
ICANN71 | Virtual Policy Forum – ccNSO: Strategic & Operational Planning Standing Committee
Thursday, June 17, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 CEST

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thank you. I'll go ahead and do my opening here real quick. Thanks, Bart. Hello and welcome to the Strategic and Operational Planning Standing Committee session at ICANN71. My name is Kim Carlson and, along with Kathy Schnitt, we are your remote participation managers today. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper format, as Kathy has posted in the chat. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand and, when called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor.

Please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphones when you are done speaking. The session includes automated, real time transcript. The transcript is not authoritative or official. To view the real-time transcript, click on the closed caption button on the Zoom toolbar. And here is the agenda for today. I am not seeing Giovanni on here yet. Oh, there is Giovanni, so I will go ahead and turn things over to him. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Kim. Sorry I'm late but I didn't find ... I was not able to find the Zoom link, which I ... And thanks, Joke, for sending it. Again, thanks,

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

everybody, for participating this morning, this afternoon, this evening, wherever you are, SOPC meeting. This is the agenda, which we have circulated some days ago.

We'll start with a brainstorming exercise on the preference list, which we went through some time ago, and with different results from the SOPC and the SCBO. Then, we'll move onto finance for ICANN planning for point three and point four, which is ... The first part will be about their prioritization project.

And the second part will be about what's in the pipeline with the fiscal year 2023 planning and the timeline, what they expect and when we are expected to provide input. Then we will leave some time for any other business. And if everybody is fine with this agenda, we can move forward and we can start with point two. If there is anything that you wish to add to the agenda, please let me know either in the chat or by raising your hand. Okay. I don't see any hand up.

And again, thanks, again, in advance to Kim, and Joke, and Bart to help me. If I do not see any hand up, to point me to possible hands up. So, let's move to the first real point, which is this exercise that we conducted some time ago about the preference on the ... That SOPC members have expressed in terms of what we believe are, let's say, the top areas that the SOPC and the ccNSO should look at when it comes to the operating initiatives and the functional activities.

And I would like to ask, Kim, if you can put up on the screen the outcome of this exercise, which is a table that shows the preference—thanks a lot—the ranking given to the different operation initiatives by the SOPC,

which is on what you see on the right rank. And the one, the very first one, is the ranking given by our colleagues of the GNSO, so the SCBO Working Group Committee.

So, what we have done here is to give a preference to the different operating initiatives and functional activities and understand, what are the areas which should focus the most? So, one of the objectives of this exercise was to see where the SOPC should focus more when reviewing and providing comments on the ICANN operating plan.

And this is an exercise that I found quite highlighting, at least, what we have as a top priority ahead of us. At the same time, we can see that the SCBO ranking is quite different from the ranking given by us, by the SOPC. There are some common rankings, or at least rankings, which are quite similar.

For instance, if we take Universal Acceptance under operating initiative, that is given six as a priority ranking by the SOPC and four by the SCBO. And in the functional activities, one of the activities. That is ranking more or less the same is the security operations that is ranking four for this committee and it ranks three for the SCBO Committee. Okay, yes.

And indeed, we have, currently, the chair of the ... Let me see in the chat, because ... Yes. So, we are having some representatives of the SCBO attending this meeting, and thanks a lot. We have had very constructive calls with them in the past weeks and months and we will continue to work together to have ICANN planning and finance with their work.

That said, I would like to shut up because, otherwise, it's a one-man show, which I don't want it to be. And so, I'd like to open the floor to possible comments by my colleagues at the SOPC level, but also the SCBO. Please feel free to intervene and speak up about how we can improve this exercise. Even ICANN finance or planning, if you have any idea how we can improve or refine this exercise to help you in the process of producing the strategic plans and the operating plans. Yeah.

So, anybody from the SOPC who likes to speak up? Should we continue this exercise? Should we somehow extend it to the whole ccNSO membership? Which is something that I thought over the past weeks. What do you feel about this exercise? I see John's hand up. John, please.

JOHN MCELWAINE:

Thanks, Giovanni. One thing I think we both could do, both the SCBO and the SOPC could do, would be to provide a bit of background and maybe a link or a description of the particular operating initiatives or functional activities in the survey itself, and probably, really, almost like a session describing each one of the functional activities and initiatives so that people were really thinking about what those words mean.

