TRANSCRIPT

SOP Working Group Meeting in Prague

24 June 2012

Attendees:

Lesley Cowley, .uk
Sabine Dolderer, .de
Atsushi Endo, .jp
Byron Holland, .ca
Roelof Meijer, .nl (Chair)
Debbie Monahan, .nz
Oscar Robles, .mx
Leonid Todorov, .ru
Mathieu Weill, .fr
Hong Xue, NomCom

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Xavier Calvez
Carole Cornell
Kristina Nordström
Gabriella Schittek

Roelof Meijer: First item on the agenda is to see if we have to change something in the way we work because the last (inaudible) ICANN on the strategic number. Strategic and operational. The operational plan and budget for this year, for next year, we have very little participation from the group. In fact, we had no one from your working group, but that was not the only problem we had. Giovanni was very much on time like he always is, but there was actually very little comments from his team, only his own input. The same was [cross talk] (inaudible). That was meant to be cynical.

That's of course the problem. We are all busy. But either we decide we are on this working group and then we have to participate, or people conclude that they don't have time to contribute. But then I think it's better to resign from the group. It's not directed at you

personally. But I find it's difficult to work if you don't get any input. And in the end, it's Bart who is doing most of the work and he works. So in fact, he should support us, but sometimes it's more like we give him a bit of support and he is working as the whole working group on his own.

So are there any suggestions on how we improve this? Do you have any proposals on how to improve, especially from your group?

Unidentified Participant: Actually I don't have a proposal in hand.

Unidentified Participant: Ideas?

Unidentified Participant: Yes, I have a let's say remark going directly in line with your remark. And that is, when you look at the different proposals to comments ICANN is currently doing and how much input ICANN receives in general for whatever proposals they are, putting online the question is if the process itself is flawed at that stage. Because what I see, I see ICANN -- I think (inaudible) what I see is that I feel actually like sitting on the opposite side of a machinery which produces paper and paper and paper and paper. And sometimes it produces paper one day before people are travelling to the meeting to get actually input to those papers and then they are obviously impossibility for each and everybody to participate. But when you look on it, be realistic, besides the really most controversial issues, let's say do we do it the (inaudible) who is in which (inaudible), if you look on the website of ICANN about what are already said in comments or whatever, there is no substance. And so I'm not sure if -- it's maybe more fundamental, because sometimes I'm completely frustrated even when we share those comments, they are more or less mostly I wouldn't say ignored, but poor received.

Unidentified Participant: Okay, I appreciate what you say and I recognize the fact that if you're not careful you get flooded by things that you can comment upon. But I can only speak for myself that I chose specifically to be a part of this working group because I think the operational plan and strategic plan are the basis of most things ICANN is doing. So that's my, it's the area of my focus. There are other things I don't comment on. I put my focus here. And I think that's the idea of a working group.

Unidentified Participant: Yes, but if you look at the comments on the last couple of two or three years --

Unidentified Participant: We are repeating ourselves on certain items, yes.

Unidentified Participant: Have you the impression that it does change the operational --

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, I do. Lesley?

Lesley Crowley: I was just going to make a crash complaint. I think we're heard, which is good. I think it does change some things, yes, so I think our work is valuable. I was going to make a crash complaint that I find it quite difficult to participate when I'm not --- when I've not got time set aside to comment. So I cannot -- my diary tends to be really full up for ages in advance and so on. And I think the strategic plan is one of those things that we know is going to happen each year and I know ICANN are working on a timeline. If we can encourage them with that, that will surely enable us to plan space in our own diaries to give us some room to comment. Whereas this time and I think the previous time, the timeline for comments slowed and then it finally landed and of course you didn't have the space and flexibility. And all of us are very, very, busy. We have day jobs. So I wasn't able to set aside much time to comment and so that's not good.

Unidentified Participant: So one way to improve it might be if ICANN sticks to a specific timeline it tells us well in advance and we can already book --

Lesley Crowley: There are some things that will always be unexpected, but strategic planning is never normally one of them.

Unidentified Participant: Okay, so (inaudible) first. On the basis of the planning that we get, we already make our own plans when we want to comment (inaudible) and we can do that as soon as ICANN has --

Bart Boswinkel: Yes. Say that's what we more or less agreed to and that was kind of discussed already at the Costa Rica meeting. Unfortunately this time, as it happens, is ICANN was shifting all, say the finance department was shifting its days. We had to reschedule or confirm the scheduling. But what we could do is probably even say one month before the expected date of publication, send out a reminder to everybody, say this will happen.

Unidentified Participant: Why don't you send it in the month before we set -- Okay, so that might be one thing that helps. We have -- I think Sabine and I are the only team leaders.

Unidentified Participant: I think we have to send out an email to the working group what we are working on, where we iterate that we really need everybody to participate and send in their comments. And if team leaders have a problem with having enough time to be a team leader, maybe you could say appoint somebody else on that team.

Unidentified Participant: I have another request or proposal and that would be sometimes if we had some of the phone calls -- they are usually very, very late notice. And I don't know -- sometimes it's really hard to participate because -- and there is no choice, so sometimes it's really like [cross talk].

Unidentified Participant: The ICANN ones or the SOP ones?

Unidentified Participant: Yes. When I actually, when Bart and I were here last year, we presented something through SOP working group, it's usually sometimes three or four days --

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, I know.

Unidentified Participant: Before it is noted. And it was in some cases three or four days noted, in the middle of the day in Europe. I usually don't --

Unidentified Participant: We promise to improve that one next time.

Bart Boswinkel: And again, we are dependent upon when they schedule it. And it's unfortunate, I don't know why, that what you see, what [Willow] said, this is plan able, you know this will happen, so you can schedule these calls way, way ahead. But again, this time we received the message I think the same day that you received the SOP invitation.

Unidentified Participant: But that shows basically for me the relevance our input has to ICANN.

Unidentified Participant: I agree with Lesley that you see, and Bart, that things change maybe not as fast and as completely as we would like, but I think also there is more pressure on ICANN to take our comments seriously because we are -- others, they are using our comments as well, so it takes some time. [inaudible cross talk].

