

---

ICANN75 | AGM - GAC Capacity Building and Outreach Workshop 2: GAC in the Multistakeholder Model -  
Community relationships and Collaboration  
Saturday, September 17 2022 - 15:00 to 16:00 KUL

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much, Gulden, and just introducing our next session. We have a session coming up to discuss enhancing ICANN's Multistakeholder Model. And before the break we learned about ICANN.org, the GAC's place in ICANN Org and particular aspects of GAC's processes, structure and operations. But for this session, we will learn a bit more about the GAC and how it operates in the wider community, and speakers from ICANN Org will provide background and updates on the ICANN Multistakeholder Model, evolution project and members of the At-Large community will more closely explain how two ICANN communities are effectively collaborating on shared issues of importance.

I would like to introduce Giovanni Seppia of ICANN.org. Is your colleague, Negar coming? Negar Farzinnia of ICANN.org will also be involved remotely, and they will introduce the ICANN Multistakeholder Model. So, Giovanni and Negar, over to you.

---

***Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file but should not be treated as an authoritative record.***

---

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you. Thank you, Tracy, and thank you for having us this afternoon. This is supposed to be a very interactive session, so there are going to be polls and also Jamboard session in the second part and therefore I would like to invite you to be connected also in the Zoom room to participate in the polls and also in the Jamboard.

So, this is about the Multistakeholder Model and also the effectiveness of the ICANN Multistakeholder model, which is a project that ICANN started some years ago, and it's all about introducing refinements in what we are living today to make sure we are contributing to improve this model as much as we can and this is really a joint effort of ICANN.org and the whole community, and this is the first of the engagement sessions about this topic that we are going to have at ICANN. We will have some slides, which my colleague, Negar, who could not be here with me today, will go through the slides. So, that said, and with more people coming in, I would like to leave the floor to Negar to start going through the slides. So, thank you so much. Negar, the floor is yours.

NEGAR FARZINNIA:

Thank you Giovanni. Hello everyone, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, I am joining you remotely, as

---

Giovanni said. I won't be able to be there in-person but great to see you all online in the Zoom room. We are going to cover a bit of background today on the status of the evolution of the ICANN's Multistakeholder Model project. We will talk a little bit about the history of the project, how it got initiated, what has been happening since the final work plan of the project was released, and what our next steps are. If I could ask, please for the slide deck to be pulled up. Thank you very much. And let's go a couple more slides forward, please. Thank you.

As I said, today we will start with where we stand with the project today, the second part of the presentation is going to involve some polls and questions that we will kindly ask our GAC members to participate in. We will then talk about some next steps and from there we will jump into yet another interactive session with you to talk about where we will go from here.

Next slide, and one more if you don't mind. Thank you very much. So as some of you may recall, our former Board Chair, Chérine Chalaby, kicked off this project in February 2019. The Board's attention to this project really grew out of our work on ICANN's strategic plan for Fiscal Year 21-25. During the trend identification exercise we held to help inform the strategic plan, it became really clear that continued evolution of the Multistakeholder Model and the challenges the model faces were an important

---

priority for much of our community. This dialogue continued in 2019 over a period of nine months of facilitated discussions, six webinars, and three public comments which all resulted in a total of six overarching issues which emerged as those most hindering the effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model. Community then further prioritized three of the six issues for a more immediate term implementation.

Now, in order to better determine how each of these issues could be addressed, discussions with the community identified over 20 different activities and projects that were underway at the time within the ICANN ecosystem that could help address these issues. These projects currently all in varying stages of work some of these projects and initiatives have been fully implemented while others are in progress or are just about to start. There were also some gap areas identified that these projects wouldn't address no matter what, that we needed to look at and find ways of addressing them so that we could address and resolve these issues cohesively.

This phase of the work concluded with a draft work plan which was included as part of the public comment proceedings on ICANN's five-year operating plan. The Board reviewed all the comments received and incorporated them into the revised work plan that was then further discussed with the community. Finally,

---

in October of 2020, the final version of the work plan was presented to the Board and in November of 2020, the implementation design phase of the MSM project officially started.

So, the final work plan included a list of prioritized issues to be addressed and identified a number of projects that when implemented could possibly address these issues. And that is all great and a fantastic start, but our work isn't done there. So how do we go about enhancing the effectiveness of ICANN's Multistakeholder Model?

