

Issue Brief: Towards a comment on evolving the multistakeholder model

Marita Moll

Categorizing the 21 issues that have been listed by the community into 4 main groups

- .Structural

- .Process

- .Participation (who and how)

- .Intergroup relations

- . the issues are related, some more so than others

- .We understand that many suggestions that we and others might make

Category = Structural

- .Wholistic view (20)
- .Complexity (2) – external and internal
- .Roles and responsibilities (15)
- .Terms (21)
- .Accountability (11)
- .Transparency (12)

Category = Processes

- .Precision in scoping (10)

- .Prioritization (4)

- .Efficient use of resources (16)

- .Work processes (19)

- .Costs (13)

- .Also connected to intergroup relations:

- .Timing (1); Consensus (9)

- .Also connected to structure:

What's at stake for end users if we can't improve our processes

- .Processes take too long
- .Consensus remains elusive
- .Financial and personal costs are not sustainable
- .Volunteers burnout, disengage

Issues around processes

.**Precision in scoping** -- too wide/too narrow?

.**Prioritization** -- evening out the work flow, identifying which issues are most important? Relating that to the cost of implementation. Too many urgent items on the table at the same time, not enough volunteers to carry the load

.**Efficient use of resources** -- time, money and people -- is there a lot of wastage? How can that be improved? How to ease the volunteer burnout problems

.**Work processes** -- do we have adequate tools to do the jobs required? Is engagement sporadic? Are team members well briefed and supported? Does the MS model, as it is practised at ICANN adequately deal with language and cultural barriers?

.**Costs** -- not just financial, but also volunteer time. Would more financial resources improve things? Is there enough transparency around costing? How are costing and prioritizing related? More defined scoping?

Proposed At-Large Positioning around processes from prev. CPWG meeting

- .Presence of external deadlines can be useful – Create a default deadline with a default outcome that noone wants to see happen (Jonathan)
- .Document decisions along the way – so people have to stick to their positions – but this works against the need to negotiate compromises
- .Have only 2 large public meetings, and maybe something more decentralized in between (Holly, John and Dev) – this has come up before, but not successfully implemented. Face to face meetings are much more productive than conf. calls (Alan)

Category = Participation (who and how)

- .Demographics (5))

- .Recruitment (6)

- .Representativeness (7)

- .Inclusiveness (8)

- .Volunteer burnout (17) – Brian Cude classifies this one as a symptom rather than an issue in itself

What's at stake for endusers if we can't solve the participation problem?

- Not representative

- Not inclusive

- Volunteer burnout (17) – Brian Cote classifies this one as a symptom rather than an issue in itself

- Attracting only a certain kind of volunteer – retired, self funded – almost impossible to hold down a job, keep up other engagements

- Requires a great deal of support from personal networks – families, employers, etc. (John)

Proposed At-Large Positioning around improving participation

- .Onboarding programs

- .Prioritizing

- .Time management

Category = intergroup relations

This category might be considered low hanging fruit

- .Cultural issues (13)

- .Trust (14)

- .Silos/tribalism (18) – groups defining themselves as who or what they are against

.If we address these three we are also a long way to addressing:

- .Consensus (9)

- .Timing (1)

What's at stake for End Users if we can't resolve the intergroup relations problems

- .System stalls
- .Nothing gets done
- .Processes go on forever
- .The multistakeholder system loses credibility
- .We want to work in a positive not negative culture

Proposed At-large Positioning on the Intergroup relations quadrant

- .that a definition of multistakeholder processes be developed and that it be a key part of on-boarding activities
- .that consensus be clearly defined and that all parties to a policy process commit to the the goal of achieving consensus
- . that a culture of trust be supported by consequences for publicly disparaging other groups – such as referring incidents to the ombuds office
- .that power inequities be addressed (needs more detail if we want to keep it)
- . a commitment by ICANN to fully address the resource needs (both financial and human resources) of volunteer groups working in the SO/AC communities (this might be too contentious – making ourselves a target)

Discussion

What is our goal? developing a positive culture; reaching across the aisles

Next steps: start a google doc and discussion on the list organized around these categories