

TRANSCRIPT

SOP Working Group / ICANN Strategic Planning Session

Costa Rica 11 March 2012

Attendees:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo
Lesley Cowley, .uk
Sabine Dolderer, .de
Larisa Gurnick (moderator)
Byron Holland, .ca
Debbie Monahan, .nz
Oscar Robles, .mx
Giovanni Seppia, .eu
Leonid Todorov, .ru
Peter Van Roste, CENTR
Hong Xue, ccNSO Council

ICANN Staff

Akram Atallah
Bart Boswinkel
Carole Cornell
Kristina Nordström
Kurt Pritz
Gabriella Schitteck

Apologies:

Atsushi Endo, .jp
Roelof Meijer, .nl

Lesley Cowley: Okay, let's make a start then please. Okay, so, good afternoon, everybody. The more observant amongst you will have noticed I'm not Roelof. Roelof sadly is not very well today. And so I've been volunteered to just open the meeting. But I'm not going to be an active chair. I'm an SOP member as well, of course. So, apologies from Roelof and hopefully we'll see him later in the week.

If you weren't here earlier I warn you now the acoustics in this room are not good. If you are going to speak to mic, can you just speak fairly close to mic because the sound doesn't carry very well.

Anyway, this meeting is a follow-on from our initial discussions in Dakar where Kurt very kindly offered to get the involvement of this working group, who have a high level of interest and strategic plan in all things strategy as you may well have noticed, to engaged at a more earlier stage in strategic planning. So, we're delighted to have this workshop for you to join us, Kurt.

The intension is that this session be more of a conversation to the extent that we can have a good conversation in this room. That will be a challenge that I'm sure we'll rise to. So, with that, let me hand over to Kurt to set the scene. Thank you.

Kurt Pritz:

Thanks, Lesley. Are there people listening in on this? Should we do like a, like we would sit on the inside of the table and you could sit on the outside and then we can have a better -- should we try to do something to make this better?

So, I'll let you guys like sit on the good side, on the outside, and we'll sit on the inside. Is that alright with you? And then we can talk. Okay. So, staff's going on the inside of the table. And we're going to try and make this more of a meeting.

(inaudible)

Essentially strategic planning should kind of be fun, right? You're thinking about the long term. (inaudible) Where should ICANN be in the next several years? It should be sort of reflective and have enough time to think about what we're going to do in the long term. And we talked about, after a couple tries at sessions with the SOP, to get input on strategic planning.

I think we collectively thought that we were noodling words on the old strategic planning or creating, not having a discussion at the high level where we thought strategic planning should take place. And so, I think Roelof and the rest of the SOP members developed this idea for a more extended session. And so here we are. In a very real sense, it's been experimented, the first time we're trying it. So, I hope you'll look at it as an experiment and then make the session work as well as you can.

Akram and Carole and I are working on taking this sort of model and making it more effective across all of ICANN. We think the SOP is the best place to start because, in fact you are the most active group when it comes to participating in ICANN strategic plans. That time and effort that goes into that is well appreciated as well as the time we're investing in this space. (inaudible)

So what we've done is we sent around some materials. We've organized the program. And we've retained Larisa Gurnick who, based on my short experience, I think will be great at being an independent facilitator of this. She brings a lot of talent and skills to this program.

So, unless you want to say something Akram? Let's turn it over to Larisa. She's going to be our neutral guide with this program. Do you want to call a halt to the proceedings or make a suggestion at any step along the way, feel free to, and again, thanks.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you. I feel like I'm competing with a lot of noise here. But we'll do the best we can here.

Absolutely my pleasure to be here with you and I know we'll be talking about important things like internet identification systems. So, already I think ICANN is doing really well because it identified me appropriately. I am a complete newcomer here. And I am listening, learning and hoping to make this a really productive session for all of you here.

Great. Moving right along. Okay, so a quick review of the agenda. The first thing we're going to do is talk about ICANN strategy. And as Kurt said, we'll do that at the highest level, and we'll have some strategic questions to start with. Unfortunately, we don't have flipcharts to capture the feedback and answers, so we'll take notes.

And we're looking at about 60 minutes, just as a time check. 50 to 60 minutes that we're going to spend on a high level ICANN strategy discussion. And then we'll move into the discussion of the four pillars and within that area we have an update for you on the project, on the strategic initiatives and projects that Carole and Kurt will take us through.

Lesley Cowley: Sorry, the acoustics are really dreadful.

Larisa Gurnick: (inaudible) should be reflected in the strategic planning efforts. I also (inaudible) we're not going to take a look at the (inaudible) but I think you're all familiar with them. And please keep these documents in mind as we go through the strategic (inaudible).

So, (inaudible) three to five years, let me just pose that question and (inaudible).

Unidentified Participant: So, is there a way to approach that question? Yeah. First we want to exist, what do we see different? I guess the question is, that we want to exist and then how are we different and if we think about how we're different, maybe we could approach that by how is ICANN different in its policy development, processes, how is ICANN development different in its technical coordination, those sorts of things.

So, I think what Larisa is getting here, though, is can we start with any broad statement about where we think ICANN should be vis a vis the rest of the internet governance and domain name system coordination process.

Lesley Cowley: I think why we kind of went quiet is (inaudible) big question and it's a difficult starting point. But it's a as good a starting point as any. Since the (inaudible) is something that's always been there, but has been missing in some of the statements around who for. Who is ICANN doing this for? And so the (inaudible) doesn't quite capture the public interest, the non-profit nature, the multi-stakeholder nature for the benefit of everybody, not just the people who participate in discussions like this one.

Maybe that's a starting point?

Larisa Gurnick: Maybe that's a great place to start is really a discussion and identification of who all those stakeholders are. Who are the audiences that ICANN aims to serve through its mission?

I'm sorry I don't know anybody's names yet. And my little chart -- (inaudible)

Sabine Dolderer: My name is Sabine Dolderer.de. I'm not sure if we are, if we really should talk about who else (inaudible) issues to really try to discuss, because what we are seeing is that the ICANN framework is getting broader and broader and broader. And when I look up (inaudible) I see a lot of issues we are discussing right now at this meeting which have nothing to do at all with the tasks on the mission list.

So, basically, and when somebody's asking me what I would like, I can foresee in the next couple of years, making a few things right and not making even more things even more complicated. And so, what I see is, especially when we're talking about the mission, and we are talking about the technical coordination function of a few (inaudible) we have incorporated over in the last couple of years, (inaudible) do nothing about it. And the (inaudible) whether it's a clear function where you have a delegation of authorities (inaudible). And where we really should, and when (inaudible) established there was a clear guidance where the authority of some (inaudible) starts and where it's finished.

And at the moment we are trying to, we're seeing that, (inaudible) these clear authority. That's your authority, that's my authority. We are intermingling. We are saying if we are delegating (inaudible) top level (inaudible) you have to do that and that and that. Instead

of saying, we are delegating the authority, what you are doing at that stage is, at some stage, or at least (inaudible) is defined, is clear local policy. And I don't understand why that has to be in the (inaudible) are completely different.