Because sometimes, I think, when going through a survey, particularly the way I did it, it was rapid. And I think that if people had prepared a little bit more in advance, there could have been slightly different outcomes. I think in general people knew and recognized what the various initiatives and functional activities were, but perhaps—and you

all may have done this, but we didn't—giving a little bit more background.

And I think it might go well, too, as people prepare, to analyze the various budgets and operating plans to have that background just to familiarize themselves with the documents before diving in. So, thank you. That's just one suggestion that I have and might try to implement on our side.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thanks a lot, John. That is, indeed, a point we touched base with in the last call we had, and indeed it is going to be quite helpful for both groups if, when we circulate this kind of survey, there is, as you said, a bit more information about what it is inside each operating initiative and functional activity that will help, indeed, those who are surveyed to produce a better answer to the survey and, eventually, prioritize ranking the initiative and activity in a different way. I see the hands of Irina and then Jonathan. Irina, please.

IRINA DANIELA:

Thank you, Giovanni, and good morning, everyone. Actually, John said exactly what I was going to say. First of all, talking about improvement of the survey, I would suggest to define what we mean by improvement. And I believe that we do not have a goal to come to similar ranking with SCBO, because we definitely might have a different view on these priorities.

But for me, improvement looks like making the results of this survey more reliable and making sure that they really demonstrate the perception of our communities. And therefore, I fully agree with John that it would be very helpful to give an idea of the content, because just the name or the operating initiatives or functional activities does not necessarily give the full understanding of what it is about.

So, I fully agree with that. And secondly, we might put a little bit more effort in promoting this survey and trying to get more responses so that it will be statistically more reliable. Thank you. Back to you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thanks a lot, Irena. That is indeed very good input. And indeed, we should define the way we would like to improve this exercise if we decide, first of all, to continue this exercise. Jonathan?

JONATHAN ROBINSON:

Giovanni, thank you, and good morning to you and everyone else. Look, I have quite a strong agreement with both of the previous points that were made, so I will try not to repeat things. I think it's a very good exercise. It's clearly systematic and logical. And so, to that extent, it is valuable. I'm quite struck by the lack of correlation between the two groups.

And while I take Irena's point that that should not necessarily be the goal, it still surprises me that there is this much divergence, and that makes me think, therefore, that we haven't done a good enough job, as the two previous speakers said, of either communicating the essence of

the questions or getting decent or good enough representation in providing those answers.

So, I'm strongly supportive of the work and I'm also strongly supportive of this approach you're taking, Giovanni, which is to try and improve it, and I think we're coming up with some good suggestions as to how we could do that. Thanks very much.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Jonathan. Meanwhile, I see some chat exchanges, and it's about, indeed, what is behind certain functions and certain initiatives. So, I think there is a sort of consensus that we should, before and if we decide to continue with this exercise, help those responding to the survey to understand what's behind each line that we see currently on screen. I see Leonid. Please.

LEONID TODOROV:

Thank you, Giovanni. Yes, thank you. Hello, everyone. Well, first of all, in response to your last comment, I believe that it's very easy to discern what is behind each and every line. You just need to turn to the ICANN Strategic and Operational Plan and go through 300-plus pages, and then you will know everything in detail.

Meanwhile, my comment. Although I'm in agreement with everyone, I believe that, still, these exercises need to be extended by trying to find where we converge and where we diverge by classifying all these items into groups where we're more or less in the similar vein or on the same page and those we absolutely diverge on. So, that should help us and

everyone in the ICANN team to realize what genuine priorities for ICANN Org are and where efforts and resources should be re-allocated to better meet the community’s expectations. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Leonid. So, what I hear ... Is there anybody else, first of all, who likes to take the floor?

ROELOF MEIJER: Yes, please.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay. I don’t see. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yeah, Roelof was first.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Roelof.

