

Comments on MSSM evolvement

In my opinion the dynamic multistackholder model adopted by ICANN and based on approach that focus on both Issues and Constituencies is very efficient model, all above issues mentioned by communities members did not make in doubt the concepts in it self or propose any evolvement of the models, most of them are dealing with operational or implementation or application procedures, and in some cases they support the model by criticising some wrong implementation actions or behaviors that are not in coherence with MSSM

I agree with some of this issues and above my comments :

ISSUE 1 Timing of decision-making:

this issue may be a aggregated with ISSUE 19: Work Processes

Severals techniques could be used in order to reduce decision making period such as brainstorming , delphi, dialectical inquiry , nominal group . The leaders of the differents SO/AC and working groups should have a minimal knowledges of such techniques and also some knowledges on how working groups should operates a god guide could be the [rfc2418](#).

In addition to the technicity and the expertise of the working groups (or SO/AC) leaders members should interacts and collaborates with each others in good faith some methods and criteria could be adopted to aware members of their degree of collaboration and interactions within SO/AC (or working groups).

ISSUE 2: Complexity

The multi-stakeholder model is concepted to resolve complex policy problems , the use of this model in others cases is not pertinent.

ISSUE 3: Culture

No comment

ISSUE 4: Prioritization of Work

should be integrated with ISSUE 20: holistics views

ISSUE 5: Demographics

May be integrated with ISSUE 6

ISSUE 6: Recruitment Inputs

Seek , Support and encourage initiators and leaders community members in the different ICANN programs.

Nominate members working groups should open membership for some individual members and not limited to SO/AC nominations

ISSUE 7: Representativeness

Identify stakeholder and their mutual representativeness is a key issue in the multistakeholder model if we are dealing with fictive representatives of the community we will have fictive community needs and fictive views of the ICANN activities which will be based only in some lobbies interests , expertise and skills are not sufficient to acquire real community and needs .These needs will be used further to establish stable policies and solutions , so some mechanism (permanent survey,...) should be implemented to ensure the representativity of some SO/AC especially those based on geographic balance and the geographic balance criterias could be integrated in some SO/AC based on expertise skills.

Also the nominated representer of SO/AC in some working groups in his SO/AC will really impacts the effectiveness of the working groups activities, an accountable and transparent criterias should be adopted by SO/AC when they nominated their representer.

ISSUE 8: Inclusivity

May be integrated with ISSUE 7: Representativeness

ISSUE 9: Consensus

The arguments exchange between different working groups (or /SO/AC) members may be formalised in a procedure ,this procedure should bring more visibility to members about different opinions and will facilitate the reach of consensus.

This issue may be aggregated with ISSUE 19: Work Processes

ISSUE 10: Precision in Scoping the Work Inputs

Issue-focused approach could be more appropriate in some cases.

This issue may be aggregated with ISSUE 19: Work Processes

ISSUE 11: Accountability

May be aggregated with ISSUE 16

ISSUE 12: Transparency Inputs from

May be included in ISSUE 13: Costs

ISSUE 13: Costs

May be aggregated with in ISSUE 12

ISSUE 15: Roles and Responsibilities

The Working Groups chair (or vice chair) and ICANN staff both are some how dominating the tasks within working groups , this marginal the role of the others members and transform them in simple passive commenters and if they designed to perform some tasks (work party or small team) they always conditioned by some hierarchical constraints which limit their actions, so I think that we should have more developed structure of working groups by including in their charters more roles that could be assigned to members rather than limited responsibilities roles to chair and vice chair.

ICANN is interfering in the mission of some working groups by engaging some technical or policy studies without the agreement of the working groups members which constraints it's activities and outputs, such studies should be engaged before the formation of the groups if their goals is to support working group activities, this due to a lack of holistic view of the organisation as mentioned in the issue 20.

ISSUE 16: Efficient Use of Resources

Should included in accountability ISSUE 11

ISSUE 17: Volunteer Burnout

May be aggregated with ISSUE 6

ISSUE 18: Silos

No comment

ISSUE 19: Work Processes

May be aggregated with ISSUE 1 , ISSUE 9: Consensus , ISSUE 10: Precision in Scoping the Work Inputs

ISSUE 20: Holistic view

A holistic view of the ICANN should be developed in order to coordinate efforts within the organisation this efforts are currently based on some board or SO/AC initiatives and/or factual actions.

This Holistic View will give the SO/AC enough visibility in order to develop efficiently their view of several issues.

the ISSUE 4: Prioritization of Work could be included in this holistic view.