And I think we should rather than discussing even more, incorporate even more people, it's where are our limits. And do we really speak to our limits. Do we (inaudible) much more often (inaudible) that's not our business. That's not in our mission. That's not in our core function. We don't have to deal with it. And that's something I would be really looking forward, I would love to see ICANN develop in that area.

Larisa Gurnick: So, if I may paraphrase. Make sure that we're all on the same page. What we're saying is looking for ways to filter based on the mission and the core principals to define what is within scope from ICANN's point of view.

So let me pose that question -- Chris, hi Chris.

Chris: I can't stick around for too long. But I just want to say, where do you see ICANN in three year's time is a really good question. Sabine, you talked about, things you see ICANN not doing. And what I've got to say is basically very similar to that but perhaps in a slightly broader brush way.

I'd like to see ICANN in three year's time as being exemplary at its mission (ph). And in respect to other internet governance issues, I'd like to see it being a respected advisor, facilitator, standing at the back of the room, contributing when asked to.

And one of the challenges of that is getting clear on what is ICANN's mission. And if you're clear on that, then the rest of it comes with time. But it's about getting (inaudible) as we're supposed to do, doing it in an exemplary fashion. And getting respect and contributing when asked to. And sometimes that contribution might be we have no contribution. We should be contributing when asked to. Thanks.

Lesley Cowley: So, for me (inaudible) being really good at a narrow role. And discussion actually what we mean by a narrow role. Because this narrow role as it currently stands is actually quite big. (inaudible)

Leonid Todorov: Leonid Todorov.ru. Let me offer a broader perspective by paraphrasing your question as to where ICANN might be in the three year period time. My sense is right now that ICANN is slowly but quite consistently slipping into very, very turbulent waters, because we know that in recent years that the IANNA (ph) contract has been prolonged just for six months. And with no applicants successful in meeting all the criteria.

With that strive of certain nations, to one of which I belong, to replace ICANN with some other structures, international structures, inter-governmental structures, not necessarily a multi-holder base structures. So in other words I would say that this is one aspect of those challenges ICANN might face within three years from now.

And also there is another important issue that I just thought of that because I would say that the major challenge for the ICANN is the ICANN itself. Let me just reference to that decade, was it 10 years ago when the first (inaudible) DLDs (ph) were launched? That was a fairly simple procedure. And there were some of them, not so many. But they were awarded by the end of the day.

If you check those applications, well, they're nice, they're humorous. They are quite substantive. But nothing compared to what we now are requested to do in terms of these new DLDs. So, that excessive bureaucracy, that search for legitimacy, as one of those papers about ICANN, recent papers, maintained is one of those challenges which ICANN

face. And Chris talked about that exemplary performance, so I believe that these might be one of those challenges that pop, that exemplary performance. Thank you.

Oscar Robles: I'm Oscar Robles.mx (inaudible) Mexico. I've seen (inaudible) on the process, on the strategic planning process in ICANN. And I see a group evolution on that regard. I think that we've seen this mission, core values, all these things that are starting to actually get together and tell us that you are doing the right thing.

But I would expect to see in the next three years, more attention to the second core value, which is meeting the ICANN action on the global coordination, let me just read it. By limiting ICANN's activities to those matters within ICANN's mission requiring or significantly benefiting from global coordination.

So I think that in some way, what others were saying here, I would see less activities but more effectiveness in what ICANN should do. Paying attention to limiting its role on very specific things that ICANN has to do.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you.

Kurt Pritz: Do you we want to talk for a couple minutes about what are those things ICANN has to do?

Giovanni Seppia: Hi, Giovanni Seppia.eu. I'd like to make a point regarding this process, the strategic and operating plan process of ICANN. And it's a point related to two elements. That this community, as well as other communities that pointed out to federal funds. And those two elements are consistency and continuity. And I think that in the past 7 years, we have been looking at major improvements in the way ICANN has been dealing with the value consistencies and communities.

However, what we have seen also is that sometimes there were some changes and those, they were not very well explained to the communities. And that has caused some confusion at certain points in some communities. So I think that even in this strategic planning exercise as we are doing now, if I look back I can remember that ICANN in 2005 was conducting this kind of consultation with the community.

And I do remember, that for instance, at the ICANN meeting in Marrakech, there were (inaudible) consultation involved in communities speaking Chinese, Arab, French and other languages. And that was a process that faced lots of (inaudible) a couple of years.

And then they changed again and then (inaudible) again. And I'm not talking about evolution, I'm talking about changes. And at some point, I believe it would be preferable for the community to see an evolution instead of changes. At least that goes to the consistency of the process itself. Otherwise you risk that the community at some point, it misses the links between one step and the other. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you. So, in terms of really defining what is the appropriate scope, narrowly defined, so that it fits within the core values that were raised. Let me broach the question, what would be some of those activities that would be within the scope?

Lesley Cowley: So, the most popular ones for this community will be IANNA. And also maybe I could add a kind of a rider to scope generally. In the organization's strategic plans, you'd also normally see the kind of ambitions. And I'm not talking about ambition in terms of new products or whatever, but ambition in terms of quality for example.

So, I guess one of the hot things for this community would be smaller IANNA services or something of that nature. So, it's the description that says this is what we're aiming for within that time window as well.

Unidentified Participant: That was kind of a trigger, because one of the, how we're going to go through this discussion is we are going to look at the four pillars. And so I wonder if we should get into that and try to answer Oscar's and Sabine's question about what the role is in terms of each one of those pillars. Maybe we could start with that. Does that make sense?

So, you know the four pillars in the strategic plan, Oscar? Security and stability, promoting competition, those general categories in the strategic plan. I'm wondering if we should get into the discussion of what ICANN's role is, vis a vis, each one of those four things, rather than globally. Or should we continue to talk globally for a while?

Oscar Robles: The thing is that there are so many things that when you're defining your strategic planning, you're not able to define a specific goal, which may trigger specific activities and actions and deliveries. So, you ended up investing a lot of money, a lot of resources and burdening your activities and your operation. And that's good because you should complete and fulfill that broader definition.

So, we have to work on narrowing those pillars and be more specific in what exactly we mean with security and what exactly we mean with stability and security for example. Or (inaudible). That's a huge thing without bottom. (inaudible) putting money in and we wouldn't feel comfortable at any time. So, we put \$100 million there and we will be working there. So, that's one thing.

So, I think that the philosophical principal here must apply like we see the government. Government has this legal system that they are allowed to do, but specifically worded in the Constitution or in the local laws. And they're not able to do something different from that definition.

ICANN is not like government. But may behave like government and do exactly what, and inside (inaudible). Otherwise, we're just growing and growing this bureaucracy. And as every single organization in the world, more is better. So with government, we have to put some limits, specific limits. And we have to agree on that. Those pillars are perfect, but we have to be more specific.

Larisa Gurnick: Well, since we're talking about the pillars, you ended your comment by saying the four pillars are perfect. I'd like to ask the group are the four pillars the right four pillars? And then maybe we can get into the discussion of the various strategic projects that currently make up each one of those pillars and take it from there. Any commentary on the four pillars?