ROELOF MEIJER: Hello, everyone. Good morning. Yeah. Though I agree with Irena that the exercise shouldn’t be that we try to align as much as possible, I also fully agree with Jonathan that the differences seem too large. So, my suggestion, in addition to getting back to our communities and, I think, presenting there and getting feedback on it, it might be an idea for each to have an exchange between our two groups, and share the rationale

between each other, and share the rationale behind our top ten, for instance.

We could choose top 15, also, but top ten, I think, would already make a lot clearer to each other because I would be very interested to know the rationale of the SCBO behind their top ten, why their number one is number one and number ten is number ten. And I think it might help them to understand our reasoning if we explain the rationale behind our top ten. So, I think there has to be some more exchange to get a better understanding of the rationale behind the rankings.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thanks a lot, Roelof. I have Berry and Maxim. Berry first, please.

BERRY COBB:

Thank you, Giovanni. For those that don't know, I assist ICANN staff or the GNSO policy team and specifically the SCBO here, and I just thought I'd make a couple of comments from my perspective. I think, first, everyone seems to like it. So, I haven't heard any negative comments, so I can envision that, somehow, we do this again.

But in terms of reminders, I do caution everyone to immediately take away the aspect that this is a "prioritization exercise." This was really an informal ranking of items. So, if this is chosen again, I think it would be fair for both groups to formulate the top two or three reasons or value-add of these exercises to help scope and frame future versions of what the survey is meant to accomplish.

I think that will help, to the point about knowing what these line items mean. I think there were two very good points. Without a quick summary definition, some of these don't provide the context. Xavier brought up a very good example with security operations.

And of course, what it does require is to be intimately involved with all of the documentation for the annual budget, as well as the five-year strategic plan. For those of us that read practically every word, it's a lot easier to know what each one of these groups are or the operating initiatives are. So, I think that that's important.

And then, the last thing that I wanted to say, which was briefly touched on, as well, is, looking at these results, again, this is not scientifically significant. So, I think there are several grains of salt that we can use when looking at some of these numbers.

But I'd also like to state, from an SCBO, or technically a GNSO perspective, that is technically just a smaller group of represented members off of the GNSO Council, is that I think what will be important for future uses of this is that we ascribe identification to who is submitting the response, especially if one of the value statements does start to tend toward prioritization or some of those aspects versus just being used as a quick tool to organize comments.

Because I think, when whoever it was had mentioned that there is considerable departure between the two groups, for example the IANA functions 15 and 1 respectively, I suspect that if, within the SCBO, we actually identified and ensured that this was a full, represented group's submission in the survey, that, if we looked at the contracted parties

versus the non-contracted parties, we would probably see something align quicker with the ccNSO, and the importance of the IANA functions, and those kinds of aspects.

And I'm not saying we would need to produce results by those specific represented groups, but it could be insightful, at least, for presenting and providing context on why some of these numbers are showing up the way that they are. So, sorry to take so much time. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you so much, Berry. I have Maxim and I'm giving the floor to Maxim. It is the last intervention, then we'll wrap it up, this part of the agenda, in the interest of time. Maxim, please, the floor is yours.

MAXIM ALZOBA:

First of all, I'd like to underline that it was a survey conducted among not all the councilors of GNSO or all the councilors of ccNSO. We would see slightly different numbers. Also, in GNSO, only contracted parties have contracts with ICANN and have interest in some aspects, I'd say. Some other parties, they're interested in compliance, etc.

And, for example, top five is easy to explain why, for example why policy development is important for GNSO, because policy development is what GNSO does. Second, office of president and CEO, its implementation. Whatever GNSO cooks is done by hands of ICANN staff, and they're directed by the president of ICANN, and it's important, then, for GNSO.

Three, security operations. Maybe there was some misunderstanding, etc., but in general, registries, for example, registrars are quite serious about the security of personnel who do IANA key change procedures, etc., etc. And effectively, we insisted that this is in plans and the backup plans there, etc., etc.

Four, contract compliance. We registries/registrars have contracts with ICANN. I think only a few ccTLD operators have contracts with ICANN. So, for us, compliance is important because they can just do things to us, or force us to do things. And given the structure of SCBO, you will see, I'd say, more people from registries, SCBO aside.

