

14 October 2019

The Endurance International Group, Inc. (“Endurance”) appreciates the opportunity to provide a public comment regarding [Next Steps to Improve the Effectiveness of ICANN’s Multistakeholder Model](#). Endurance recognizes the importance of this work and commends the significant effort made to date within the community.

Generally speaking, Endurance agrees that the issues, existing solutions and solutions being developed in other work streams, and priorities identified are accurate. Our specific comments or objections are noted below.

**Issues 1, 2, 3, 5, 8**

In all cases where the GNSO’s PDP 3.0 process seeks to improve GNSO policy development process, the GNSO should be allowed to complete that effort, implement the improvements, and reassess effectiveness at an appropriate time in the future. Any competing work will not only interfere with the GNSO’s ability to effectively improve GNSO policy development processes, but will place an unnecessary burden on the community, which is already suffering volunteer burnout.

**Issue 5 - Representation, Inclusivity, Recruitment and Demographics**

Two aspects of this issue are beyond the control of ICANN Org and do not belong as part of the MSM improvements:

- There are not enough new people and not enough diversity coming into the ICANN community.
- A lack of a significant influx of new and diverse participants will tax existing volunteers who are overstretched and may hamper the quality of the work outcomes.

While it is clear that there is volunteer fatigue within the community, the source, amount, and diversity of volunteers is ultimately determined by the organizations that participate in the community. ICANN Org does not control whether an organization devotes 1 individual or 12 to community work, nor does it control whether an organization assigns this work to men, women, people of color, or up and coming personnel or experienced. As a result, these issues should not be included within the Evolving ICANN’s MSM Work Plan.

Regarding the effectiveness of the Fellowship Program, this suffers from a similar problem as described above. While ICANN Org can certainly expose individuals to the ICANN community through the Fellowship Program, it is ultimately the organizations that participate in the community that choose whether Fellowship Program participants are employed in the industry

and continue with community work. As a result, these issues should not be included within the Evolving ICANN's MSM Work Plan.

### **Issue 6 - Culture + Trust + Silos**

As identified, sound processes, accountability, and transparency can contribute to trust, and personal relationships play a role as well. In addition, clear and concise scoping of issues, appropriate prioritization of work, and clear understanding of roles and responsibilities also play a part. There is work being done within the GNSO's PDP 3.0 initiative to improve all of these areas, so to the extent this involves GNSO policy development, the GNSO should be allowed to complete that effort, implement the improvements, and reassess effectiveness at an appropriate time in the future. Any competing work will not only interfere with the GNSO's ability to effectively improve GNSO policy development processes, but will place an unnecessary burden on a community that is already suffering volunteer burnout. For non-GNSO policy development, we suggest that Issue 6 be discussed and addressed at a later time, most likely after the other MSM improvements have been implemented and their effectiveness evaluated. We expect many of the MSM improvements will result in an improved culture, increased trust, and less silos.

We look forward to the opportunity to engage on these issues at ICANN66.

Darcy Southwell  
Compliance Officer

The Endurance International Group, Inc.

[PDR Ltd.](#) | [Domain.com](#) | [Fastdomain Inc.](#) | [BigRock Solutions Ltd.](#) | [LaunchPad Inc.](#)