Because as we all know, an effective Multistakeholder Model doesn't just happen, right? it's a process that needs to be constantly evaluated and adjusted based on the changing needs of the ICANN ecosystem. The need to be able to make small adjustments to our business model to make it more effective really warranted a process in which the stakeholders, the ICANN Board, the org, and the community can evaluate various projects and initiatives and determine what works well, what doesn't, what changes we must make to keep improving our business model. And this is precisely why in the course of their discussions the Board, org, and the community agreed on the need for an evaluation methodology that could be applied iteratively or on an as-needed basis depending on what is being evaluated.

---

So, there are some high lever key steps ICANN.org is working on, one is to evaluate a number of projects that were identified when the work plan was finalized back in October of 2020 and really work through the findings of these evaluations to determine impact on our Multistakeholder Model. Another key step is that ICANN.org will investigate and evaluate other projects that were not really in existence back when the work plan was finalized but have since emerged or have been initiated and are critical enough projects that need to be really looked at and the impact of which to be determined on the Multistakeholder Model.

This is all a work in progress but not something we can do alone. The community's involvement and input are really paramount to the success of these evaluations, and this is precisely why we are having this engagement session with you today. As we progress in these evaluations, we're seeking your input, your thoughts and ideas on some of the identified issue areas and also on what projects we should be evaluating next so that we can continue moving this important initiative forward.

Next slide please. Thank you. Now, as I noted earlier, we have some 20 projects that were included in the final work plan of the MSM project. These are projects that when implemented could help alleviate the issue areas that the community identified as those hampering the Multistakeholder Model. We selected four

---

projects out of the 20. These are the projects that have been fully implemented and really involve the whole community. As you can see on the slide here, four projects are about improving communication between ICANN.org and the community [audio issues] Fellowship Program and ICANN Learn. The remaining projects that are not currently fully implemented will be evaluated once the implementation has been completed. Now there... as I said there are also a number of projects that have been initiated after the publication of the final paper such as ODP, ITI and a lot of other projects , and the details have been listed publicly in a dedicate wiki page for the MSM project available for all to see.

So, if you can go to the next slide, please. I will talk a little bit about what our current next steps are. As I noted the need for evaluation methodology, I wanted to mention the ICANN.org has completed the design of this evaluation methodology and has posted it for everyone's visibility and reference to the dedicated wiki page. We are currently in the midst of applying this evaluation methodology to the four projects that I noted in the previous slide, and our goal is to share the findings from these evaluations of the projects with you once completed. During ICANN75 we have a number of hands-on engagement sessions, the first of which is this session today, to get your input on one of

---

these projects specifically that we are looking to evaluate, and then we will talk about the next steps.

So, let's go to the next slide, please. And one more, thank you.

So, as I mentioned, one of the projects we need your help with is the consensus playbook and consensus-based decision making. While the MSM project was being conducted, community had differing views about how consensus is applied to a given project or work and risk of concerns about all voices being heard equally when decision making. One of the projects that was deemed as helping alleviate this issue was the development of the consensus playbook, the playbook is premised on the assumption that consensus building is a process that does not take place at the end of a group celebration and this playbook also includes practical tools and best practices for building consensus, bridging differences and really breaking deadlocks within ICANN's processes which should extend beyond just the GNSO Working Groups. So, what we are looking to do now is to ask you a series of questions, polls if you will, to really better understand how you have applied consensus decision making to your work and what your perception of the process is.

These questions are ones we're planning to ask each and every one of the constituencies across ICANN so that we can get a more



---

comprehensive view of the areas where improvements may need to be made when it comes to consensus-based decision making. So, as you probably can see on your screen, question number one has been posted. The questions are all yes or no questions. The first one being: Do you know the basic principles for making decisions on a consensus basis? We will give you a couple of minutes to respond, and then we will display the overall results

(Poll being taken)

Ok Yvette, can we close the poll now? If you have sufficient responses. Fantastic. So, this is already a great start. Let's move on to the next question please. And we can go to the next slide also, please. So, the next question you should see popping up on your screen is: Are you aware of the existence of the consensus playbook? Okay, Yvette, if you see enough responses, let's close it out please. Thank you for that.

All right let's move on to the next slide and next poll question: Have you used or referenced the consensus playbook in ICANN work? This could be in the forms of PDPs, ICANN reviews, any cross community working groups (CCWG's) or other working groups you might have been a participant of.