So, what is important in this survey? I suggest we conduct it each year because it will be interesting to see how the priorities of SCBO and SOPC change over time. It will be quite interesting. So, you will see, id' say, internal feedback on ... We saw this last time and maybe we thought about it, we worked on it, and currently we see a slightly different picture.

So, from one hand, it might be interesting to ask SCBO next time to, I'd say, ask councilors, maybe, to ... Maybe next time, it will be an exercise of asking councilors from both sides to fill the survey to help the financial committees to, I'd say, better reflect intentions of the whole group. So, that's it. I think it's important. We cannot be the same because we have different priorities, but it will allow us to better understand each other in terms of what we want and how we want it. Thanks.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you so much, Maxim. Indeed, good points. Leonid, I'm sorry, I cannot give you the floor unless it is something death or life. Okay, no. Thank you. I would like to wrap it up and say that the discussion I have just heard, and also the exchanges that I have seen in the chat, show that there is a value in this exercise. As Irena and others have pointed out, this was the first time we conducted this exercise, and I believe that we can certainly improve the exercise. But, as it was the first time, it was already showing something. Therefore, it was a successful initial exercise. And as anything, we can certainly improve.

So, I'd like to wrap up this part of the agenda by saying that we can, at least for the SOPC, have an action point on the SOPC to present and think about some ways to improve the exercise in terms of its timing, in terms of the way we can provide more information to those participating in the survey, when it comes, also, to understanding possible differences with the SCBO ranking. So, the action point is that I'll work with the secretariat, with Bart and the others, to propose some improvements/refinements in the process, and I'll circulate them at the SOPC level.

And then, afterward, we may foresee a confrontation, an exchange of views, with the SCBO, and see how we can improve the process in the same way. And thanks, again, to Berry and John for sharing your thoughts on the outcome of this exercise and the future of this exercise.

We will also involve ICANN planning to see if they have any ideas how to improve the exercise. Xavier in the chat threw in the idea that we can include in the exercise the fact that the functional activities are divided

into five groups, and this could be a way to help to refine the overall exercise.

So, that said, I'd like to thank everybody for this discussion. We'll follow-up. I'd like, now, to leave the floor to ICANN planning for point three and four of the agenda. I know they have a set of slides they will guide us through. So thank you, Xavier, and Becky, and Victoria, and all the others, and [inaudible] in the participant list. Thank you, the floor is yours.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you, Giovanni. This is Becky Nash from ICANN Org planning. I just wanted to ask Xavier, would you like to provide just a couple of points of introduction?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Sure. Thank you, Becky, and thank you, Giovanni, for the opportunity to participate with this meeting. Thank you for everyone who is attending. That attendance is really making all of it worthwhile. The prioritization framework is the major endeavor from our perspective. I think all of you have been confronted over the past years to the reality of ICANN's work, that is demanding significant ... Taking a lot of your time. And with different perspectives or history, both of your groups are represented during this meeting.

I know it's an SOPC meeting, but there are also SCBO members participating or looking into, and have been looking into, efficiencies, better planning, better organization, etc., of the work of ICANN. So, this

prioritization framework exercise is an endeavor to try to give ourselves the opportunity to take control of our work. In a multi-stakeholder model like ICANN's, which is, by definition, by nature, meant to be open and inclusive, everyone's voice counts, and should count.

Because that is a little bit counter-intuitive to prioritization, because when you try to be inclusive it becomes difficult to rank things in an order or priority. So, when we start talking about various different projects or activities, whether they are reviews, whether they are Policy Development Processes, etc., we find, of course, a lot of people say this is important, that is important. We are not hearing a lot, and it's natural. People saying, "Well, we shouldn't be working on this because everything is important. Everything on its own has justification, value, logic, at least for a fraction of the community.

And therefore, we have a tendency as an ecosystem to work on everything. Therefore, prioritizing is not easy. And we really have not done it as an ecosystem. We have not really prioritized purposefully our work. And I know the GNSO has been putting effort over the past years in trying to prioritize the work that they are faced with, which has proven to be difficult.

Just the names of these exercise demonstrate the challenges the GNSO has, the scary list that turned into a very scary list over the past couple of years. So, all that to say I think we all understand that we need to prioritize. This project is about giving ourselves the means to do that. It's not going to be easy. It's going to be really difficult.