Byron Holland: Hi, I'm Byron Holland from .ca. And I think the four pillars, without doing a blue sky exercise, an appropriate place to think about strategy here, particularly the DNS stability and the core operations pillars. The one that to me is a little bit concerning is the notion of a healthy internet ecosystem, or internet governance ecosystem. That is extremely broad and just building on Oscar's comments, it's an endless space. And if that is going to be one of the pillars, it has to be extremely clearly defined.

And I would suggest that that's actually going to be a very difficult one for the organization in the long term if you read what the specifics are to ease global participation and those types of things. That sort of makes the assumption that ICANN as a convener, but if it's a convener, what are the topics that are going to be discussed. And if it's, I think it makes it very difficult to have that pillar there if ICANN is strictly going to be a convener or a forum, or an enabler. Then how does it control the topics?

Because generally speaking, the topics often are going to range far and wide outside of what ICANN's core functions are, which I would argue are the first and third pillars.

So, I think the fourth pillar is the one that concerns me, not to be very narrowly defined. And I would also say, harkening back to the previous conversation for a moment. As the organization matures, it really needs to step forward in terms of its professionalization and support for continuing to secure strong staff and strong processes internally to build a really strong foundation. Because that has often, in my experience, been one of the challenges that it faces.

But I'd also just, one final comment, to give credit where credit is due. I've been involved in the strategic planning process from this working group's perspective since the beginning of this working group. And this year's strat plan from ICANN is a significant step forward from previous years. So I just want to acknowledge where good progress has been made.

Lesley Cowley: (inaudible) Byron's comments. I think for me, the first three pillars, the DNS, stability and security, competition and consumer trust in this area, and cooperations including IANNA, are what ICANN does, what ICANN should do.

The fourth one, the healthy internet governance ecosystem, is more or less the environment that ICANN is operating in. And ICANN on its own can't ensure a healthy internet governance ecosystem. But it has a part to play. So that the kind of different thinking, I think, to me in terms of where they work and the first three are the core business, as I understand it.

Kurt Pritz: I think that's exactly right. I don't know if there's a way to differentiate that in the plan and show that. But it's definitely part of our strategy, though, because we want to affect it, but we also want to swim in that ocean and survive with the other fish.

Lesley Cowley: Yeah, it's not the sole territory or the sole responsibility.

Larisa Gurnick: Sabine?

Sabine Dolderer: I'm a little bit puzzled, in principal on agreeing on the four pillars, but with the (inaudible). On the other side, the headlines are (inaudible) everybody can't understand everything amongst them and incorporate it. And why don't you use actually (inaudible)?

What I'm saying, coordinating a location of (inaudible) or coordination of the operation of (inaudible) instead of saying DNS (inaudible) which is something, which is much more (inaudible). If you talk about DNS, it's always security. (inaudible) you're not only talking about the DNS and security and stability, in the (inaudible) of ICANN and what ICANN is actually responsible for. But you're also talking about the DNS security and stability of the (inaudible) the cash resolver (inaudible). And I'm not sure if I can (inaudible). I thought about that.

If you talk about the DNS system as a whole, you're talking about a huge bunch of operators. You're starting with (inaudible) operators. You're having (inaudible) operators. You have the hundred point whatever million secondary domain name set of operators. You have the resolver, the (inaudible) operators which are all the ISPs worldwide. And we have sometimes the people that are running their own (inaudible) servers.

So you're talking about a real global system interacting with each other. I think ICANN is responsible for a part of that, for a very important part of that. They have a responsibility of coordinating of the DNS at the root level. That's it. And not part of DNS as a whole.

Because there are so many operators in there. ICANN can actually contract you to (inaudible) evolution of that system. They can coordinate with other very important operators about that.

That's if we're talking about hundreds and hundreds of millions of operators worldwide. And ICANN is not responsible for all of them.

Larisa Gurnick: Akram?

Akram Atallah: I think that with the (inaudible) agreements, I think that it is true that the pillars can be interpreted wide or narrow. And the purpose of this is essentially saying how do we interpret these pillars? So start with getting some objectives on the pillars. And then from that, get to some functional things that we need to do. And we would like to get from that even further in getting these functions measurable so that we can deliver operationally on these commitments that we make to communities.

So, I think that the discussion has been the space is wide. How do we define our limitations so that, in my view, if we take it as wide as it is, we will always fail anyway. So, it's better for us to define it as narrowly as possible and agree on where our role is so that we can put some metrics and actually deliver to these metrics, because that's the only way we can be successful. And I think that's an exercise that should get us there.

Peter Van Roste: Hi, my name is Pete Van Roste. I'm the General Manger of CENTR. We're the regional organization for Europe's (inaudible). Two things, just to add to the discussion, I think that basically the (inaudible) that people have been saying before, (inaudible) it's obvious that the core function, including IANNA, are for them the primary function of ICANN, that's what they consider to be the most important thing. Depending on who you talk to, you will see other things added to that, global policy coordination, IDMs, obviously depending on the regions.

My second point was that (inaudible) on the healthy internet ecosystem, I think we shouldn't be naive and consider this as a somewhat dangerous pillar because it's fluffy and could be as broad as possible. Because without that pillar, it wouldn't be in ICANN. So, I would even see it as absolutely a condition for ICANN, to enable ICANN to do the rest of this stuff. So I would be very careful not to underestimate the importance of that fourth one.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you. I would like to just, as we move into the four pillars and really get into the substance of the kinds of points that all of you are making. The four pillars, I think everybody found them on Page 5 of the handouts. And then also following that, there's an update that has been prepared that we'd like to walk you through and I'm sure that this will prompt some questions and discussions that will hopefully help us identify the scope and the kinds of projects that this group feels would be helpful as well as how to define more specifically what ICANN's role is within each pillar.

So, I will ask Carole to take us to that for the first pillar, DNS stability and security.

Carole Cornell: Thank you very much. First, I'd like to show you there is a key on Page 8 of the handout. And the reason for that is to help understand what the matrix is that you're looking at. The very first column was the strategic objectives taken direction from the one page, four column effort. That's the very far left column.

The second column is the strategic initiatives and projects that were identified in the second row of that four pager, just so you know where they came from. I think that's important.

The third column is some operational projects that are very specific that we are doing in support of those. So you can see that works.

And then the next two columns, the next one is project status. And this is, if you will, a quick high level status, if you will. Either something is new which means it's funded in FY13. It's continuing. It's a multi-year and so it's still on the list to be completed. The next is something that's been completed within this FY12 year. And then the last is a core element which means it has transitioned from specific project to ongoing work that we are doing within the ICANN's core set of activities.

And then the next column after project status is something called comment. And within comment we either said it was an ongoing activity, it had a one year expected completion, a two to three year expected completion, or a three plus year expected completion. And that was to give you an idea of where those projects were and when we anticipated them completing their efforts.

Akram Atallah: And they've decided not, about going to these projects and just discussing these projects. They've decided to look at these projects and actually say some of these projects we shouldn't be doing, some of them we should be doing, additional things we should be doing. It is a starting point, but not the goal here.

Carole Cornell: So, I don't think it's helpful to read every one. But I think if you look at the very first one and we thought we'd just start with the first pillar. And then we'll kind of do them one pillar at a time. Chris?