---

Okay. let's see the results, Yvette. Great, thank you for your responses. Let's move to the next slide and question, please. Alright, so question number 4 is: Did the consensus-based decision making contribute to the project's success? Again, the project could be of any form that applies to your given work or constituency.

Okay. Let's see what we find out. Wonderful. This is really great news for a Multistakeholder Model that is consensus based. Let's move on to the next slide and next question, please. Do you think you achieve better consensus of goals and objectives as a result of using or learning from consensus playbook? Yvette, if we can wrap this up, please.

Fantastic. So, let's move on to the next slide and question, please. Did goals and objectives become clearer as a result of consensus based decision making? Okay. Let's see what we learned. This is great. Thank you all for responding. And moving onto the next slide and question, question number 7: Did you reach better mutual understanding as a result of using consensus based decision making?

Okay. Yvette let's see what everyone says. Wonderful. Question number 8, please. And as expected: Did differing positions successfully converge when using consensus-based decision

---

making? Okay. Let's see the results please. Interesting. This is great. Thank you all for bearing with us. Last question: Was there good communication and context when converging differing positions? And let's see what everyone has to say.

Okay. There we go, fantastic, and these are the results of the last question. Thank you all very much for participating in this. This has been very, very useful data for us. And I will tell you what we will do with this, so if you can go to the next slide, please. And one more.

So where do we go from here? As I mentioned, we will be asking these same questions from all constituencies across ICANN so that we can get a more comprehensive view of the areas where improvements may need to be made when it comes to consensus based decision making. Once we have everyone's input, we will collect the data, analyze results and share our findings with the community, and we will also discuss and agree on improvements we might need to make henceforth.

I realize that a lot of the GAC members may not have been able to participate in these engagement activities, whether the polls or the next session that we just move over too quickly, and so just to note, we will share this list of questions with the support staff, policy support staff of the GAC to share with all of you, for those

---

who did not get a chance to participate, and still would like their voice to be heard, you will have a chance to do so at a later time after ICANN75 so that we have a much broader set of responses from everyone. With this, I will hand it over to Giovanni to walk us through the next section.

Thank you very much for your time, everyone.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Negar, and a special thank you to Julia for managing the polls as we had some issues with our remote support.

If we can go to the Jamboard, which should be ready, because the very last part is an engaging session by a Jamboard. Once upon a time, in pre-pandemic times, I would have invited you around this top stage to write your thoughts in a flip chart, unfortunately that cannot be done because of the rules that we have to follow for social distance, so let's try to do it by Jamboard which should be in the Zoom room available, I don't see it yet. So, through the Jamboard, what you will see is a list of eight projects which we are going to ask you to prioritize. And there is a tree on the Jamboard, and we would like to ask you to use the Jamboard to put those projects that you believe are most valuable to be evaluated and assessed to see if there is any gap or refinement needed to make sure they're good enough to continue to support

---

the ICANN Multistakeholder Model, and therefore these trees will serve as sort of a tree of the Multistakeholder Model.

And there is a tree in the flip chart at the bottom of this room in front of me on my left, and I would like to invite those who would like to have any further input on the Multistakeholder Model, any wild thought, to place it on the tree. And I will come later to collect whatever you may have written on the tree and make sure we take on board. Because these exercises we are doing is mainly about listening to your input to make sure that we all work together to refine the Multistakeholder Model.

I would like to understand if sooner or later there is going to be this Jamboard available. And I see none in the Zoom room. Sorry for that. Again, there is the list of those eight projects, and we will make them available afterwards in any case, and again, there is this flip chart with this design tree at the bottom of this room where you can write any thought you may have for the supporting and announcing the effectiveness of the ICANN Multistakeholder Model.

I think there are some issues with the Jamboard, because I don't see any up on the Zoom room. I am really sorry, because this was supposed to be the most engaging part of the session. That happens when things go remotely. Just looking at the

---

secretariat's table to see if any update on the Jamboard. It seems we won't make it. Okay. If not, as we are quite short on time because we were supposed to finish at half past the hour. I would like to invite you again to drop in the idea you may have to contribute to the announcing the ICANN effectiveness, the effectiveness of the ICANN Multistakeholder Model on the flip chart that I will leave at the bottom of the room. So, thank you so much for participating in the session. We will stay in touch. This is just the first of the engagement sessions we have planned for this very important model which is something at the very core of our community. So, thank you so much.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Thank you very much, Giovanni and Negar, for your presentation and the interactive collaboration, and I certainly hope that we could somehow enjoy that presentation that we didn't quiet see today so maybe in the future it could be made available to everyone. So, thank you so much again.