Making decisions as a community about what we're not going to work on is going to be difficult, and we're going to learn lots through that exercise. With that, I'm going to let Becky describe how we are proposing to take this endeavor and walk together through the path of developing for us, for this ecosystem, the way to prioritize the work. Becky, please go ahead.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much. Thank you, Giovanni, and thank you, everyone, for this opportunity to talk about both the Planning Prioritization Framework Project, and then also FY 23 planning. I know that we have several slides, and please, Giovanni, feel free to let me know when we're running out of time. I appreciate it.

So, the first topic is the planning prioritization. At a high level, the project background is that, in the five-year operating plan that we were just discussing in the previous agenda item, we have an operating initiative called "Planning at ICANN," and it's one of the 15 operating initiatives in the adopted plan.

And a key goal and targeted outcome is this prioritization framework. It's a project that we're starting and it is to be in collaboration with the community, board, and Org. We just heard from Xavier about the points of why we need this project, and also the fact that it has also been a topic reinforced by the topics from the "Enhancing the Effectiveness of ICANN's Multi-Stakeholder Model," and in the ATRT3 final report. So, we're just highlighting that it's ICANN's planning department that is leading the creation of a planning prioritization framework. Next slide.

The scope of this project. Again, it's a project that starts and ends. We want to first highlight that it does need to be broadly accepted and adopted by the community, board, and Org as the basis for decision-making on how to prioritize in work or activities in scope. It will have to enhance effective decision-making without hampering or obstructing workflow in day-to-day operations.

And then, it's something that we are recommending to be implemented as part of the annual planning cycle. That means that it will also be subject to public comment. So, the purpose is twofold of this particular project that we are beginning.

It's first to design a conceptual framework with embedded techniques for making informed, collective, and collaborative decisions on prioritizing ICANN's project-based activities. In addition, the project has a component to engage and collaborate with the community, board, and Org to seek broad and diverse input on the approach for planning and prioritization.

So again, we are just stressing that the actual designed process ... We are proposing that this framework and techniques then be implemented as part of the annual planning cycle to inform decision-making for the annual plans and the five-year plans. Next slide.

Here, we wanted to just highlight a couple of clarifications in a Q&A format. So, this is something that we want to share with everyone and receive feedback. One question we thought that the community would ask us is, will Org propose a draft framework to start from during the

engagement? And we're being very open and transparent saying, no, we're not going to list out a fully designed process.

Instead, we would like to work together to collaborate and develop together areas, what we're calling the "design elements," so that we can decide upon these together. So, we want to collect broad input through engagement sessions and we are making note that, definitely, for this group and other groups, we would like to have follow-up detailed sessions on some of the design areas that we're going to talk about in a few minutes. So, once broad input is collected and consolidated, a draft framework will then be built and reflected ... And include the input that we have received.

And then, we will share back a proposed framework with all of the groups and the public for further engagement and what we're calling "version" ... So that it will be a very iterative process. So, another question, just to clarify, in a Q&A format, is, is the prioritization framework going to be implemented for FY 23 planning? And no, we are suggesting that we are starting this project as part of FY 23 planning and that we will begin this design process and then have iterative or versions of a proposed process available for review and discussion.

And then, we are suggesting a pilot be run on one specific area of activities, and a proposed pilot is very important for all of ICANN so that we can see what works and doesn't work and have lessons learned on an area that we have scoped. So, we are recommending that, for FY 23, we run a pilot process of this collaborative framework on the review recommendations. And we'll talk a little bit about that in subsequent

slides. The project includes a prioritization process and then engagement and consultations.

So, again, the project has a start and an end, and we are suggesting that this project is going to run from FY 23, and as we see on subsequent slides, through to FY 24 planning. We just want to make sure that everyone understand we want this to be very inclusive, open, simple, short, and effective as a framework, not overly complicated.

So, we're going to move into some slides now, just about consultations, and then timeline, and then some of these areas of design elements. So, for consultations, again, we are highlighting that the objective is to collect diverse stakeholder input to inform iterations or versions of the draft prioritization framework.

