I totally agree with you and I have been raising issues with talking about efficiency and effectiveness of the community all the time without having a cohesive consensus-based process that we say that we want to talk about it.

So, efficiency and effectiveness of the community and working groups, I think it's the community. It's actually mentioned in the bylaws. And I think—am I right? Did you take that from the bylaws, the effectiveness of the community?

BRIAN CUTE: That came from the public comment, the identified issues.

FARZANEH BADII: Yes. I know where that comes from. When we were in the accountability group, I do remember that there were some members that wanted to talk about efficiency and effectiveness of the community and the multi-stakeholder model. There is some wording in the bylaws. I don't want

EN

to say something that is not precise but this is a pure example of what I'm talking about, that there's one part of the community that says I think this should be called this project, and then the other side of the community doesn't have the background or don't know why this thing was changed and it creates a problem because, to be honest, I think effectiveness is a loaded word.

The other thing that I can see even now we can see here … So, for the term limits you have in issue number five. For inclusivity, we've considered term limits. And I totally agree that there should be term limits. Now, in the accountability work stream, when we were talking about the accountability of SOs and ACs, there were some members that were against the term limits. So, now, I'd like to know now that we come up with the term—and I love term limits, and thanks so much for putting it in there—but how are we going to resolve these issues? Because there in that process we had to say that it is not binding. You don't have to have term limits but term limits is a good thing, which I insisted that we have.

These are the problems that I see with the process but, as to this statemen, I can make a couple of other sessions on the Google Doc. Thank you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: I'll give the … Because there is a question here.

ICANN
ANNUAL GENERAL **66**
MONTRÉAL
2–7 November 2019

[DAVID]: [David] [inaudible] for the record. I mean, we keep on referring to the term community and I have a suggestion. Talking about the Middle East community, why can't we go more transparent by stating who they are and what is [inaudible]. I mean, from where they're coming, who they are representing. So, that would actually give some confidence that there is a community because [inaudible] to the term community, we have the same thing with ISOC and we've been having that for the last 20 years. It's too general. But who are they?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: I will try to respond to you because I think you've been away a little bit from—

[DAVID]: No, no. I've been there and I know what's happening. I read the document many times.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: No, no, about the structure of ICANN.

[DAVID]: I know. I know that. But, I mean, that does not represent the community. The community does not mean the silos of ICANN. The community means those that you are serving and part of [inaudible] might be the law enforcement in the countries where we are, part of them might be the banking sectors because they are very—

HADIA ELMINIAWI: So, I can answer as where we say here the community and when we say in our statement the community, what we mean here is the Middle East community—Middle East and adjoining countries community. And the Middle East and adjoining countries community as defined with certain countries that you can't go back.

But that does not mean that we actually represent those countries. We do not. Those are actually the people that decided from this region, from those countries, to contribute to the work being developed by ICANN.

And remember, anyone can step in and be part of this group. It's not a closed group. The names of the members who actually participated in this is publicly known. The members of the community—and again I'm talking about this particular community—is publicly known.

So, we are not representing any countries or the region. It's simply the people who decided from those parts of the world to contribute to this work which anyone can do.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, all. Let's try to wrap things. We have the statement will be open again for comments and the section we so far will be edited, the issue five. Also, issue six about the silos. And we have the issue about the consensus with regards to the PDP 3.0. I would like to also include [Nabil's] point about the community maybe as well. I will send you the link as welcome.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I just wanted to comment on Farzi's comment with regard to issue number … When we were talking about the term limits. And that was issue five. Actually, Farzi, what you're saying could be actually absolutely true. That's why when we noted to the possible solutions whether it is PDP 3.0 or work stream two or ATRT-3 possible recommendations, we said that in the end there is a need to look at what actually those suggestions accomplished or did and look at also the aggregate effect of these solutions.

And if it turns out as you just said, that no solution was developed in this regard, then at this point we will need maybe to go back and say, well, this did not happen and it should be addressed.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, Hadia. Thank you for being here for us. Thank you, Brian, for your input.

BAHER ESMAT: Did we agree on the time limit of the extension or you're going to decide on the mailing list, just to be clear?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yeah, there is … I think it would depend, the end of the month this would be good.

EN

BAHER ESMAT: Okay. So, you're going to announce this on the mailing list, at least for those who are not attending physically with us, right?

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Yes.

BAHER ESMAT: Okay. Thank you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Distribute it to the whole ICANN Middle East community. Do you have any point? But because for that second … I'm not sure if all of you are also part of the mailing list of the Middle East mailing list through [Fahad] and Baher because it's important to have your input to go through. For the next statement, we would like to have more volunteers, more engagement. And it's good. That's how we all—most of us—started, just by observing, then by putting some comment here, and then by developing a full statement. So, it needs a learning curve, so I encourage everybody to help. And I'll give the last word to Baher.

BAHER ESMAT: On your point. Thank you for raising this. If anyone is not on the list and wants to join the list, talk to me after the session. Thank you.

NADIRA AL-ARAJ: Thank you, all. Thank you, Brian. Thank you, Hadia. Thank all of you. Don't forget tomorrow's meeting—not meeting, the session of Brian. Yes. It's important.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]