Chris: So, I just, one reason for this document is to describe some sense of progress that's been made on these objectives, but too, I want to just echo what Akram said. We really want to talk about each pillar and what you think should be done. So, I would view this document as more of a guide and not to review each project like Akram said, but rather okay we've got this on our desk. I would invite comments, what we think ICANN should be doing with regard to each pillar and not necessarily relying on the projects here.

Carole Cornell: So to start, for the DNS stability and security, I'm just going to deal with the far right side of this, so you can follow along. But, maintain and drive DNS availability. We consider that a core activity. It doesn't have a specific project at this point.

And I'm going to say this, in doing this table, there are lot of overlaps between other work and this work. So please don't think that there isn't work going on. It's just I tried to sort them as quickly to help give the visual opportunity to look at the work.

The next is enhanced risk, enhancement or resiliency. You can see that there's some core work as well as the advocate IPD6 adoption. And as you know, that's continuing on. The RPKI effort is continuing for two to three years. The GNS capacity building is continuing for two or three years. The facility, who is evolution, is also and the implement best practices for DNS business continuity planning, as you know that is continuing. And there has been quite a lot of published material for that. But it's still moving forward and the information security plan, we've done a draft already and we'll continue to update that.

So, that's a quick example of the first pillar. And I'm going to stop at the first pillar and open it up for dialogue.

Larisa Gurnick: Let me ask the question now that you've seen this. Are these the right projects? What's missing in here, if anything? And are these the kinds of projects that would be within the scope for this pillar?

Sabine Dolderer: I'm very sorry. I'm sure my positions may be a little bit theoretical for most of the people in the room, but if I can summarize, maintain and thrive (inaudible) root, great. Good job for ICANN. Maintain and thrive (inaudible) for DE, not your job. (inaudible) not your job. Enhanced risk management, resilience of DNS, (inaudible), as long as it's risk management for the IANNA function and not throwing away the tables, great, your job.

Doing for it registry, which is outside items, not your job. For most, (inaudible) adoption, as long as for the root, great. As long as it's for others, not your job. Enhanced international DNS corporations and (inaudible) facilitating whose evolution is the approach at bear. What evolution will DNS (inaudible). Nothing.

Improved response to DNS security incidents, on the root level great, but otherwise, yeah.

Unidentified Participant: And so, I really don't want to get into editing this list, though. So we really should have, you kind of say what should be on this list. It would probably be worded in a different way than might be here.

We wanted to get your ideas of what should be on the list. And rather than make it a check box. And so I wanted to get, if you have a comment about that great. And in the bylaws, or the core values, there are broad statements about promoting DNS stability. So, are you advocating that ICANN does that by example through its LROOT and IANNA performance? And limit it to that?

Sabine Dolderer: Yeah, but I think a huge portion of DNS stability is that ICANN is providing the one and the only unique root. So that would have clear, those clear, a very clear and unique root. And I'm not sure that it was ever meant that was an extension to the whole technical DNS system.

So there is a real value in there that there is a unique root. And that's (inaudible) to maintain that unique root. But I'm not sure that there is really a broad response that the DNS is a system of let's say delegation and you delegate authority. That's explicitly in the protocol. But by delegating authority it's very clear that the authority is the other one who has the mandate.

And especially when you're talking about CPTLEs (ph). We had a long, long, long discussion when we're talking about the skills of the CCNSO where we really, really clearly tried to define and succeeded to define that where I think mandates start and where it ends as far as the CPTLE.

When I talk to people within my country, there is a clear understanding that (inaudible) domain, the only and solely responsible person or organization is our organization. And we are the ones being in charge for Germany to run that system. And nobody will run to us and say oh please tell them to make things otherwise. And I think that's in all the countries of ICANN.

It might be different with GTLEs, (inaudible) they're our organization and they have a clear responsibility for what they are operating.

Debbie Monahan: Debbie Monahan from .nz. I agree with Sabine about the fact that CPTLEs keep their own parameters. So what I think would be good with something like this is a reflecting effect that I do believe ICANN's got a role in to help, sharing of knowledge between the G communities and the CC communities.

And I think like (inaudible) for example which is done there, I think some of the initiatives taken by some of the safety KLDs (ph) the Gs could actually learn from and vice versa.

And I think the whole thing about acknowledging the difference, that the fact that we can share and that ICANN is a forum, it's about sharing and knowledge and direction can actually take place. And that doesn't really come through on this. And I think it is a key role for ICANN and what they can achieve.

Oscar Robles: I agree with Sabine in general. (inaudible) but as a principal, the thing is that when IANNA or whoever delegated the first CTLDs (ph) and EPLDs, (ph) they didn't put too much attention to the technological conditions of the designated, authoritative (inaudible) nations. So you cannot undo that without creating more risk.

So, if we are in the ideal situation, I think that Sabine's comments should be applied. Everybody is developed. Everybody, every CTLD and every GTLD (ph) has good conditions, technical conditions, political conditions, stability, everything's okay. So ICANN should not get into these other branches of the DNS, should define things. Because that's what the RFP1581 (ph) establishes. They are delegating the authority under that branch.

But there are situations, this is not the ideal situation. It's like the (inaudible). In other words, something is differently done in the past when no one put attention to the technological capabilities. Some of us are, have had the evolution, some of us haven't had any evolution in that regard.

So, I think ICANN should look into creating ways to help those that are willing to be helped. And step aside from those that are not needing that help. And I have some ideas in case you are interested.

Larisa Gurnick: Well, let's hear the ideas.

Akram Atallah: But I think that is kind of like the brainstorming sessions that we want to see is that if there is an opportunity that you think ICANN should be doing something and we're not doing it, this is the forum to try to get it done, instead of we do it. It's not in the budget. It's not in the plan. And we have to do it. We want to plan it so that we can do it right. And then want to put the right metrics so we can succeed then.

So if there are activities that we should be working on, then should be, this is the right place to put it on the table. Also I think that somebody mention that ICANN's role of facilitator in this space. It's actually what we do. And that's true, and I noticed that we don't talk about it in this, but there is a working group that's trying to scope this pillar itself on the stability and the security of the DNS, to narrow of the scope of this and then what is our role and what we should be doing as well.

Lesley Cowley: Thank you, Oscar, for the list of wonderful ideas. I would just caution generally there's a danger of adding to whenever we have these kinds of discussions, we talk about what else ICANN can do and you'll end up with quite a wish list at times.

But also, we haven't really approached this from the other direction which is what do we stop doing? What actually, there are not limitless resources, limitless people and so on, there's quite a lot of constraint. And so the tendency will be to add as opposed to subtract. And I think we've got to guard against that tendency.

Akram Atallah: Thank you, Lesley. I agree 100%. But also I think an important way for us to add or subtract is to put the whole list and put the priorities. Because if we're doing something that is not as high priority as a new idea that we should be doing, I think that exercise would facilitate that.

Lesley Cowley: I agree. It's more than a priority, it's actually making sure that something's on the list at all.

Larisa Gurnick: Oscar?

Oscar Robles: Yes. Besides my role as a TO of Datamex (ph), I sit on the board of directors of LatTD which is a Latino association of the Latino, America and Caribbean region. And we were discussing about these things in the last three days. And one of those ideas is that there are some resources allocated for new GTNDs in some specific countries or including organizations with strong need of doing these kinds of projects.