So, we are very happy to be here today at ICANN71 because we do suggest that financial groups, or groups of SOs and ACs that have committees that work on submitting public comments and other financial matters ... They are all groups like yours that we would like to have some detailed consultations with. And I will ask everyone at the end what they think about some of the design elements. But we are also going to hold public webinars and regional webinars.

If we go to the next slide, this is the proposed project steps and tentative timeline. So, this actually answers a couple of questions that we have received about the timing of planning activities. So, if we look at going from left to right, we did hold two public webinars, one in April and one in June, as part of the ICANN71 prep week. We do suggest that those webinars be viewed for some of the general overview.

Today, we have more information, so we're very happy to have this time today. But the consultations have started in May and will run through June and, most likely, early July. We will discuss some of those design elements today. But after the first initial consultations, we're suggesting that, in late July, there will be a version of this framework published and circulated to this group, and also other groups.

And then, we will launch the pilot process, which will be a hands-on opportunity to apply some of the data that we have received in the suggested outline of the framework. And then, that particular pilot will then go into another version of the proposed framework that we're suggesting will be published in the October timeframe, and also it will be included in the draft plans, which is the December 2021 timeline there, where we then will seek specific public comment on the framework and the pilot as part of the FY 23 draft plans, subject to public comment.

Following the public comment, that's when we will then move into refinement, adjustments, and other iterations of this process to be able to launch an implementation after the project for FY 24 and beyond. But we want to highlight that this framework needs to be flexible to adjust to the needs of the ICANN ecosystem.

If we move to this slide, we just want to highlight that the process design elements for consultations that ICANN Org planning has suggested include these elements, although we want to highlight that we want to hear if there are any other areas that we should focus on.

So, the first one is scope, identification of the scope of activities to be prioritized. Another design element is the participants. So, who should participate in this process, and what are their roles and responsibilities? Then, the frequency of the process. Then techniques. Then, we have systems and tools. And then, also, a pilot that I mentioned.

So, the next slides take each of these design elements and we go into detail. So, I know we only have probably about seven minutes left, so I will go ahead and start with scope, and then we can talk about some follow-up sessions on some of the areas that we would like to discuss in more detail.

So, scope of the activities. They could include or exclude the following type of activities. So, community-initiated activities supported by ICANN Org, like PDP support or other non-policy and advice work support. So, this would be community-initiated activities. Then, the scope could include implementation activities. So, PDP recommendations' implementation, review recommendations' implementation, other non-policy and advice work recommendation, implementation.

And then, we are suggesting that other Org-initiated activities that are large projects, such as the ITI project or the Naming Services portal NSp project and other compliance systems. So, those are areas that we have identified as possible activities or work for ICANN to be in scope of a prioritization framework.

Examples of activities that we’re suggesting that should not be included in this prioritization framework are all ongoing operations, and those would be what we call “continuing operations” in the functional activities that we were discussing in the previous agenda item, or other small projects for a given Org department or community group.

So, I’ll just pause and see if anybody has any comments that they’d like to give on this, either in the chat or ... If not, we’ll go to the next slide and we’ll just continue going, but please raise your hand if there is anybody that would like to give any direct feedback.

So, another design element is actually the identification of the participants and their roles and responsibilities. We have two slides on this. One key principle is that we want to make sure that this project and the development of the framework is ... Anybody can participate.

And then, also as a steady-state process for prioritization, since it’s something that would be part of the annual operating planning process, individuals and groups can submit comments through that process, as well. But one question that we have is, do we want to recommend a separate, stand-alone, public comment on the prioritization of activities prior to the development of the draft operating plans?

So, that would mean that we would have a public comment prior to the drafting of the operating plans, and then we would have a separate public comment for the draft plans annually. Or, as listed here, another option is to have separate, informal consultations with SOs and ACs in public webinars.

So, those are two fundamental questions about, how should participants be organized for the planning prioritization process? Then, we have specific questions about the roles and responsibilities of the participants in this process. This is a key element that we want to focus on, and we're also suggesting that we can use a [racing] model to highlight roles and responsibilities, and who is responsible, accountable, consulted, informed.