Unidentified Participant: I think there also we can improve ourselves to be better in tune and increase further the quality of our comments. So unless we get notice of change from the team leaders, my inclination will be that they are still the team leaders and they have the responsibility to get their team to work. Bart and I will send out reminders that responsibility of getting the team to work and getting input to Bart and I, Bart and myself for the next round of comments which will be on the 16th.

We'll send out an email to the whole working group encouraging people to choose between actively participating or maybe giving up being a member of the working group. There is no obligation to stay in the working group if people can't afford the time.

(Inaudible cross talk - off mike). [no content conducive to transcription for several minutes].

Unidentified Participant: Well maybe just to use the time, you've all seen ICANN's under -- the second point of the meeting now, and Curt is not coming so we have Carole here. The first part is the letter that we received as a follow up on the strategic session that you had in Costa Rica. I say you because I was ill at the time and I couldn't make it. I don't know if anybody wants, while Carole is here, to take the opportunity to comment on that, or is it all clear, are we happy about it? Okay.

In the strategic planning process, there has been a proposal from ICANN to come up with a strategic planning working group, or more of an advisory group. I'll ask Carole to explain a few things about this working group and I would like to have your opinion in the discussion on what you think of such a working group, if it's going to help, if it's a good idea or not.

And as you are probably all aware, there are two strategic planning sessions this week as a part of the whole process. One is on Wednesday morning when we have the CCNSO association of the GAC and the other one is on Friday. Is anybody intending to go to one of those two sessions? Okay, Leonid, to which, to the Friday one? To both? Okay, that's good. You will try to go to both, but can you commit to go to at least one? [inaudible response]. Okay, because I think those of us who are on the CCNSO council, we will go to the CCNSO GAC meeting and I won't be there on Friday morning. So it's only you, Leonid, or anybody else?

So we will depend on you, Leonid, to give some feedback on that. Will that be possible that you at least go to one of the two and give us some feedback on that? Thank you.

Is there any other business that you want to talk about? The last item on the agenda. We can continue with that one. No? Yes, Leonid?

Leonid Todorov: What I found in this document is that initially it was the intention to create the cross community working group, which I don't quite, haven't gotten that sense whether they want us, created it to substitute it, I mean to have a substitute for our group, or that would be just yet another group? Working group, I mean?

Bart Boswinkel: Well that's the one that I was talking about so we will have to ask Carole what the goal is, the roles, division of responsibilities are. And while your question is a good question, as well, I think it's in addition so it's yet another working group. But it's a cross constituency one so we will have people from all (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: Also, that was our communication with Giovanni I thought that our project was kind of a special stuff on which we could comment against --I mean vis-à-vis what we have in this SOP. That could be a good case to build some comments upon. Because with all these parameters and objectives stated in each and every strategic and operation plan that we have seen so far, I mean we are more or less aware of them. Now we can see that there is a huge gap between what is proclaimed or about and what is delivered in practice. And I believe that it could have been a very good case to examine and to highlight on where or on which points the ICANN sort of underperformed to try to find a remedy for them and for us as well. To be more constructive in a sense. But Giovanni took a more traditional approach. I couldn't unfortunately contribute to that because I was at (inaudible) with Lesley. But I think that it's kind of worth a discussion of whether we should try to examine or revisit that case with (inaudible) when it's over to see

where we can help ICANN with some let's say validation or critique, if you will, of their operations.

Bart Boswinkel: So like an evaluation or something. Is there an evaluation plan for the first round of new gTLDs by the gNSO? Have we heard about that?

Unidentified Participant: There's a discussion this week how the (inaudible) analyzes the first round will be evaluated because it's an AOC commitment to doing a review a year after the launch. But I don't think there's a timeline.

Bart Boswinkel: Well thank you for coming, Carole. We have two items on the agenda for you and one is the letter we received as a follow up on the Costa Rica session we had on general strategy. I asked the group, there were no -- oh, hi, Debbie! There were no questions or remarks from the group but maybe there might be something you want to add to or explain what you've been doing with it in the meantime. And then there is the new strategic process where there are a few things that we would like to have clarified. First of all, there's a proposal to set up a strategic plan working group. We have a process and a timeline and a few sessions. I thought they were identical, but it seems not, so maybe you can start with the letter.

Carole Cornell: Sure. Thank you. I promised that we would send you a follow up letter since our last meeting and we went through and checked those comments. And you were the first group so we actually started with your initial feedback to help us work on what do we want to change within the strategic plan to make it better and more useful or inclusive to the comments that we received. So because we met with you before and had those early comments, we've actually started revising the strategic plan for 2013 to 2015 to incorporate some of those. Larissa, who was the consultant that was here, is coming and will be leading the next two session as well, so we have this continued continuity between the first session, the second session, our internal meetings, and all of that to build the strategic plan for this year.

One of the things that we received a lot of feedback from this group was how good are we at the strategic metrics part of this? And so one of the things that if you were to look in the packet that should be posted, because it has been submitted for posting and it is in advance of the meeting, which his another feedback that I've received a lot of, and this is the pack that I have in my hand. And it does do all of those things. It incorporates the timeline, there's more focus on the strategic metrics. I even put in some early results of 2012. I have still kept the four pillars, but we're talking about maybe changing some of the nomenclature of the pillar, the healthy internet ecosystem, which is one of the ones that we discussed in this group that we thought was not truly reflective. And so that is one of the pillars that we are probably going to try to change a little bit of that. The content within it is still measurable and important and we still think we need some of these, but we're going to change that focus. Instead of maybe the word healthy for example, we might change it to something less focused or maybe give up the word governance which was one of the other controversial components of that heading.

So what I'd like to say is, I know it took a long time to get you back the letter, but that we did take your feedback, and if you looked through this, you will see we have started to include some of those comments in the future strategic plan. I think the last time we'd also talked, the board was in the process of reviewing the 2012 to 2105, that's been reviewed, posted and is up on the Wiki. So that's also a frame of reference. I think it was in draft form when we last met.

The other component and why it is we try to go with a strategic plan working group, it was because we often get, and we still want as much feedback as we can have, but we thought by having a working group approach we would be able to have a cross constituency conversation with all people, different groups, at one meeting. So we're taking two pillars on Wednesday and

two pillars on Friday and we've invited a representative from each group to participate in both with the idea that we could have a good cross community dialogue, not just come and go with each individual dialogue and then put it all together. We were hoping to allow to have that cross conversation and that's what we've changed and why we wanted to have working groups which allow better interaction from one group to another.