[applause]

At this point in time, it gives me great pleasure to welcome Cheryl Langdon-Orr, who is in the next session here, who will give us some insight into the collaboration with ALAC and the GAC, and I believe she has a team with her, so I think you have to introduce

---

your members, who are also remote and present, for my understanding, so correct me if I'm wrong. So, I think you have the mic, so Ian and Cheryl, take it away.

IAN SHELDON:

Thank you, my name is Ian Sheldon, I'm the Australian GAC representative and I have been asked to come along and say a couple of words about our engagement with the ALAC domestically. For many of you, and as I mentioned in my introduction, I am a recently new GAC member, I am still working my way around who is who in the environment, getting a sense on how all these dynamics work, and a big part of what I am really looking to get a handle on is who else is there and what is the history of a lot of this.

And through my very steep learning curve into the world of ICANN, the engagement with ALAC has been instrumental, really in helping me get the grips on how this space works. The Australian government works very hard when we are designing policy, to go out to the public we speak to industry, we speak to academia, and we also speak to the broader public. We value the input of broader members of the public and use other parts of the system. So, we have arranged with established mechanism to capture all those inputs.

---

From my personal experience, having a relationship with members like Cheryl is incredibly valuable. And there is a count of two core themes to that relationship, one of trust. Both Cheryl and I trust each other. We understand the various perspective and various roles we play. We have a very trusting relationship in being able to pick up the phone and talk about a range of topics. She asked me about input, what government is doing, what is the general policy direction in certain things, and in turn I can ask as well, what's some broader history of about some of these things and give me your frank and fearless opinion on some of those challenging topics.

And it is through that trusted relationship that we work on developing pretty open communication as well. So, a frequent and trusted communication is the second critical part in our relationship. We both have each other's numbers, and we can speak frankly and openly at most times of the day. And so really working with members of the At-Large community like Cheryl have been incredibly invaluable on helping me get up to speed on how the big machine that ICANN is operates. I may live it at that, I am sure Cheryl has more to add to this.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Always happy to fill in the dotted lines, you did a great job, seriously, you did a very, very good job. The only thing I will pick



---

him up on just slightly, it's of course, it's not just Cheryl, far from it, and if we can have the next slide-- we will see there is another logo going to come up and it's called Internet Australia, and that of course is one of the prime At-Large structures which form the At-Large community within the Asia Pacific region, and there are two At-Large structures, one less active and so I didn't in fact need to put the logo up unfortunately, we may change that in the future. But apart from this the department is very, very familiar with, and that is the Australian Consumer Communications Action Network, ACCAN, is also an At-Large structure. So, you have two big bodies, both ACCAN and Internet Australia within this sort of in country zone. That being said, I certainly see Holly there, if you want to stand and be recognized Holly, as another member of the At-Large Advisory, or not, the At-Large Advisory Committee, and we certainly have one representative here from the other At-Large structure that came, there you are. Excellent.

So, what I was exemplifying there, and if we can have the next slide very quickly, is one of the ways that our significantly interested parties in all things Internet -- and that does mean industry and that does mean not just the tech industry but industry in general, government players right through to mom and pop just users of the Internet. One thing we do together, and we really want to appreciate the department's input here [indiscernible] is the annual Internet governance event that with run in Australia. And

---

that's NetThing, that's their logo up there, we run it in its current version, this would be I think fourth or fifth year, and we wouldn't have been able to kickstart it back off without government support, so they are our partner, our trusted partner. They don't just throw us an occasional bit of grant money though. They actually have staff in the multi-stakeholder meeting group that puts the whole thing together. [indiscernible] tune up every Friday at nine o'clock should they have 15 minutes of time to see what's happening in a stand up meeting. So, it's an active, trusted communication. And I think with that, that's how we do it. How you do it is up to you. But I guess if there are questions, we can answer them.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Fantastic. So, we have an opportunity for questions as to the collaboration that takes place between ALAC and the GAC. So, the floor is open. Not all at the same time. All right. So, Tracy Hackshaw has a question.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Yes, I have a question. Can you give us an idea of some of the topics that the GAC and the ALAC share mutual interest in? And perhaps the success with those collaborations sort of have if there is one particular area or two that you could share. We have people that are new who may not understand the topics. So, one or two topics

---

and how it works and where the success made in joint statements, joint actions, anything like that, thank you.