And on the next slide, we have a series of questions, just as it relates for the discussion of, what is the role of the community for prioritizing? Should the community provide individual input about what the priorities should be? Should they develop recommendations about the priorities more formally? What is the role of Org?

We have highlighted a couple of points here of responsible to develop and submit for public comment the operating and financial plans, meaning a way to look at the prioritization framework is that the community will provide feedback to Org as input into the development of the operating plans and financial plans. Org is responsible to submit the plans, again, for public comment and to the board for adoption.

And, what is the role of the board? To act in the best interests of the organization and in the global public interest, to ensure that the public input has been adequately considered, and the ICANN Board has the role of adopting the plans as part of its duty of care of the organization.

So, we have highlighted several elements of participation in a framework for prioritization, and this is where we want to hear from community groups and SOs and ACs on what makes the most sense and

what they view the roles and responsibilities are. Another design element is the frequency of this process. I touched on that in some of the earlier slides.

So, at a minimum, because this is something that we are suggesting will be inserted as an initial step in the operating and financial planning process, it will take place once a year. So, again, as input into the draft development. But the question is, should there also be another time throughout the period of the year that this prioritization process should take place?

So again, when we're talking about a new process as part of the operating planning process, we're suggesting, at least once a year, before plan development—so, that would most likely be in the June and July timeframe—and then, if time permits, what we want to do maybe every six months. That's something that we're seeking input on. And I know that we're coming up on time elapsing, so at this point I will just indicate that we have several other slides that are available.

And if we want to move forward, just so that we can see that one of the next sections is the techniques. And this is an area that I am suggesting that we work together and have a detailed brainstorming session. So, I would like to suggest that each of these groups are combined, that we come back together to go into a lot more detail about the selection of agreed-upon prioritization techniques. It could be multiple techniques. It could be hybrid. But it's something that having the opportunity to have a working session on we would welcome very much.

And then, we have some additional information that will come forward about systems and tools, and then the next slide is about the pilot, and a work plan is being developed that we will share about, actually, a hands-on pilot.

And again, as I said, related to review recommendations, which is only one element of activities that we suggest is in scope. But on a go-forward basis, there will be many other areas to work on as it pertains to the framework. I see some hands are up now. Xavier, do you ...? Giovanni, can Xavier go ahead, then?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Yes, please. I have just seen his hand up.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Giovanni. Just to raise and use the point that Maxim put in the chat that I think is a very good illustration of exactly the type of work we would like to do with the community groups, because Maxim raised the point that, for example, the GNSO first has a step within the council to create a list, basically, as opposed to have the entire GNSO work together in what he is describing would be a very anarchist-type of way to try to come up with a priority list. So, I think this is a very good illustration of the types of questions that we want to be able to talk about as part of the design process.

Should we, for example, also say, “Let’s have a small group work together to create a proposal and then bring that proposal to the community”? That’s a possible option. That may not be the only option,

but that may be an option to be considered because it's practical but also achieves the objective. Just, I think, I want to thank Maxim for putting that in the chat because I think this is exactly the type of conversation we want to be able to have in the process of designing this framework.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Xavier, and thanks a lot, Becky, for guiding us through this very, very enlightening presentation about your important project, about prioritization. And one question at my end: now that we are going to have this ... I mean, we have these slides because they have been published. Is there any way you'd like us to move forward?

I'm speaking about the SOPC. I mean, shall we wait for this session that you mentioned during your presentation, a brainstorming session together with you, or shall we already go through the slides and some of the questions that are included in the slides and provide you with initial feedback? How would you like us to help you?

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much, Giovanni. I am very happy to hear that work can be done. I would suggest that your group does review the slides and, if you'd like to provide feedback on suggestions/questions that were asked, that would be great.

But we would like to be able to have a consultation to review the output of that particular level of engagement, but also to go into much more detail about the techniques, and then the pilot suggestion, as well.