Bart Boswinkel: Any questions from the group on maybe the working group? You had something here? I think you had, Leonid? Or was it Sabine?

Sabine Dolderer: Just a general point. As you know, we're struggling with time slots this week and time slots that were suggested unfortunately either clash with the CCNSO meeting itself or with when people would be going home because of course the travel schedules were arranged quite some time ago, etc. And so there's more of a plea for whole strategic planning kind of planning for strategic plan that we kind of figure out the timeline and therefore community engagement earlier so that it can go in the diaries and hopefully not clash with so many things. We may struggle to get people. I'm sure we can send your each one, but we're going to struggle to get people to those session at which I suspect from your own perspective will mean that you won't get as much feedback as you might like, which is a challenge.

Carole Cornell: I would like to say I truly recognize that it was very hard to schedule. Monday is not a day that we can schedule because it's supposed to be non conflicted. Tuesday -- I mean I could go through this, it left me -- and with losing Friday and Sunday, which is today, I wasn't sure I could put it in the schedule.

Sabine Dolderer: So we're not aware of Monday being non conflicted. That generally tends to be the day when we're trying to have cross community sessions and the SA and OC chairs discussion. We've been suggesting that we go back to having that as more of a cross community thing, so maybe that will be easier next time.

Carole Cornell: I would love that, and I do think there would be a lot good dialogue then. It's been, as I said, I think it has been challenging even on this side and it is one of the lessons in trying to try something a little new. We actually put it on the calendar really early on, but a lot of things got pushed in terms of priority and then we ended up with two different days to do that. So thank you. I would like to say though that it's really important to know your feedback on the timeline, how we do it, I'm very open to that and actually the timeline has been out for public comment and it's out through July. So if you have, staff has things you'd like to submit, that would be great. I will say this openly that so far we have zero comments so far.

Bart Boswinkel: What we decided was -- yes, maybe I have to clarify. We decided not to comment on the timeline because there's a problem with the timeline comment period on the timeline. I sound like Chris now, don't I? It was too quick after the whole work on operational plan and budget for which we already had problems with the timeline, so it was very difficult to get everybody to participate and to contribute. And I just didn't want to bother people again with comments on the timeline. So we think the timeline as it is, and also our comments on the operational plan, that what we really need is predictability of the timeline and not for it to change. Because we had a brief discussion on how we can improve participation of working group members and this working group thru the final comments. And one of the things we concluded is the fact that timelines are so unpredictable make it very difficult to plan work or working group well in advance. And people in this working group are very busy, so their schedules are full if we plan to do something the week before. So I think more important than when the work is actually to be done, first it's very important that we know well in advance so that we can plan it in between the regular jobs that we have. So if you could do something about that.

Carole Cornell:	It's a great idea. I was thinking maybe we should do a multiyear one instead of trying to do -- because we approve it and then we almost start all over again a timeline. So just have a fixed one and a multiyear one might be a better approach. Would even help on my side as well.
Unidentified Participant:	So in my own organization, we have a five-year plan and then we do one year updates.
Bart Boswinkel:	Okay. With regard to the -- oh, sorry.
Unidentified Participant:	A very simple question. Could you elaborate a little bit on this cross constituency group? I mean how do you envision that to emerge and to operate? What is going to be its mandate? If you could just --
Carole Cornell:	Not a lot of development on this and I apologize in advance for that. The idea was to ask for a minimum of two representatives from each group to come and participate both at an ICANN meeting and also one or two meetings that we set in advance with an agenda that we could then get the what I'll call cross talk that we think would be so helpful. In looking at the schedule, the way this is working is we've put up the timeline, then we have a draft that we've actually started to share in advance. In the past we would not have gone to this much level because we were trying to listen to the community feedback. They would like a document, to be able to react to it and to note. We are following a lot of the same steps as we had done in previous where we have key events, so we've done an internal SWAT, we've had some internal management meetings, we've taken the feedback started from the QZ, we're putting that in to get a first draft with the idea that if you looked at that timeline which is in here, it says the draft is going to be generated after this meeting and then posted for a period of time. And I hope a longer period of time because that allows us to work on the feedback as a whole thru Toronto.

So hopefully the way we thought of it this way was to try to have some good work sessions building on what we did with you guys before and then allow a whole bunch of feedback between this meeting and the next meeting to create the next version and allow a lot of that feedback to be incorporated properly by each group as soon as you get us the representatives. |
Bart Boswinkel:	Okay, thank you.
Unidentified Participant:	The document that Olaf sent around was the same one that's posted so that everybody has a package of information.
Unidentified Participant:	Anybody else? Yes?
Unidentified Participant:	I would elaborate on Leonid's question and ask how you see the relationship or respective roles of the cross working group and this group? Because we are putting a lot of work in commenting on the SOP working group from the CCNSO. And I wonder how this change of process, adding another layer, is going to impact this working group? Should we keep on or should we close this working group and move our efforts to the cross working group? Is that how you see the future? And considering that we are, as I was saying and others were saying, quite busy, so we don't want to have to say things twice.
Carole Cornell:	It's a really good point. I think your team was, I'll say this much, more advanced at giving us the input and it's been very good to get all the direct input and it has made a big difference to us in making changes. So we were hoping we would get a similar more buy-in from other groups by getting this cross talk. So to your way of thinking, if it means that you guys would not need to do as much and then have fewer representatives, but still a collective thought, and that took away or would allow you to do other things instead, maybe that would be better. I mean I think that we would like to hear from you on your thoughts on that.

Unidentified Participant: If I can, with a follow up question, when I listen to you, it seems to me that the problem you are trying to solve is participation. And what I'm a little frustrated about, maybe frustrated is too strong, sorry for my English, is that the issues we have been stressing in the process are the timeline which is consistent, but also focus metrics and accountability within the organization. And I don't see how this new process is going to address this. Because when you increase participation, it's even more important to make decisions because strategy is about not doing things. So if we take all comments and make sure they are all in the strategy plan, then the issue we've been stressing about the number of priorities multiplied by 4, multiplied by etc., etc., is going to become more and more important. Where are decisions being prepared? Where are you taking the community input about should we put priority on this or that? This is what I do not see in the process at this stage.