IAN SHELDON:

Thank you, Tracy, I can only speak to my very limited tenure, I am afraid -- and Cheryl can speak to the GAC-ALAC relationship more historically. But I guess, in my limited time, being able to speak to -- I guess broad-stroke topics like Internet governance in general, which the topic of NetThing here has been something of incredible importance as we prepare to engage both, across ICANN, as well as a whole range of a different fora as well, such as the ITU.

The input of the various members of the At-Large community has been instrumental in helping us get ready for things like the Plenipotentiary Conference that's on very, very shortly. And so, being able to... Frankly having those conversations and incorporating some of that feedback into some of those position and preparatory documents as we proceed to these fora is for me, personally, one of the most very valuable concrete examples where we have worked together, and certainly the case as we have prepared for both this set of meetings here today as well as the Plenipotentiary meetings coming up shortly.

---

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: And I will just add, I think I should add another little piece of information as well, and that is that both ACCAN and Internet Australia are also some of your more active community based groups sending those regular responses and calls to the public comments, so the government in itself when it seeks specific topic-based input can pretty well guarantee that should it fall within our particular areas of expertise and interest, that they will be getting in, a not just an individual's opinion but a conceded opinion on the behalf of the community of people that they represent and in Internet Australia's case, that's Internet users Australia wide and industry or otherwise, in the case of ACCAN, of course, is any consumer who consumes telecommunication product, which is again a big as Australia wide, and is an awfully hard task to ask each and every one of those, so doing a sampling with a trusted set of voices that you know will act in the best interest of those that they are calling on to represent, I think is the trick of at least how we do the trade.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much, Cheryl. And I would just like to say to everyone for those who are in your home country's governments, it is a good opportunity for you to reach out to those organizations who are not necessarily At-Large member structures as yet, so ALS, another acronym, maybe they can

---

encourage them to join the At-Large community in ICANN, but you reach out to them, ask them what their thoughts are on Internet Governance, DNS, domain name system again just making sure [indiscernible], and ensure that you don't come here unprepared or just with your own thoughts. And I think it may be very useful to get a collage of opinions and views, especially from the At-Large community, Internet users and so on, within your particular jurisdiction or country.

I believe there is a question in the back. You can turn on your mic and say who you are, and you can go ahead.

AUSTRALIA:

Holly Raiche, GAC Australia and ICANN Board, so I probably know a little bit about the organization that Cheryl talked about. The first question was about common interests in an issue that both GAC and ALAC had. And I'm not sure how many of you know much about Closed Generics, but it was an issue and centrally [indiscernible] if a new gTLD is obtained by a registry and used for their own purposes. Some of you may see the very competitive nature of that. One of the issues that both ALAC and GAC took was that if you are going to have Closed Generics at all you need something like a public interest test. It was something the GAC [indiscernible] on the terms of if you have that kind of situation,

---

you have to be very careful as to the circumstances in which you allow a Closed Generics situation.

In terms of cooperation between ACCAN, which is our Australian Communications Consumer Action Network a very good partnership on issues involving digital platforms. Some of you may not be aware, most of you probably, but in 2019 our competition body [indiscernible] which raised a number of issues. So, what the ACCAN has done is establish a particular small group to look at consumer issues arising from that and [indiscernible] Australia had. So, I guess it's a way of saying yes, there's a lot of cooperation and common ground both between GAC and ALAC and within Australia, Internet Australia, and ACCAN.

I hope that helps. Thank you.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you very much, Holly. That does help. Again, a good example of collaboration between bodies who have similar interests although coming from different sides of a spectrum, if you want to call it that, government and consumers, but they really are both seeking effectively the public interest. Egypt?

---

EGYPT: Just a curious question. What is the meaning of the logo NetThing and the wi-fi above? For me it is offloading or what? Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Egypt. I appreciate the opportunity to share with you. The word NetThing simply stuck. It was the operating term we called this yet unnamed plan and annual inter-sessional set of events and we went from Australian Internet Governance Forum to various other terms, and we had called project names, it could have been called strawberry; it wasn't, it was called NetThing. And then some clever designer at the website apparently thought the wi-fi symbol represented the Internet, so it was a compilation of absolute serendipity, just a logo.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much.

Nepal.