Meaning I think having the pilot, regardless of which area of work that it's on, is also a good way to just walk the walk or have some hands-on experience of what we might see will work down the line or what won't work and have total agreement about how we're approaching this from community members.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thanks a lot, Becky. The next session is about ... I see Bart has his hand up. My next question to wrap up this part is, by when do you expect this initial feedback? Is there a timeframe you expect us to provide you with some initial feedback? Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much, Giovanni. We are hoping to have consultations and feedback completed by early July on this initial set of questions, and then also to be able to come and meet with various SOs and ACs to review the techniques. And when I say review the techniques, it's giving some background on ...

We have researched, as noted in this presentation, 11 published techniques. We have prepared some pros and cons and identified a set of guiding principles, etc. So, that's the type of thing that we would like to also have a detailed session or brainstorming discussion with this group and other groups, as well.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thanks a lot, Becky. I see Bart and [Jaap].

BART BOSWINKEL: Yeah, it's more a scheduling and organizing or logistical question. It sounds more like you want to have a kind of workshop, not just limited to one hour but, say, more time. So, I think that's more the direction you are looking for, and that will be, probably, a bit hard to organize in a very short timeframe right now. But it is just to be sure that we're not talking about an hour-long session. This is a longer session, given the topics that you want to discuss. Otherwise, it's just touching on the topic and move on. Thanks.

BECKY NASH: Thank you, Bart. This is Becky Nash, ICANN Org planning. That's a very good way to look at it, is calling it a workshop. Thank you, Bart, for mentioning that. And I agree that it should be either, as Xavier said, two sessions of an hour each or maybe a session of one-and-a-half hours.

We will have opportunities through this iterative process of versions to keep the line of communication and discussion going, as well. Again, that's why we're saying that this project is going to span both FY 23 planning and then FY 24 planning, as well. Thank you very much for the opportunity to share these slides with you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Becky, and thanks again to all your [members of your team] to guide us through this project. I am having ... I'm conscious of the timing and, therefore, if there is not any specific, urgent question, I would just like to give you, really, one minute about the fiscal year 23

planning, which you can go back to that slide about the fiscal year 23 planning, which was one of the last slides of your presentation. Or you can ... As we do not have the slide sat in front of us ... Yeah, here it is. So, if you'd just like to have two words about this planning slide? Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much, Giovanni. Yes, we have prepared a tentative timeline for the FY 23 planning process. We just would like to highlight that both the kick-offs and engagement process starts for the IANA budget, which has a requirement to be submitted earlier. So, the community webinar for planning and kick-off we're suggesting is July. We're looking at having one combined webinar, if possible.

And then, just some key dates will be that the PTI IANA operating plan and financial plan would be published for public comment as a draft in September timeframe. And then, we have the public comment staff report in November.

Then we would have the ICANN FY 23 through 27 operating and financial plan. We are anticipating that to be published early December, and also to have a webinar early/mid-December, prior to the year end.

I know that that's always something that the community has to take into account, how work can be done over the ... Accounting for the year-end holidays in most areas. And we always make a point to extend the public comment period for that. And we would like to have the community webinars about the draft plans before that year-end

timeline. So, those are the key dates, and then we move into the staff report and other aspects following the next calendar year, in FY 22.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thanks a lot, Becky. Really, thank you so much. I know that we are short of time. Thank you for guiding us through the fiscal year 23 planning process. I would propose now that we are just two minutes behind schedule to wrap up this meeting, this SOPC meeting with the very special guests from the SCBO. Thank you so, so much.

Is there any other business anyone from the SOPC would like to bring up at this stage? I see no hands up, so we have some work for the SOPC. Just to wrap it up, we will work as the SOPC to refine the process for prioritizing this ranking exercise against the operating initiatives and functional activities. This is a work that we will do in the short-term, and we will present some proposals to the SOPC. We will coordinate with the SCBO.

Thanks again, Berry and John, for participating and for sharing your views. So, that's the first action point. The second action point is that we will follow up with Becky, Xavier, and their teams on this prioritization project. And thanks a lot for having given us this premier information about this project.

We will be more than happy, as ever, to help you to start and kick off the project. So, thanks everybody, and thank you so much to Bart and all the secretariat for your work, to the scribes, everybody. We'll stay in

touch. Again, thanks, everybody. This is the end of the SOPC meeting at ICANN71. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]