And I'm afraid by going cross constituency, and I think cross constituency is absolutely fine and probably a way forward for ICANN as an organization in many areas, but we're not addressing the fundamental issue with ICANN strategy.

Carole Cornell: Thank you for the input. I don't really have a quick answer back. I would say that I personally have taken to heart trying to change the metrics because it's something I think I can influence as well as take all your feedback. We have been working on it. For example, I know that if you were to go to the dashboard today, we now have a whole meetings page where we're showing the type of population, the type of services. That's now being measured and will be updated on a monthly basis or trimester basis, depending on when those meetings occur so that you can see that improvement in that process. And those are metrics that would be measurable and those that are similar to the ones like are we increasing our participation? Where is that participation increase coming from? Are the meetings getting more effective? Things like that, you'll be able to see that on the dashboard page.

We have deliverables for the last three years up on the page so you can see 2009, 2010 and 2011 and I'm working on 2012 and you're seeing it now. So what I'm trying to say a little bit is that there's a little bit more emphasis on the dashboard at getting the right results. That's part of what we're trying to change in the strategic plan itself by showing not just how it ties to each individual initiative, tied to each strategic objective, but also then change the metrics to be direct as to how they relate to those components. And we are changing those and we're improving those and adding those to the pages in the strategic plan. So with regards to accountability, that's a hard one for me to answer. I'm probably not the right person to answer it to be honest with you.

Sabine Dolderer: I think my comment goes along in line with Mathieu's comment and what I sometimes really puzzle with is how the huge amount of -- I remember, I think it was one or two years ago when we talked about strategic plan and about ICANN's role within the (inaudible) just as an example. But there are others, too. And I know there was a group, I think cross constituency group, founded who was dealing with these issues. But I have to say I have no idea how the results of those groups -- which group exists, the results of those groups which they're providing fit into the different bullet points of the different strategic agenda. Some of it is interlinked but not all of it. And we know that it's not only the (inaudible) group, there is the (inaudible) advisory group, and there is the root server, I don't know how it's called, a root server relationship who it's called group. So what I see is a huge amount of different groups looking cross constituency or hand picked or self selected or whatever reason built up, and they all come up with proposals and some of them fit into the strategic plan and some not. So for me the process sometimes is a little bit difficult to understand. Maybe it's up to (inaudible)? It's really difficult to understand who is talking to whom and what result and where and who decides what on which problem. So that's a little bit my, sometimes I'm confused. And how do we -- yeah.

Bart Boswinkel:	And maybe especially that last bit, how decisions are taken by whom? Because I think all those working groups in theory should provide input to ICANN to come up with a strategic plan or an operational plan. But I think very often it's unclear for instance something is taken in and something else is being left out.
Sabine Dolderer:	Yeah, but let's take another possibility, we have the CCSA group working on and then I think at the last meeting somebody from the security staff from ICANN provided a sort of private paper on the ICANN website where he actually came up with solutions which are completely not interlinked with what actually some groups developed. And sometimes it's really hard to understand how the process is.
Bart Boswinkel:	So what would you like, Sabine, to be done about this? Do you have an idea?
Sabine Dolderer:	At least an understanding. I'm not sure -- I'm sure if somebody within ICANN understands, maybe they can explain us how the different working groups work together and what's expected from whom and what all the iterations are and so forth. From an outside perspective, it sometimes looks a little bit interesting.
Bart Boswinkel:	Say from, I think from an ICANN staff perspective, there is at least from that perspective, not say from your department, but some other departments, they know which working group is working on what. And especially if there is overlap with some of the strategic or operations planning objectives, that at least these are listed. That's a starting point. Because -- and maybe even do a cross reference of tasks of these working groups because then you know what the overlap is and it becomes clear to the community. And I think it's even -- and this is just me talking, I think even within ICANN there is not really an understanding which working group is working on what.
Unidentified Participant:	I think you have to be careful, Bart, because you might end up with this job of coming up with it.
Bart Boswinkel:	I know, I know.
Sabine Dolderer:	But maybe sometimes it's truly helpful, if at least when you talk about different topics and then sometimes you have three headlines. And I know from different working groups, people, staff, whoever are working on that special area, they know who is working on that and sometimes if they are working in different directions, which obviously sometimes also happens. And I can tell you at least somebody is taking the initiative to put those two people in one room or group in one room and try to come up to a decision.
Bart Boswinkel:	To add to this, say if you look at the number of working groups, say the CCNSO can create its own working groups which doesn't filter down including ICANN staff. So make it broader, every SO and AC has its own working group as well which sometimes are known to say ICANN staff and sometimes aren't. And then you have the other way around as well that within ICANN, there are some working groups within departments dealing with some topics which are very clearly understood. But somewhere is an overview internally. But then because you've got this huge grouping of SOs and ACs creating their own working groups, ICANN staff creating their own working groups, it's sometimes very, very difficult to match them. Because I think even say, probably you wouldn't know how many GNSO workings groups there are, or how many ALAC working groups there are. I don't know how many working groups there are in ALAC dealing with some topics. And that's only know, well you know -- but say the number is 15 I guess, they're working on 15 different statements. And some of them are overlapping with the CCNSO stuff and some don't --

Unidentified Participant: But Bart, maybe this -- if these are working groups that fit only within DSL or DIC, that's not really considered this whole thing of clarifying processes and how input is taken in and treated. But let's take working groups that are either organized by ICANN itself or constituency work from groups that directly fit into the ICANN process like ours. [cross talk]

Unidentified Participant: It is definitely important when we talk about areas where there is a mutual responsibility for all of us. So what we are talking about DNS operation, I don't feel I can be the one and only organization being responsible for that. Every TLD operator obviously has a similar responsibility and their root server operator. And especially when we are talking about areas where there is a mutual responsibility whereby you don't have the one entity being responsible for the whole system, but having different organizations being responsible for different parts of it, I think it's important that the work is organized in a way that it's not being seen as the one organization being responsible for all the others working on it.