There's no association for overly delegated CTPLEs. And some of them we recognize have a strong in several fields, not only in the technological part, but maybe ICANN should work with the regional organization, CTPLE regional organizations, to define what kind of help should be provided to them with funds from the community or ICANN manage, whatever, with some conditions, like the situation in Europe. Greece wants to receive some money, they have to define some internal things.

Europe are not going to, to define the specific things Greece has to do, but if Greece wants to receive money, they have to do those things. So, ICANN should not step into the IT world and (inaudible) and define the things that should be made. But, if they want to receive some help, they should have some political definitions in place, stability definitions in the longer term to ensure that all that help will be really beneficial for the stability of the DNS. And already the delegated (inaudible).

Akram Atallah: That's, I think, a noble idea to have the CNDs that are struggle, but I think that the space is probably better suited for the CCNSO organization to define a policy or something like that. So, I mean, if we get some recommendation from your CCNSO on how you'd like to do that, because I don't think we're the right people to say how to implement something like this. And what to do and how to do it.

I think it's a good idea, but I think it needs to mature and maybe needs to be worked out within and then come up to ICANN.

Sabine Dolderer: Just to mention it, when we got to the bylaws, it's definitely not in the scope of CCNSO, nor in the scope of ICANN. I understand the issue and I'm very sure that there were people being around visiting several CPTLEs but that's not in the scope of ICANN. It's not in the scope of the CCNSO.

Larisa Gurnick: Are there any other comments on the scope as we look at DNS stability? I know we moved in a couple of different directions, but are there any other specific comments on the scope, what's within scope and what might be outside of scope on this list?

Unidentified Participant: I want to respond to Sabine. I agree with your original assertions. So my question is for guidance, from everyone, is that you discussed the maintenance of the interoperable root. And so, the CPTLEs operate their own entities. What's ICANN's role with ensuring a safe, stable, single operable root kind of environment? What's our role for preventing the formation of alternate roots? Or ensuring there's support in the broad internet community for a single root?

Sabine Dolderer: I think, adding unique identifiers as necessary as fast as possible if it's necessary. Being consistent while changing (inaudible) for that, single entities. And let's say it was with regards to (inaudible) IDMs discussion, how long would it actually take to come up with, to add those IDMs where they are really evident. That it, I think in 2003 the first IDM A-standard was actually brought out and (inaudible) we opened up the Dutch DE (ph)

space for IDMs in 2004 and I was very, very sorry to our community that it took us one year.

And (inaudible) I think (inaudible) it took 8 years after the first (inaudible) to come up with a unique identifier. It was created (inaudible) that's unique. It was obviously that there was a CLD (ph) operator being (inaudible) able to maintain it. But it took 8 years to come up with a standard. We're seeing a lot of discussions about user confusability of IDMs, but I don't think, certainly I think it's (inaudible) discuss confusability, while on a technical level the identifiers are unique.

I'm not sure that there has to be a discussion on a global level that somebody in China maybe confused about some Cyrillic character in Russia or some Greek character somewhere. We have had all these discussions over 8 years. And it blocks people with real, real, real interest from entering into the space.

I discussed this with Arab colleagues, they say, you in the US, not only in the US, but you in the US your children they can actually use the internet in their language. Ours can't. And similar was in Russia. And I think, and we are discussing about people who are confused because they might be seeing a confusing character which they haven't seen in America (inaudible).

I think that's, if you really, really want to look up what the people need, you just ask them. If there are real people who need it and of course the (inaudible) is a little bit more confusing. But it doesn't really prevent the further problems.

And be responsive to the peoples' needs globally. And not (inaudible).

Larisa Gurnick:

Leonid?

Leonid Todorov:

I'm going to try to conceptualize what Sabine has just told us. Because I agree, I fully agree. The problem, again, lies in that too broadly formulated mandate on the one hand and that quite understandable strive for covering whatever aspect within the ICANN's reach.

So I believe that if we try to narrow down the focus, that would be, well, an organization which is completely technical, (inaudible) with some kind of, I would say, touch of educational efforts, with very clearly set communication channels, with a minimum of bureaucracy. And as Sabine has just told us, very attentive to all those, let's say, technical needs of the global community.

That would be, if that underpins the strategic initiatives, then we would just certainly be whole heartedly in agreement with ICANN on every issue. So, this is again, as I mentioned before, the problem is not even that external environment which we have to cope with or address, rather the problem is somewhere in the ICANN. And something should be done about that mindset, if you will. Thank you.

Lesley Cowley:

Maybe I could be slightly, essentially, not very correct as it were, but I think there's some language in the strategic plan that sounds great, sounds very worthy to do capacity building, to do capability building and so on. But because that's quite loosely worded, that could be taken to being the end of very worthwhile things.

And that's where you get the discussion around is that ICANN's scope? Is that somebody else's job? And of course, a lot of organizations are quite financially constrained. Therefore, that's the kind of temptation to open up the floodgates for all sorts of requests that can be squeezed under those headings. And could affect the quite a big distraction at ICANN.

So what I'd like to see, whilst those are those worthy things to have, is some sort of field, a scale, a limit of those. Because I foresee particularly with the GTLD income coming on stream et cetera, that there would be even more pressure for things like that to be done by ICANN because here you are. It's in your strategic plan, so you should be doing this.

But I would still like to see those things going on of course.

Larisa Gurnick: In order to clarify some of the optimal wording, broadness, do you see this as something that can be more clearly defined to Akram's point where the objectives are worded in a more precise way? Perhaps not on the one page. Maybe that presents a bit of a challenge. But that it would start with a more specific wording of the strategic objective which would then lead to a more specific definition of the strategic project and all the way down.

Lesley Cowley: Absolutely. (inaudible) makes it easier to measure and show that you're meeting the metrics. But importantly it would help manage peoples' expectations as well.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you. Well, I'd like to move on to the next pillar if we may. Competition, consumer trust and consumer choice, so that we can give at least some consideration to all the important pillars that we've got here.

If you can please turn on Page 6 of the handouts. Carole had already walked you through the framework for how these charts were developed. So, I'll give you a couple minutes to review just the general nature of the projects, the strategic objectives and the operational projects that are underway.

How about some comments?

Carole Cornell: Do these projects generate any thoughts in terms of areas perhaps that require a little more definition and clarity?

Lesley Cowley: I have two kind of questions, maybe I'm being a bit thick. But the last one around increasing industry competition. The project is about expanding stakeholders. So I'm not quite sure how the project links to the strategic objectives. Maybe it's because we're in shorthand mode, as it were. I have a more general point, but I've forgotten what it was. I'll come to it in a minute.

While he's doing that, I've remembered my general point which was the affirmation commitment was quite strong on measuring ICANN's effectiveness in this area over a period of time. And I kind of assume that somebody else is doing the root fact to the AOC (ph) to check that those initiatives will deliver on those commitments within the respective timeframe.

Unidentified Participant: And so the AOC requirement is really to measure the effectiveness of this task, right? It's seeking to attach some metrics to the introduction and (inaudible).

Lesley Cowley: The AOC is not just seeking to measure.