NEPAL: Considering the Internet governance system, ALAC had the role to advise on [indiscernible] and I'm not talking about the GAC, I'm talking about the government, to [indiscernible] is the public anyone can put on the either social media or something else, how

---

ALAC is going to educate the [indiscernible] so that they don't use the [indiscernible] what is the approach to [indiscernible] the information?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you, Nepal. And in fact, the appropriate outreach and engagement with community, local community, often in local language, giving a good message, correct message and well-thought-out message, is a vital role for any At-Large structure within the whole of the ICANN world of At-Large, remembering of course that we have the changing of the guard in terms of who is running what at the moment. Maureen, as some of you might remember, she was the Chair of the ALAC -- stand up, Maureen. She is about to take over outreach and engagement and make sure the message, including using social media to spread the right messaging, is part of the key appropriate that we will be taking.

NEPAL: I have one supplemental question. What about network neutrality?

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: We enjoy talking about that in the world of the Internet society [chuckling], not in the world of ICANN.



---

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you very much, Cheryl and Nepal.

Any further questions either in the Zoom room or in the audience?  
Yes.

PAVEL FARHAN: Good afternoon, this is Pavel Farhan for the record. Just wanted to ask a question based on previous things we talked about which is consensus playbook and just wanted to ask if the GAC and ALAC ever had this issue where they didn't see eye to eye to use the consensus playbook, because we were just talking about in the WhatsApp chat and it is still very new, 2020, I guess, so maybe a lot of people here don't know about that. And if you could give your real-life examples of where you had to use it and how you did it, that would be great. Thank you.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: I am unaware that we, in our national space had to use it at all. We certainly agree to disagree at times, agree to disagree quite vehemently at times. This is all not walking hand in hand down a sunny pathway. They are full and frank conversations, but that means that there are decision makers and policy makers are well apprised of that. And that, in fact, fits in with the consensus playbook, which is, you are right, is new but is incredibly valuable

---

as a resource. And I think the more, that we AC's that have the public interest at heart, work with that tool, not just with each other and within our own development of consensus but especially when dealing with other parts of ICANN the better, because it's a powerful tool when used properly. Let's make some case studies. I can't give you one, would love to develop one.

TRACY HACKSHAW: Thank you, Cheryl. We have another question from my friend.

SPEAKER: Just a comment. I need to have some experience from what you said about ICANN's responsibilities, Internet society and ITU, what is the difference between the responsibilities of the [indiscernible]

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Okay, well without wanting to school the different areas of interest, I will simply say, very clearly, that here we are talking about addressing naming and numbering. The same entities, the same organization, Internet Australia is passionately interested in about all sorts of other things when is purely acting in its ISOC capacity. And when we are in our Internet Governance mode, we get excited about the delivery of services and the ensuring that people even as remote and [indiscernible] as I am, finally get

---

proper access to a quality broadband network. But here in these confines, we try to stick to our particular core reasoning -- what that does mean, with government and At-Large cooperation, you get to use the brain-picking, the information sharing, and the building of trust across all of those different areas, including of course as Ian did mention, in preparation for ITU and other activities.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Thank you, Cheryl and Ian, for your contributions and the fantastic example of collaboration. And I don't want to end the story here, because I know there's going to be opportunities for persons to come and ask you, you know, Ian and Cheryl, about more in depth opportunities where there are collaborations. So, I'm assuming this is just an example, and this example could be replicated in your region, in your group as the case may be. So certainly, let me thank Cheryl and Ian for the time, and effort, and the ideas.

Thank you much.

[applause]

All right, so I think Tracy, if I'm not mistaken, I think we have a half hour break, unless I'm mistaken.

---

TRACY HACKSHAW: Yes, welcome to the GAC and the world of coffee breaks.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Yes, so you have half hour before the break. So, UK.

UNITED KINGDOM: I was just hoping to pick on a question from earlier in the session. And thank you very much for all for the presentations. But just to point out a note in the chat from Switzerland that consensus means different things in different parts of the community, I think this is a really important point. So, without wishing to put Jorge on the spot, perhaps he could explain this more fully. Again, I think it's an important part to recognize as part of the session. Thank you.

KAREL DOUGLAS: Jorge, I you willing to get in the mic and jump in? Are you there?

JORGE CANCIO: This is Jorge Cancio for Switzerland. Let me put y video on.