And that is something I think is very -- I think there are areas where there is a thing of responsibility with ICANN let's say maintaining the AR function in some way or another. But when we are talking about the (inaudible) availability, introduction of IPB6, there is a mutual responsibility between different organizations. And there is -- which can't actually be taken away from them. And I think organizing those mutual collaborations in a way which acknowledge the different responsibilities is very important and should be reflected also in the plan. And I think that is something important to point out where you see sort of these competing working groups popup up or why they are popping up. Because you see on the one hand side the one being responsible for one and the other being responsible for the other. And I think there people should try to find solutions which reflect --

Carole Cornell: So I'm walking away with the idea it would be really nice if there was a map is what I heard. Because a map would show how the working groups tie to the strategic plan which ties to the workload and how the staff would then be accountable or not and that would also tie to your concern earlier about who is accountable and what that connection is.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Bart Boswinkel: And then I want to close off with --

Unidentified Participant: I'm following up on this trend to open up to comments. Before mapping all these groups, I think it's worth trying to do a kind of audit of all these groups for at least the past two years to see how active they were, what kind of deliverables they insured. I mean do it, well, without some metrics but just very roughly about their input. Because some of them might be -- I mean I'm speculating, I don't know, but some of them might be sort of deadwood groups. They may just exist on paper. And we might be unaware of that, we both might be unaware of that.

Carole Cornell: And I do believe that working groups are there for a purpose and once their purpose is finished, then you should disband and move on. I know in our own internal staff, we're trying to be much better about closing a project at the end if it's completed with that scope, redefining if there's a new scope and opening up and looking at it each like in segments rather than just letting it continue on.

Bart Boswinkel: So Carole, on this cross working group, I don't want to be criticizing so I'll take it from a positive stand. If we look at what we've done with the SOP over the last few years, we have the impression that we're being heard, other communities are using the input we are providing to ICANN. But we also have two things that we are not overly happy about and that could also threaten the success of such a cross constituency working group. Probably even more so because it's a joint constituency thing. And one is the fact that it's sometimes very difficult to get

proper ICANN participation in our face to face sessions during ICANN meetings. Thank you for being here, thank you, but we've had other sessions where this was very difficult or the time that we got was very short, making a discussion impossible. And the other thing is, and that was a point I think that Sabine already made, some parts are taken into consideration, quite a few of our comments we think that are valuable, are not taken into account. And we have sometimes the impression that we are repeating ourselves quite regularly. And I think those two things are very important to avoid if you make the working group even bigger because otherwise it will be unclear to people what the real intention of this working group is. So if it becomes cross constituency working group, there's even more reason for ICANN to take this working group very, very seriously and to actively participate in it with staff.

Carole Cornell: So I'm going to take it back and I won't come up with an answer, I don't think I can do that, I think I can take the feedback back and come back and say that I will follow up with you with a more solid answer. One of the things that you say is, the challenge of not hearing your voice heard fully, has to do I'm sure with some of the prioritizations and I know that's always a challenge and the amount of work to be done versus a given year and the timetable and the budget all doesn't always align to everyone's satisfaction. And I know that's something that Xavier is becoming very actively involved with, with some of the work he's doing. And Xavier and I are partnering on this, again, operating plan, to try to do a better job of marrying the two so that you will see a better linkage between the requests made in the strategic plan and how they tie to the what's funded or not funded in the operating plan. So I think there is going to be a better linkage and a better mapping. But obviously we haven't done enough. And I want to say that I think -- I know I really value the input you guys have given me and it's really helped and I feel like we have taken a lot of it into account. But there's a lot of other inputs we get, too, and it's trying to find that balance. Like if you guys ask for one thing and then somebody else says, no, we don't want it, where do you find that balance? And sometimes it doesn't make it to the top level which is part of what you're saying, where are those decisions made in terms of and the rationale behind it. So I walk away with that as well.

Unidentified Participant: I think it's completely understandable that you can't take all our comments into account. I'm very -- I understand that. But sometimes it's helpful if it's explained in a way which is understandable. If somebody else has also come up with some issues, then therefore we -- but say there are the input on those and we balanced it and because of those reasons, one, two, three, four, five, we decided to rank it that way. In an explainable way that's sometimes very helpful to understand your rationale. And I think that is something which is missing. Because my impression is that we try it sometimes and we throw in things every now time and again, but we never get an explanation why is was not accepted. Obviously when you read it you say okay, it seems not to be accepted. But why and for what reasons? That's sometimes also very helpful to understand maybe.

Carole Cornell: I would say one of the things where we're trying to do that is a little bit on the public comment. If we get -- you will see on the operating plan, there were lots of discrete questions and we are responding to them one for one with answers back. And that's another way that we're trying to improve this process. But I do understand and appreciate what you've said and we will continue to try to improve that and get more rationale as to what's in and out of the plan.

Bart Boswinkel: Thank you, Carole. We have to switch over to Xavier and -- so one point I want to make before I hand over -- it would be good if you can clarify a bit more, not now, but in writing when you do your communication about this working group and the responsibilities of this workings group, vis-à-vis ICANN staff, vis-a-vis existing working groups that deal with strategy or operational plan or budget. Who was first?

Unidentified Participant: It's a follow up to Sabine's comment really. I think, Carole, you said prioritization going on. This is extremely important and we look forward to prioritization because we want focus. But where is it taking place? When? By whom? For what reasons? That's where we get lost in the process. And this is creating I think in the group some fatigue about contributing and this is a big risk into when you ask for comments, and it's all the same for ICANN, that people get a little tired. But I think Sabina really explained that -- I'm okay to say that we don't have time for that this year or this is not in our financial abilities this year. And it's been considered less because the impact on objective number 3 is considered to be inferior to this other project. That's fine. But that's what we don't see in the documents and the thing I sometimes I have this, oh, this is all good comments, and we will try our best. And this is where frustration maybe is coming from.

Carole Cornell: That makes sense to me and the best I can do is take it back with me and try to do a better job when we give you the presentations in the future with the understanding of what those priorities are.

Unidentified Participant: And I'd like to stress that this comment is not directed at you or your particular department. It's all over ICANN.