Unidentified Participant: I know that. But in that bullet, one of the tools is to measure the effectiveness of the new GTLE program. By measuring, by seeing if the goals of the new GTLE program, as specified in the policy, were met and determine if changes were made. But if you expand stakeholders, they just get really big.

Sabine Dolderer: When I try to compare our business with usual business, when I talk about competition, usual business has usually possibilities that the people entering the industry are able to

come up with new ideas, new business models, new things, that they can actually get success with it or they fail with it.

What I see within the ICANN framework is a complete harmonization of the industry. Everybody has to do their thing. And I see there's no potential for failure, because we see that somebody is sitting in the background and taking over. And holding our hands and telling us what exactly to do.

The question is maybe ICANN should think about using the usual definition of competition where they are allowing more playground for the people in the market. And letting them fail. Why not, where's the problem? If the users know that they can fail.

If I buy my washing machine with an industry operator, a washing machine is actually much more expensive than a domain, I always have the potential that it fails. And it's not only a big problem that it fails, if there is really somebody interested in taking the business over, we'll find somebody. And if the business is not valuable enough to be taken over, so then it fails.

So, maybe we should look a little bit more in the usual type of businesses where failure is part of the real life. And I'm not sure that we actually have to build up an environment where everything is harmonized, every business is taken, every registration is done exactly the same. The TLDs are not able to fail.

And ICANN is the protector and regulator of all of that. That's how it currently looks to me, how all the things are implemented. But I'm not sure that that's something which we have seen a similar model in the whole rest of the industry-wide. Maybe we should be looking more for a --of course if it's sales, we need a sort of cooling down or protecting a little bit. But I'm not sure that we really need such an amount of additional protection to usual businesses who want to generate revenues and of course are able to fail.

Unidentified Participant: So, I think a new GPLD is more expensive than your washing machine, but your washing machine's more expensive than a domain.

So, anyway, I agree whole heartedly that innovation results from the environment where people can try things and fail and some people try and succeed. And I don't think the new GTLE program is antithetical to that. I know that policies were put in place to have a soft landing for registrants that rely on their registration in GTLD. But it was I think encouraging innovation and also recognizes failure.

And maybe we don't talk about that enough when we have these discussions, but I think that we're encouraging innovation and some failure is going to result.

Lesley Cowley: I don't feel as relaxed about my domain failing as I do my washing machine failing. So, if my washing machine fails, I've probably overloaded it, but I still manage to operate my business. If my domain fails, I'm not quite so relaxed about that.

I think also particularly from some research recently done in the UK, the whole kind of trust of consumerism, businesses on the internet, will fail if there is widespread failure in this industry. Probably trust won't be affected by my washing machine breaking down, one would hope.

Sabine Dolderer: I whole heartedly disagree on that. And I have seen the failure of (inaudible) or one of the major ITs in Germany, and there was no provisioning at all made for that, for (inaudible) happen like that. I think we live in an industry where things can fail and will fail. And I'm, people have both the potential to merge, to find other ways.

Lesley Cowley: Maybe we need to pick this up offline, but I think yes, there's innovation, yes there's some failures. But I don't see the failure of an ISP or whatever is quite the same as a TLD failing and the affect that that failure could have on trust in the rest of the TLD market.

Larisa Gurnick: Lesley, so if I may follow up on your comment. What do you see the role for ICANN in that capacity to preserve the trust?

Lesley Cowley: I think it goes back to the things we've been talking about a long around the whole (inaudible) operations so that any failure isn't down to a failure in ICANN's operations particularly.

Larisa Gurnick: Are there any comments? Any other thoughts on scope in this pillar?

Okay, why don't we move onto core operations including IANNA. Page 7. So, please take a minute to review this, same deal.

Byron Holland: Not to burrow down into specific things, but I can't help but notice that the FSR financial system is listed as complete and I can't help but recognize that we've been asking for information and we keep being told that there is work to be done on the financial system. In fact, I think if I recall correctly, Stage 2-4. I'm just curious as to how this reconciles with that.

Akram Atallah: The FSR is complete in the sense that we've delivered on what the original plan requirements were. We are entering all of the data since July 1st into (inaudible), that is an important effect that is (inaudible). I think that from the learnings of FSR, we'll do some (inaudible) that are (inaudible).

Lesley Cowley: (inaudible) in on the conversation.

Akram Atallah: (inaudible) inject noise. (inaudible) we're not getting the data (inaudible) the system. There is also some simplifications that we would like to do the way (inaudible). (inaudible) complications. We have to find alternatives to make it simpler also. (inaudible)

Byron Holland: So there's done and then there's done done. And we're not quite there yet.

Akram Atallah: I think that --

Byron Holland: It doesn't quite accurately reflect the --

Akram Atallah: It's not quite complete as in the sense that we can deliver to every, all the ambitious goals that we had. It's disappointing of course to see that we have the structure to get the data so that we can supply them back everywhere we want to, but we're not able to get the data because every user has to be able to get the data and it's not as user friendly as it should be.

So, it's disappointing from that aspect, but I think that we need to still achieve, our goal is the same, just figure out how to get there.

Lesley Cowley: So, I guess, I was going to ask a similar question, but more broadly on each of those headings. So if you take an HR management system, a human resources management system, the activities about kind of putting the system in, but actually that's probably only part of the overall thing, because normally you're putting the system in order to better manage your resources, better make sure that you can process increases or leave or whatever.

So, in a way I guess probably what we're seeing here is a window on one bit of activity that's towards a broad range. And the same with the finance system. So, you put the system in, and when you've done that, of course you then have to work back, better reporting and better analysis as a result of having put that system in.

Akram Atallah: Yes. For sure, Lesley. And actually, to be clear, the continue label is actually included this fiscal year. So, the one year which showed FY13, as we defined it earlier. So, to be clear, that continue, nothing was done on it already, but it actually should be finished in this year.

Now, on all of these systems, yes we, for example, HRMS, for a company with 150 employees, with much more international and much more complicated than a (inaudible) that would have 150 employees. So, from that perspective, even though we're small, we behave like a much bigger corporation that is in a lot of different places, has been for years, in more than 15 countries. All of these kinds of things that provide more issues that normal companies outside won't see.

So, we're implementing all of these things to improve because we're going practically, on the HR, we're going from Excel spreadsheets to the system. So, it's that much of a leap that we're taking right now. And the system will include at least two different HRMS systems, one local DNS, one outside. It is a big jump.

Lesley Cowley: So, you're selling yourself short on the objective because the objective is to better manage your people, as opposed to just putting in systems.

Byron Holland: And I want to follow up on that point specifically, actually. I think that you're looking here at tactical objectives as opposed to what is more the strategic goal of said system. Right? I mean, however you want to measure success within HR, all kinds of different ways you can do it.

But it's to create that high performance culture and high performance team and world beating HR environment, right? I mean, to me that's a strategic goal and this would simply be one way to facilitate getting to that goal. So, when I look at core operations, and excellence of core operations, I don't see here what I would think you'd want to see in terms of what is the objective here. And that's but one of them.

And when I referred earlier to building that strong foundation of a company or an organization upon which you can pile all the more sophisticated issues that ICANN has to deal with, this to me is that core foundation. And I'm not sure it's being articulated clearly enough here. And maybe it's not being considered in the way that it should be considered in terms of building a world class high, high performing organization.