So, very quickly, I think the consensus playbook is of course a very useful piece of work. If I recall it properly, it focuses basically on the work done in the supporting organizations and it may be, but

---

I am not entirely sure, it is focused on the PDP piece and the GNSO. But this doesn't diminish its importance nor its usefulness, but I think it's very little known so far in the community. There was the idea of having some capacity building, specifically on this consensus playbook within the GAC, but during the pandemic this was very hard to schedule. I don't know if this is still a plan within the GAC leadership. So that's, let's say the context, regarding the different definitions of consensus we saw before we heard from Nicolas Caballero and from others that we have a very specific consensus definition in the GAC, which is defined in our operating principles and now also in the ICANN Bylaws, which basically says consensus in the GAC means that there is no formal objection to an agreement reached by the committee.

So, this is a very high hurdle, and this means that we really have to agree on basically everything which we put into a GAC consensus advise in this case. So that is how we work in the GAC. And this has, let's say, a more intergovernmental background, the definition comes from the United Nations originally, so this is our government setting.

But of course for instance the GNSO when developing a policy development process and the corresponding recommendations, they have different levels of agreement within the working group when they are finishing their work they have something called

---

consensus calls, and there the chairs or the co-chairs of a working group, for instance the working group defining the policies for the next round of gTLDs, they have to say, ok, what is the level of support for a recommendation, to a specific recommendation which has been discussed in that Working Group?

And without going into details, this may go from full consensus where there is basically an absence of opposition to a consensus where there might be a small divergence. And then they have also different levels of agreement which are no longer called consensus. So that depends very much, and of course depending on the rules, also the incentives are different to reach consensus or to reach different levels of agreement. Everybody who is aware of game theories knows that the rules really have a very big influence on the incentive structure for attaining different levels of agreement.

So, a very long answer just to say it depends on the supporting organization, on the advisory committee, what we understand with consensus, although the general idea is of course to have everyone on the table and try work out a deal with which everybody is equally unhappy -- or happy. So, I will leave it by that. And thank you, Rosalyn, for putting me on the spot.

---

TRACY HACKSHAW:

Thank you, Jorge. And I do remember that point when I was [indiscernible] Vice Chair, I had to drive that Chair, so is exactly what Jorge said. Consensus is defined as everybody is equally unhappy with the decision that was taken. And I think if you go back into the -- using my own memory -- into the GAC archives and look at the new gTLD process and the IANA's transition, you will see some very useful Communiqué outputs and even some discussions regarding consensus and what that meant, including the view of some and others, what they say and that whole concept of -- I won't say minority reports because we don't use that specific [indiscernible] but that kind of thinking to get to the consensus decisions and what we can all agree to live with, which is I think at the end of the day is what consensus eventually is, what can we all agree to live with? Even if I don't agree with the actual topic, I can live with this part of the decision that you have made, and I will no longer object.

And I think that is some of the things that we need to look at in the world of consensus. It takes some time and depending on your country you are in or your government, you might have to go back to seek advice and use, that is another thing you need to look at from the GAC, we will discuss that in a coming session, but keep that in mind, what can your government, not what you can live

---

with, but your government and your country can live with in the decision related to the DNS?

So, I think that is an important point. Thank you.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

Thank you, Tracy, that is so true. There are a lot of opportunities on how to get involved. But I think it's time we take a break. We have a half hour break. When we come back, we will then explain how you can maximize your participation in the GAC.

TRACY HACKSHAW:

And before we go, I was told to advertise, as you may be aware there are event, a social gathering, we are having at Beta KL which is located about nine minutes walking distance from here, nine to ten, five minutes by car, and for those who don't know where it is, and may have a challenge understanding what google maps is saying, but there is actual a printout version of that, that you can collect right from the secretariat's table, at the back, Julia is showing she has copies, so you can do that.

And for those who are staying at a particular hotel, and you want to go back and put your bags down, not now, at the end, maybe you can arrange to have sort of a team to find the location and meet in the lobby of the hotel and can all leave from there. So,



---

the maps are here, at the back, have a look at it, and we can all reconvene to have a lovely bite to eat and a few things to drink later on this evening. Not now, later this evening.

KAREL DOUGLAS:

And I was going to say maybe we can put the map up later if possible. But definitely we want to have all of you there, we want to continue this interaction, we want to know you better, we want to find out where you are from, what you do, what your concerns are, and what you hope to achieve in this meeting and so forth.

So, Tracy, without any further ado, we can allow you your half hour break, and please return at 16:30, next half hour, so we will get to the session of how you can maximize your participation in the GAC. Thank you so much.

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]