**Comment to the recommendations from the Strategy Panel: ICANN Multistakeholder Innovation**

**Introduction**

The ccNSO Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the recommendations from the Strategy Panel on ICANN Multistakeholder Innovation.

The council acknowledges the detailed work from the panel and underscores the efforts to guide the future of multistakeholder governance at ICANN.

**In general**

We observe that the document raises many important questions and highlights fundamental aspects of the multistakeholder model at ICANN. However, we find it is somewhat challenging to use it as a guiding document.

A general concern is that there was no full explanation for choosing the key principles ("legitimate, effective, evolving").

Moreover, we were confused by the structure of the text, where the recommendations seem to jump around multistakeholder engagement both inside ICANN (within the different ICANN SO/ACs) and also in the broader IG space beyond ICANN. We found it difficult to connect one recommendation with the other.

In addition, we note that the language of the document is very abstract, and it would have been helpful to provide further examples in the recommendations. We found the some of the public comments to the Panel (for example [this one](http://thegovlab.ideascale.com/a/dtd/Liquid-Democracy-to-reinvigorate-decision-making/23940-26387) by Elliot Noss) to be more informative and specific than the Panel document itself.

We also had the impression that some of the recommendations did not take into account many ICANN’s current processes and work. Many of the proposals currently exist or would only demand minor changes to the current processes, as we indicate below.

**Comments to the recommendations**

We have the following comments and questions on the specific recommendations:

- 1. Use Expert Networks:

*Comment*: ICANN already seems to be strong at connecting and involving a wide range of experts in policy-making processes, in an organic way.

However, to follow the proposal, a case study could be the current ccNSO "Community Pools of Expertise" website (<http://ccnso.icann.org/about/expertise.htm>), where ccNSO members voluntarily define their expert areas to be considered when needed. A system of public comments or working group "alerts", where expert volunteers are reached based on the "tags" assigned to the projects, could complement the pool database.

- 2. Embrace Open Data and Open Contracting:

*Comment*: We wish to note that opening all data and contracting may be problematic. While these may be noble objectives there are likely to be significant objections from those who create the data out of their own work and who attach value to that data. The idea of publicly available contracts between different parties may also face objections from those who enter into such contracts. These issues should be addressed with critical thought.

Moreover, with regards to "fostering an ecosystem of users for open data", what would this entail? Would ICANN support be the development of applications economically, or automatically just by making its data more open? Further explanation from the panel would be helpful.

- 3. Enable collaborative drafting:

*Comment*: If implemented, this should still take into account the central role that ICANN staff has today at helping community work and producing useful working documents. The role of staff should not be overlooked.

- 4. Crowdsource Each Stage of Decisionmaking:

*Comment*: This proposal should be clarified. Is it targeting improvement in the public comment process? Is the proposal to crowdsource each stage, or only some stages of the policy development processes?

- 5. Move to Global Engagement:

*Comment*: This comment seems to be targeting the traditional GNSO processes mainly, otherwise how does it apply to other ICANN structures?. Would the current strategy panels be an example of global engagement? Could the panel explain why should ICANN continue on that line?

- 6. Impose Rotating Term Limits:

*Comment*: How is this proposal different from the current ICANN bodies, where voting members have fixed terms? Would this prevent reelection? Moreover, currently the NomCom appoints volunteers on rotating terms, to provide balance to different governance bodies. How would this proposal improve the current system?

- 8. Innovate the ICANN Public Forum:

*Comment*: How is the "virtual reality" proposed different than the current remote participation provided at meetings?

- 9. Establish citizen juries:

*Comment*: How does this proposal take into account the role of the ATRTs?

- 11.Descentralize accountability:

*Comment*: How would this take into account the work of the ccNSO and the GAC? Why should ICANN develop standards for national Internet usage, and not leave the issue to the country's local IG scenario, or to the joint work between ICANN and other IG fora?

- 15. Embrace evidence:

*Comment*: ICANN already works with universities and other institutions to perform empirical research, on a contractual basis. How would this proposal be different? Would it explore creating an R&D unit inside ICANN? If so, given ICANN's mandate and resources, would ICANN be in a position to have one?