Because these are tools, these aren't the goals. I mean, obviously putting it in and implementing it, there is a set of goals to doing that, but that's not strategic to me. This is just an enabler, not a strategic goal.

And I think we should see those reflected a lot more here. I mean, these are all important systems, but what are you trying to get to? Just ticking the box that software's installed is not the strategic goal here.

Larisa Gurnick: Giovanni?

Giovanni Seppia: Thank you. Just like to highlight one of the strategic objectives which is the international relations. And that also goes back to the first question, how do we see ICANN in three to five years time? And how do I see now ICANN in terms international relations? Actually, it's still far away from being recognized as a real international organization.

And unfortunately, that goes back to the fact that there was, there's been a lack of continuity in the international relations sector. So my recommendation would be, I don't know what is the work behind defining international efficient principals. But my recommendation is really to make sure that continuity is there.

As, currently what we are seeing, and I can speak about Europe, that there is a big gap between what are the European organizations, international organizations and ICANN. And that is primarily caused because of the lack of continuity in the (inaudible).

So, again I would like to recommend to include the objective of continuity in the international relations, when developing and thinking about that. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Giovanni, can you define that as a strategic objective? What is continued excellence in international relations? Or global relations?

Giovanni Seppia: To me, (inaudible) assuring continuity in international relations means that when we start a dialogue with any international organization, no matter if it's big or small international organization, this dialogue is a regular dialogue. And there are no six month gaps when answering their questions or when addressing a high level principal.

And that doesn't, let's say, show a good profile of ICANN. On the contrary, it shows that there are many issues, internal issues that are still to be sorted out. And I don't want to give examples, but fortunately or unfortunately, I've planted examples of (inaudible). And again, that to me is a sign that there was something that, with really minimum common sense could have been avoided. And this common sense again is linked to continuity in relations.

This is really crucial to every international organization. That whenever there is a dialogue, the dialogue is continuous. Even to say hello, from time to time. It's not always to discuss important matters. But just to say hello, here we are. Ready to help. Ready to share our expertise. Ready to share what we are doing. If this is the (inaudible), again, it's a long way to becoming an international organization.

Peter Van Roste: Peter, from CENTR. Just picking up on Giovanni's point, and I might have missed it. Is there a reference to metrics that are being used to define what internationalization actually is? Is it employees? Offices?

Akram Atallah: There will be a survey coming out to the entire ICANN community on internationalization that BDRC or the board of governance, governance relations committee has developed. And that we are looking to define exactly the metrics that the community would like to see us focus on in the sense of becoming more of an international organization.

And we actually hope that everybody will participate and take the survey so that we can use this to define the more important metrics instead of just coming up with some, put an office here or put an office there, and that's how we become international.

So, it's very important for us to hear from the entire community and Kurt, I don't know if you want to add anything to that, but we've been asking for everybody to advertise this and ask for the input because without your input we would not be able to define the right metrics.

Larisa Gurnick: Other questions there? Comments?

Byron Holland: Sure, I'm going to keep harping on the same thing. But I think particularly for you Akram, you're sitting in a room full of operators. I think you can set the bar a lot higher than what

we see here. And I think you'd have, I may be speaking out of turn for my colleagues here, but I think you'd have strong support if you set that bar a lot higher and built this foundation a lot stronger, than what this would suggest to us in the community.

I mean you have the privilege of working in an incredibly dynamic industry that should attract the best and the brightest globally. You have the luxury of no financial challenges, notionally speaking for an organization, in one of the most compelling industries going right now. I think you can set that bar a lot higher across the board and really turn around the organization itself and then allow it to then better develop some of the more sophisticated and challenging elements that get set on top of it.

So, I think that you can raise the bar a lot here as an organization. And that the people in this room and others would strongly support that.

Akram Atallah:

So, I have (inaudible) this a lot and I think that one of the things that is not showing in here very well is that the bar is set higher. The representation is, like we said earlier, is not representing the goals of the organization in this transformation right now.

But we are setting the goal much higher. We are setting the goal at, actually at an enterprise level, much bigger than ICANN. But getting there with the current workload of the staff that's doing the changes as well as delivering on what they need to deliver day to day is one of our biggest challenges. It's not the goal that's lacking, it's actually the -- and I may be more conscious of spending than I should be, but I'm very focused on doing it with, that I'm doing it with other people's money, that I don't like to overspend to get the result.

I don't want to hire outside consultants to do everything for us. So, these have been some of the challenges that keep us from maybe turning the corner within 24 months and instead would probably turn the corner within 36 months from when the plan started.

So, these are the kinds of things that maybe we, I should revisit, but that was the original plan.

Larisa Gurnick:

Sabine?

Sabine Dolderer:

I'm talking, this is quite a long when can, and very often I see very much that I can strive to bring in people to draft their comments. . But very often when I see the mailing lists here, type of thing is out, we have (inaudible) comments or listening to.

What I view is that you generally receive a lot of comments, usually. And when I see that the (inaudible) of this, we try to incorporate people more if we send out a survey and we are asking the people. I'm not sure that you will receive more answers than you receive usually.

So, then maybe, I don't have a good idea of how you can actually come to another (inaudible), but maybe you should preview the strategy of sending 20 pages, 50 pages, papers asking for comments, receiving three of them and saying, fine community is happy. I'm not sure that that works on the long run.

And at least for myself, I can speak, sometimes I'll look, what's the issue about? How much pages? And I say, it's not worth me to read it and therefore I don't comment. But it doesn't mean I don't have an opinion on the big issue. But maybe you should think of, come into a dialogue with the community and how you should come up with a better way of interaction where the people actually really come in. Sometimes I'm really (inaudible) about the material like I receive and I see, sometimes I look, has somebody commented and (inaudible). And usually firmly one or two, even sometimes it's nobody commenting. And I'm not sure if that's the way to do a dialogue. And to (inaudible) we will send out a

survey. I'm not sure that you will receive a lot more answers and a lot more substantial answers.

And maybe just, I don't have an idea how, but I think the current way of interaction is maybe improvable.

Lesley Cowley: I mean, bear in mind when we started off it was 3 to 5 years sort of horizon. I think there's something around evolving how we work. And I mean that quite boldly in terms of how ICANN works and how the community works. Because I would query whether this module is still sustainable over that period.

So I was talking the other day in the in the SONAC (ph) chairs meeting and we were also talking today specifically in the CCNSO work planning session around the capacity of the volunteer force. So, again this is something within that longer term things that maybe we should start thinking about now as to how sustainable that is.

And we have a similar thing back in the UK and I'm sure colleagues have similar experiences, where we're putting out stuff to comment, you get one or two comments back, one says it's black, one says it's white. Then you haven't got enough to help. If you put out something really controversial, you get a load of feedback, of course. But that's not kind of a good way to develop obviously.

Unidentified Participant: That's sort of the nature of the public participation process. I actually read something called the Public Participation Handbook. And it said, if people don't want to comment, you can't stop them. Or something like that. And so that's a fundamental issue with all the bottom up models such as this.