Carole Cornell: I recognize that as well. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you. I note that healthy ecosystem is one of the prioritized areas even though I don't always prioritize it, but it's an important one. In order to build healthy ecosystem it's important to take a look of ongoing ICANN engagements, contributing, outreach programs. Things are quite fragmented right now. We have [battleship] program, we have global partnership, we have newcomer orientation, and recently there's a large academy proposal. It's been labeled as a high level duty on top of all these. So I want to know, in the strategy, what kind of measure resources are going to put into integrate and enhance these programs? I think it's weird, they need some linkage between the programs so that the global partnership, (inaudible) huge budget, but what is (inaudible) review of this program? And for the Academy one, I know there is no budget for that. And the Toronto one is going to be wrong, very interesting scenario. And most important of all, and most interesting of all that, the Academy is a training for not only the board member, but high level staff. We have a new CEO. I guess it's very welcome to trying to train him on the Academy in Toronto. But there's no budget for that. That's a big challenge. So that's my observation.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you. Last one please.

Unidentified Participant: Sorry. Just to echo, I mean I was sort of asked to do that on behalf of quite a huge group sort of, and that is CIS countries. Mostly middle Asian ones. They are totally out of -- they were left out of the ICANN spend unfortunately. Because of different reasons. Even in Africa, people can't speak English and/or French. Those guys have no English and no French, no other language, they have no command of that. They have no access to ICANN's papers unless they are translated into Russian which they are also kind of forgetting now. So this is kind of an abandoned community. And more than that, even though some people from Khuzestan claimed that they once made it for the ICANN meeting under the fellowship program and this is probably (inaudible) problem but people were not paid back. All their expenses were not compensated. And they said that there would be no other experience or no other chance like that.

Bart Boswinkel: That last thing is probably something we should take up --

Unidentified Participant: No, no, I mean -- so this is important to insure that multilingual outreach. Thank you.

Carole Cornell:	With regards to the multilingual outreach, there is a new language services guideline that's been under several rounds of input and public comment. And it does take into account some of the areas you've expressed. And once that has been reviewed and adopted, then I think you would see financial dollars allocated in that direction for that purpose.
Unidentified Participant:	Okay, Carole, thank you very much for joining us and we look forward to hearing more from you.
Carole Cornell:	Thank you again very much for all your input. And if one of you would come that would be great, to the session on Wednesday or Friday. We'd be very much appreciative, and thank you.
Bart Boswinkel:	From this group there's -- maybe you weren't there when we were taking inventory of who would be able to go to the Wednesday and/or the Friday session. Because so far we only have Leonid who can go to the Wednesday session. So when will we hear more about this working group? What's the next step? We have to provide names, right?
Carole Cornell:	Yes, we would love to hear names. But we also, it sounds like we owe you some information, so I doubt you're going to hear a lot between now and Friday. But I'm going to work very well to give you more of a written feedback for that with some guidelines not too long after Prague so that you can then plan to engage more for the Toronto and how that might work as well. Because I recognize what you said.
Bart Boswinkel:	Excellent. Thank you very much. Okay, Xavier, welcome. Sorry to keep you waiting. We were not making a point or anything, so --
Xavier Calvez:	Next time I will just come late.
Bart Boswinkel:	No, I was afraid that you were going to conclude that. So for you we have -- let me see, we have four or six points on the agenda. We would like to hear from you on our submission on the FY'13 draft of plan and budget. We would like to hear from you on the open session that will take place this afternoon I think from 4:00 to 5:30, finance open session on the budget. And if there is anything we have to prepare for coming Tuesday. Yes, when we have the CCNSO, you will be there, right? At the morning session? I think it's first item on the agenda Tuesday morning.
Unidentified Participant:	You got an invite from us. From Bart. [indiscernible cross talk].
Bart Boswinkel:	I have a question for my group because I just received a message that I have to call somebody in Italy, so can you take over for me for 5, 10 minutes, Leslie? Would you be willing to do that?
Lesley Crowley:	Sure. Do you have a plan for this?
Bart Boswinkel:	No, there was no plan. But I got a call from somebody several times and now get a message if I can call them directly now. And it's the person who is doing my job --
Lesley Crowley:	I actually meant what you want to cover during this session, not why you are leaving.
Bart Boswinkel:	I'll be back in a few minutes. But the first thing is Xavier's feedback on the comments.
Lesley Crowley:	Sure. All right. Thank you. Xavier?
Xavier Calvez:	So I didn't necessarily try to learn all the comments or all the iterations by heart, but from a process standpoint first, the comments that have been publicly provided have been partially though mainly responded to in the public comment forum as well. I don't know if any one of you have had a chance to see that a response was published on the 19th, on Tuesday. In a document

that contains, in an Excel document that contains the questions -- let me rephrase, the next tract of the comments in a compiled format. And responses to those comments. So there has been a process of looking at the documents that we are provided by all the organizations, extracting the comments or the questions that were formulated in those documents, put those comments or questions in through that Excel format, and then provide an answer in front of those items in that Excel format as well. And that's the document that has been published on the 19th across all our organizations, so what I just described is not specific to the CCNSO comments. It's been applied to all the comments.

In this document there are a few comments that we have not yet responded to because the responses won't second these responses on comments applied to those comments that were provided by the end of the comment period. What I mean by that is that the responses to comments that were provided between the end of the public comment period and the end of the response period to put dates, the comment period ended on June 8th and we have tried to address all those comments provided until then.

The response period, the reply period, sorry, finished on June 15th and comments have been provided between June 8th and June 15th, or replies on comments have been provided, and those we have not yet responded to those in the document that I'm referring to that's been published on the 19th. One of the reasons being that most comments provided after the 8th have been provided on the 15th which is Friday. a week ago or 10 days ago, and of course we did not have enough time to be able to review them, process them, respond to them by the time we published the document on the 19th. So our intent was to try to answer most comments with at least some kind of answer even if it's in progress by the 19th which was now 5 days ago, to ensure that we close the loop on those comments. So that's a generic comment on the comments.

Lesley Crowley: I'm not sure if the group are aware of that spreadsheet. I know I wasn't, but I may have missed it. Gabby, if you could send the link to the SOP that would be appreciated. Thank you.

Xavier Calvez: What I meant to recheck is to who --

Unidentified Participant: It's in the list of public comments, so it's submitted by the ICANN controller. That's the one that's been published on the 19th. If you look at the comments on the draft budget, you'll find it on top of the comments.

Xavier Calvez: But what I want to recheck as well is that we also tried to send an email to a number of people and I thought you would have been in there, Lesley, to indicate that we had published these comments. Sorry, I will recheck that as well.

