

Summary and analysis of public comments for:

Proposed Recommendations for a Global Outreach Program

Comment period ended: 10 April 2011

Summary published: 15 April 2011

Preparation by: Julie Hedlund, Policy Director

I. BACKGROUND:

In October 2008, the GNSO Council established a framework for implementing the various GNSO Improvements <http://www.icann.org/en/minutes/resolutions-26jun08.htm> identified and approved by the ICANN Board of Directors on 26 June 2008. That framework included the formation, in January 2009, of two Steering Committees, the Operations Steering Committee (OSC) and the Policy Process Steering Committee (PPSC), to charter and coordinate the efforts of five community work teams in developing specific recommendations to implement the improvements. The OSC established three work teams, which were chartered to focus on specific operational areas addressed in the Board Governance Committee (BGC) Report recommendations: <http://www.icann.org/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf>.

One of the recommendations in BGC Report was to develop and implement a targeted outreach program to explore the formation of new constituency groups. The OSC tasked the Constituency and Stakeholder Group Operations Work Team (CSG-WT) with developing the recommendations on a global outreach program. The CSG-WG submitted the document to the OSC for consideration on 21 January 2011. On 14 February 2011 the OSC submitted to the GNSO Council the document "Recommendations to Develop a Global Outreach Program to Broaden Participation in the GNSO." See: <http://gnso.icann.org/drafts/global-outreach-recommendations-21jan11-en.pdf>.

The OSC's recommendations describe a global outreach strategy to relevant members of the public, particularly non-English speakers and those from developing countries/regions; and for development of a global outreach program aimed at increasing participation both from current members of the ICANN community as well as potential members, particularly non-English speakers. At its meeting on 24 February 2011 the GNSO Council approved a resolution that acknowledged the receipt from the OSC of the document and directed Staff to post this document for forty-five (45) days in the ICANN Public Comment Forum.

Additional Document Links:

- GNSO Council Resolution Inviting Public Comment:
https://st.icann.org/gnso-council/index.cgi?24_february_motions
- The Board's GNSO Improvements Report (03 February 2008):
<http://www.icann.org/topics/gnso-improvements/gnso-improvements-report-03feb08.pdf>

II. GENERAL COMMENTS & CONTRIBUTORS:

The public comment period was opened on 24 February 2011 and closed on 10 April 2011. At the time this summary was prepared, a total of four

community submissions were posted to the forum. The contributors are listed below in chronological order by posting date (with initials noted in parentheses). The initials will be used in the foregoing narrative to identify specific quoted contributions.

- * Frank Ellermann (FE)
- * Susannah Clark (SC)
- * ICANN At-Large Staff on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee (ALAC)
- * Gregory Francis for Access Partnership (AP)

III. SUMMARY & ANALYSIS:

This document is intended to broadly and comprehensively summarize the comments of the various contributors to this forum but not to address every specific argument or position stated by any or all contributors. The Staff recommends that readers interested in specific aspects of any of the summarized comments or the full context of others refer directly to the specific contributions.

A. Summary of Comments by FE

FE questions the need to form a new outreach committee and points out that there are well-established processes for engaging in outreach. In particular, FE notes that ICANN could improve global outreach by simply producing (English) Internet-Drafts eventually published as informational Requests for Comment (RFCs), such as RFC 6055. FE adds that there are already various "RFC streams" and suggests that ICANN could create its own journal featuring relevant RFCs -- not limited to RFCs produced by ICANN, but still with a bias on topics relevant for ICANN, e.g., IDNA. Finally, FE notes that for academic audiences a journal is sufficient and for ICANN's global outreach efforts the journal can be published in all languages supported by ICANN.

B. Summary of Comments by SC

Most of SC's comments constitute a critique of the ALAC and thus are not specific to the proposed recommendations for a global outreach program. However, SC does make some suggestions relating to outreach. In particular, SC notes that the true way to launch outreach is to use media, including social media, such as Facebook and YouTube, to draw in the public and to create direct involvement. SC also suggests that forums should be moderated by peer review. In addition, SC suggests that the largest representative group on the ICANN board should be individual users. Finally, SC notes that by directly engaging individuals ICANN would provide a dynamic, participatory At Large, full of input and ideas, which would be true public outreach.

C. Summary of Comments by ALAC

The ALAC suggests that it would be most useful for ICANN to directly engage ordinary Internet end users. In particular, the ALAC suggests that more education and communication from the ICANN center regarding the policy development process in general and the more information returned to the center on the effects of these policies as implemented on every area of the Internet ecosystem - including ordinary Internet end users - are major building blocks for the transparency framework that ICANN must operationalize if it is to be truly internationalized. The ALAC further suggests that such engagement would engender greater trust for ICANN at the edge - where the At-Large constituents live and

work - with public embrace of mechanisms instituted for greater accountability.

For the above reasons, the ALAC comments that it heartily endorses the GNSO's Global Outreach program with a clarifying proviso: that the needs of ordinary Internet end users for education and information be embraced as a central theme of its development. Furthermore, the ALAC notes that the Board Governance Committee Working Group advised collaboration with a like-minded Supporting Organization or Advisory Committee for the development of a winning outreach strategy with implementable outreach programs. The ALAC offers its resources in this regard and in particular draws attention to the chapter on outreach in the summary At-Large declarations on global outreach at its Summit held at the 34th International Meeting in Mexico City for advice and guidance at <http://www.atlarge.icann.org/files/atlarge/correspondence-05mar09-en.pdf>.

D. Summary of Comments by AP

AP commented that the recommendations are an excellent first step in developing the outreach strategy. In particular, AP notes that while the document's treatment is, in places, overly top-level, the essential points of communicating in languages other than English, leveraging existing meetings to engage with newcomers, workshops, and development of a toolkit for interested parties are the staples of any successful public outreach campaign. However, AP suggests that while it is logical to prefer that outreach is conducted virtually, the OSC should resist excessive reliance on web-based interactions for training, information sharing, or building of a community. Specifically, AP recommends an increase in in-person, "off-line" discourse as the essential ingredient necessary for success with the constituencies that are least engaged at the moment. To that end, AP recommends that taking full advantage of the planned meetings and congresses for further instruction is the necessary precondition for being able to sustain them over the long term by remote means.

IV. NEXT STEPS:

This Summary Analysis document will be posted to the ICANN public forum and submitted to the GNSO Council for consideration.