Lesley Crowley: I may have been, I have had a major board meeting going on.

Xavier Calvez: On Thursday afternoon, whatever time that was for you, we had sent an email to indicate that we had published the comments. So that -- and you were either travelling or busy with other things like everybody else. And I recognize it's obviously fairly close to the meeting starting and people making traveling plans, or not making, but being in the process of travelling to come to the meeting. Which is part or what we will probably discuss in terms of process throughout this Prague ICANN. With the comment period finishing either on the 8th or the 15th, there's about zero chance us to be able to provide responses on those prior to the 19th. I will actually say I am reasonably happy to have produced anything actually before the end of, before the beginning of the meeting. Which I have the impression, I don't know if it's a first or not, but it seems to have not been consistently managed to do in the past.

Are there specific questions on the comments or on specific comments that you would like me to address? Otherwise, because I didn't intend to -- well I didn't know for sure what the agenda was, but I assumed we'd talk a little bit about the comments, but if there are specific questions on specific comments, I'd be happy to try and address them further now.

Lesley Crowley: Okay, anyone? While you're thinking of questions, if I can highlight at the SO/AC chairs' discussion from earlier this week, on Friday, which was about particularly where things are quite predictable trying to recognize the desirability of having comment periods not ending to just before an ICANN meeting and so forth. So particularly on strategic plan and budget, the desirability of having a timeline that works both for staff and for community would be immensely helpful.

Xavier Calvez: So I cannot agree more. And it's clear to everyone that we all have the same problem which is if it's too close to the meeting and then it becomes difficult to do. But taking the timing of the meeting out of the equation, what I think we're really talking about is to have sufficient time for everyone to -- time is one aspect and quality and type of input is another, but I'll leave that one aside for a minute. But sufficient time before the board approves the budget to have iterated, and probably more than once, on the budget. And I'm formulating it like this because next year the meeting is in July and the budget will need to be approved before July. So the meeting is a milestone that will not apply next year in terms of what the approval process is going to be.

So the bottom line is, whenever the board approval is, is of course our ending process from which we need to insure that we have the adequate amount of time to iterate on the budget. So your point is, I completely agree, it is one of the many reasons why I wanted to have, to initiate with the community a discussion on the budget process itself. As part of that, which we will have on Wednesday, well, let me rephrase that, we will start on Wednesday. The issue that I have, not to anticipate at Wednesday meeting, but is that we need to be able to, between Wednesday next week and Toronto to have reworked this overall timeline so that we can launch the FY'13 budget process then with enough predictability of the schedule established then in Toronto so that we can all schedule ourselves by it.

Lesley Crowley: We're in agreement. What we need to do then is stick to that schedule.

Xavier Calvez: Yes, and that's the point of wanting to establish it and communicate it early, is to be able to stick to it.

Lesley Crowley: Yes, there's not a track history of doing that previously, but I'm sure it will be fine. Okay, anyone else?

Unidentified Participant: One of the things that Roelof had mentioned was, the second subject, was the session this afternoon at 4:00? (Inaudible). Well the only thing I want to see is he attended. So during that session we will have, it's only an hour and a half, so the -- the main intent there is to provide an overview where we, how the budget process has concluded to this meeting, provide an overview of the NCNOS request which I recognize is of less interest to this group than to others, and to provide an overview of the public comment process. A certain amount of what I said here earlier is going to be repeated this afternoon as well. And I'm sure, I suspect we will also discuss the fact that the board has approved the budget.

Lesley Crowley: How about if we discuss the desirability line, bearing in mind the budget for next time needs to be approved by July 2013 which should give us sufficient time for a timeline to be developed and then hopefully start to, which will enable us to participate more effectively. And you were just highlighting the (inaudible) which clashes on the 3rd with many things.

Bart Boswinkel:	Okay, thank you, Lesley. Sorry for leaving it up to you. So did you discuss the highlights of the comments we provided on the plan? Get some feedback?
Xavier Calvez:	I didn't try to comment on the comments. And I don't think we have time for that though I'm happy to have a more detailed session on that. The only thing that I said, which I don't know if you know, is that we published responses to the comments on the 19th.
Bart Boswinkel:	No, I didn't know. Also to our comments?
Xavier Calvez:	Yes, to all comments. (Inaudible - off mike)
Bart Boswinkel:	Okay, so I missed that one.
Xavier Calvez:	And the one thing Roelof and I need to make sure we do in the future is that we sent an email to a member of, community members and mainly the chairs of the organizations on Thursday, three days ago, to indicate that we had published the comments. Not on that next day. I'll make sure that in the future you and Byron are -- so Lesley is on that list, but Byron and yourself are not. And I need to make sure that that's the case. Now, it's last Tuesday that they were published and I recognize that between travelling and so on, not everyone can have the time to read that.
Bart Boswinkel:	Okay, no thank you. That was quick. So we'll have a look at that, then there's no point in --
Xavier Calvez:	The feedback that I wanted to make sure I provide, I didn't suspect you wanted to discuss every single one of the comments in this discussion. I'm going to blow up your timing otherwise.
Bart Boswinkel:	I would have settled for the management summary, the 5 points that we have in the summary.
Xavier Calvez:	You had two other subjects I think that you wanted to be addressed?
Bart Boswinkel:	But I think one you've touched upon that one already, the session that is this afternoon is conflicting with almost everybody's agenda. And I think -- let me stress the importance of a timeline which is communicated well in advance of the event actually taking place. We have the session day after tomorrow, CCNSO?
Unidentified Participant:	Yes. (Inaudible cross talk - off mike).
Unidentified Participant:	Yes, we'll coordinate ourselves on that. And then there is the budget process session for the finance community on Wednesday the 27th.
Unidentified Participant:	Yes, it's not elaborated, it's not explained what we have done, what is the purpose of that meeting.
Xavier Calvez:	So if you'd just be (inaudible) say a few words. Wednesday I want to get a limited number of people to have a more I wouldn't say intimate, but more focused conversation on the budget process itself. And when I say on the budget, how to improve the budget process. I think there is -- and it's a fairly comprehensive subject because there's aspects of timeline, there's aspects of types of information, there is -- it's basically to put everything on the table that we all as a group think needs to be improved on the budget process. I have my views. We have a certain amount of public comments on the budget process itself, so it's already quite a beginning of input. What I want to try to accomplish during that meeting is have a common view of what we think needs to be improved. And how we move forward to be able to improve that. Not resolve everything Wednesday. I would like to, I'm sure we won't, but the point is to start the process of discussion on the budget process with part of which being to determine who participates to that exercise

and how with the objective to complete something by the end of -- let me rephrase, by, before is rhetorical, but you can finalize a budget process, a revised budget process and communicate it in Toronto. Because I think that's the last, it's the latest we can provide a budget process for the fiscal year '14. So that everyone can understand the process, we can share it, and finalize it and start on it. Because to me, it's really late to start in October on that. Do you see what I'm saying?

Bart Boswinkel: By the budget process, you mean that comprehensively, so not just the timeline but also with providing input who would be deciding on it. Because that was a discussion we had with before. I think you picked up the last bit of that because -- so it's really the process part, so the input, from whom, who is deciding, and prioritize.

Xavier Calvez: It is timeline, it is content, it is level of detail, it is structure of the data, it is strategic understanding. It's everything honestly, which is why the only thing we can do on Wednesday is drawing a picture and defining how we're going to deal with what we want to change to the better process. Part of the complexity of that exercise on Wednesday is that there is what we want to do and there is what we can do in the next three months.

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah, okay. Mathieu?

Mathieu Weill: My question, I'm a big fan of reviewing processes and continuous improvement, but what's the goal? What's your one goal that we say we will succeeded in the reviewing process?

Xavier Calvez: Yes, so let me make everything clear. My goal is that in Toronto we have a revised budget process.

Mathieu Weill: And what is going to make you -- if you had to define now the success criteria for having reviewed the process -- I understand the delay issue, but to me it's the end rate. I don't care if the next part what I want has some extrication from it, but your process within ICANN around accountability, around transparency. But what I find a little puzzling is that you have a very aggressive timeline to review a budget process which has consequences for the whole organization. And I have difficulties understanding your one goal in reviewing this. For instance, when I review, I don't know, the registration system performance at [AFMIC], I say well, I want performance and the average or maximum availability time to be this. This is my one goal. And what I do not see here is what is the goal. Where do you want to improve the process?

Bart Boswinkel: The argument is why do you think this whole thing has been successful? What would be the difference? What would have improved on the process?

Xavier Calvez: So to me, Wednesday is the opportunity to (inaudible) the subjects that we want to improve upon. So I'm not expecting that this yet answers your, directly, your question. In order to be able to say what is the objective and when are we successful, what I think is that by the end of Wednesday, we will be able to define what we want to achieve as objectives and deliverables on the subject of the budget process. When are we going to be successful will depend on what objectives we define for ourselves. That's why also I was mentioning the point of there is what we want to do and what we can do.

So we don't yet know when we're going to be successful, but what I want to do out of the meeting on Wednesday is define we want to do this in the next budget process. This could be define a different timeline for public comments so that we enable ourselves to produce it, respond to it, potentially have other iterations of comments and response so that we have an interaction that is more valuable. For example, one of the things that I will say on Wednesday is that I don't think that the format of the public comment allows the community to provide the

input on the budget process and on budget content that the community wants to collect or should collect. I'm not saying we should not have public comment. I just have the impression that this is not a working process that enables to provide the input that I think you guys want to have. And what I'm hearing on our comments are not heard or listened to or responded to or acted upon, with the process where we receive of 150 comments at the same time, we have to respond to them right there and move onto something else, this is what is bound to happen. Unless the comment is very specific for a very identified corrective action that can be carried out fairly quickly, then it becomes something very generic and we move onto the next thing. So it doesn't work.

And I'm not necessarily surprised that we'd come back to the same comments on a fairly regular basis. I'm sure you feel that you've provided the same comments several times. And so then the question is, how do we handle that? And what I want to try to lay out on Wednesday is what we think the issues are which, again, I think we have a good starting point with compiling the comments on the process that we received just over the two years is maybe 80% of what doesn't work. I have my own views on what doesn't work that I want to add to that. But we have that list which I think is probably what we would want to fix. And out of that list, I want to have a list of things that we are going to aim at fixing by Toronto with a revised budget process. So success for me is internal, too, that we have a budget process that we all agree upon.

Unidentified Participant: I would certainly agree. I mean I would draw a parallel with you being a minister of finance and us, I mean all the constituents as being like a parliament with the different actions therein. The problem there is yes, I would agree that budgeting process is streamlined and amended once and forever. Well, as a process. But I'm afraid, and this is like a caveat I just want to give you, and I'm sure you are perfectly aware of that, is that the -- well for a certain part of participants in that meeting, there will be yet another issue they will inevitably raise and that is the ICANN now is the Uncle Scrooge sitting on a big bag of money, cash, you know? And there -- I mean their reasoning, their argument would be, okay, so how shall we just make sure that you sort of allocate that money in an adequate way? So they will probably torture you not with those budgeting decisions, rather, with what you are going to do with that money.

Bart Boswinkel: Then they're in the wrong session. Because it's not, as far as I understand, it's not the content of the session. So they need a good chair who will intervene and say, listen --

Unidentified Participant: No, this is just a side comment. And I guess you should be prepared for that.

Xavier Calvez: It doesn't require a lot of preparation. This meeting on Wednesday has a very specific agenda which is not that. So that's it. And I have no problem telling that to any of the participants.

Bart Boswinkel: Any questions for Xavier? Okay, so we will look at your responses to our comments and I'm sure some of us, at least I, will be there, but I'm sure a few others, at the session on Wednesday. So okay, thank you very much for coming. I will be there if there are no urgent things that change my whole schedule. But the way it looks now, yeah. So I think I'll hand over to Byron then and we move to the session of the finance working group. Thank you all for being there and we'll be in touch. Thank you. Thank you, Sabine. Byron, do we need -- well, no, it's up to you, I'll hand out to you and you do whatever you want. You do whatever you intended to day. That's better, sounds better I think.

Byron Holland: Since there is a fair degree of overlap between the two committees, I was going to suggest that we have a five minute break, but maybe I'll ask if we could absolutely be back here within five minutes since we're starting a few minutes late.