I wonder, Byron, if the rationalization between Akram's comment and yours about setting the bar higher really goes to how do we state our objectives in a strategic plan? Like you said, these almost border on operational in nature, implementing software. And so, being at long term we can be fairly lofty, but we want to use words different than excellent or best in class. I'm trying to think of how to put it in a strategic plan that sets the appropriate bar and keeps it at a strategic level.

Larisa Gurnick: I'd like to find out if there's any thoughts on this idea of getting the feedback from the community. Everybody's having the same challenges. There's no real answers. But are there examples of engagement and involvement that are more effective perhaps than surveys? Is there something that ICANN ought to be considering doing differently?

Akram Atallah: We just changed the way we do public comments based on the working group that did that work and then came up with some feedback on that. But I think it's a tough problem. It's a tough nut to crack because the working group, when they came out with their recommendations, I don't think they were really radical changes that actually are going to cause us to all go wow, this is going to change everything.

So, I don't know how, I don't know if you have more feedback on that and that you want to share with the team on this. One of the things that we're trying, that I'm concerned with is what you want to call feedback fatigue. We put all of these things for reporting and they come at you so fast that you just give up. It's like he said earlier, you look at the subject and then you decide if it's really, really, really worth your time to actually comment and most times you pass on it.

And the surveys are the same thing. And we're trying to centralize these things and try to space them out and give enough direction so that people get preparation time instead of just doing it at the last minute and stuff. But that's also minute changes. They're not, I don't think that they're going to cause any major upheaval in the feedback that we get.

So, it is a challenging issue. I don't know how we get to that, but I think there's a lot of elements to it. I think getting more people into the whole (inaudible) community, fresh blood that is more willing to do that. I think that could help. I think it could be a lot of small changes across the board that could help us instead of just one major change that's going to make all the difference. But we're open to any suggestions and any, on that subject.

Peter Van Roste: Peter, from CENTR. Just based on experience, when at CENTR we're considering how we can best get feedback, I always use the rule that when we're gathering data, surveys are the best. When we're gathering opinions, writing our own paper and then asking for comments seems to work much better than asking for opinions to a survey.

Because then again, you end up with what like you said, you get black and white. You get people misinterpreting the questions. And when you send out a proposal, it can be quite controversial but there's probably no need for that in this case. I think you'll get more substantial and more useful feedback.

Larisa Gurnick: In the interest of time I would like to move on to the last pillar which we already know is probably the broadest and deserves the most attention. So, can we talk about a healthy internet governance ecosystem for a moment? And really reflect on how important that is to the environment in which ICANN operates and how to look at it in a more framed perspective so it's not the world at large, but has some scope and definition.

How about we go straight into comments on this?

Lesley Cowley: Just because nobody else is saying anything I'll fill the space. So, I think, I mean going back to my comment earlier, this is one that is very broad and ICANN is but one player in this whole general, healthy internet governance ecosystem.

It feels to me, we've been doing this strategy process at (inaudible) that this is one of the particular challenges over the next 1, 2, 3 years, much more so than has been previously. So, I don't know to what extent yet ICANN board or senior staff have been able to kind of think about the environment that you're operating in on this one. Because this text kind of feels like an iteration on from where we were last time. And everything's moved on since.

But I think for me the thing that's kind of missing by that, but probably is implied in some of the words is the working with the other organizations in this space, and particularly in terms of international staff, the ISOCS (ph) of this world, et cetera.

But the ability to work with country codes and with GAC members, to ensure that we are all working with our governments, I think somehow hasn't quite ever happened. And we need to be a key element of that over the next 1 to 2 years.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Lesley. Are there any further comments?

Unidentified Participant: How does ICANN articulate a strategy for participating in the internet governance discussion either through the IGF or WIKID (ph)? How do we articulate a strategy for participating effectively, I think with a goal with the continued well being of the ICANN model in mind?

Lesley Cowley: Maybe the strategy should be to develop a strategy. Because I'm not sure there is one, apparently. And how do you develop it? When we look at the environment, you look at what's happening and then you think, okay so what the hell are we going to do and how

are we going to do it? I mean, maybe at this stage, but I'm not sure that that is there just yet.

Sabine Dolderer: (inaudible) I'm not sure if it's really a strategic objective to be (inaudible) international whatever organization. Sometimes I think it's a chicken and egg situation. If you do your things right, if you come to your core objectives, if you do your operation very well, then you get the authority, you get the trust and you get the ability to be a truly trustful organization.

So, I don't think it's just the strategic goal to actually make the world believe that we are such an organization, but I think to some extent, it's the result of your work. Or what makes it successful is it's interlinked. Of course you have to, of course sometimes international work is part of your work. But you build on your operational success. (inaudible)

Larisa Gurnick: How would you go about, how you would suggest that ICANN go about measuring, defining what those benchmarks or successes would be and measuring? If it is indeed to be an outcome of all the other work of the organization.

Sabine Dolderer: If somebody wanted to (inaudible) another additional task in 3 years, saying yes you are the organization we want to have these additional (inaudible) and you were successful. Because then you have the (inaudible).

Lesley Cowley: I mean, I think you're right. Doing what you do really well is part of proving your space. So, maybe the key word in that objective is multi-stakeholder. So, particularly in the changing political environment unless you can prove that you are doing multi-stakeholder things really well, and demonstrate that's why multi-stakeholderism is the correct model for this space. Then you could be operationally brilliant. But it's not going to be enough.

So if we're talking about ICANN being a model of a multi-stakeholder success, as well as being operationally excellent, then that gets you there. But being operationally excellent on its own probably isn't going to be enough to defend that multi-stakeholder model, I think.

Sabine Dolderer: I think that's partly right. Of course, it is obviously a, it's a more favorable model. But as long as it's not delivering things like really (inaudible) country, are the NCLDs (ph) needed? (inaudible) Nobody is interested in the organizational framework of ICANN. So, of course it's a chicken and egg situation. But I think that to some extent that something to (inaudible) to deliver, it's part of the criticisms of the people today.

Larisa Gurnick: Any other feedback on the topic? I think the, what we heard is that perhaps there needs to be a clearly defined strategy that helps frame exactly what is intended by this pillar and what some of the deliverables would be.

Byron Holland: I just want to build on the comments that were made there. I think that excellence in operations will not solve the problem in and of itself. But it gives you the credibility to stand upon what really in a sense gives the model its authority and the beauty of the model is the multi-stakeholder element. And I think that this organization, I hope, can walk and chew gum at the same time. That they just take care of their core business in a very effective and excellent way. But also provide the forum that enables the multi-stakeholder model and it's between those two and the interplay of those two things, that you will then get the recognition of hopefully being the benchmark of multi-stakeholder models.

Akram Atallah: I agree with you, Byron, 100%. I think that doing our operations well is comparing ourselves to any other organization that whether they do good or bad or, it doesn't

actually talk a lot about our end product. And when you look at the multi-stakeholder model, that's really our differentiation. And if we can use our differentiation and make it better than the other alternatives, then that's when we are successful. So we need to have both.

We need to have the operational excellence, so that we can optimize our performance and then perform at the high level, but also we need to make our multi-stakeholder model stand out as something that can not only bring everybody from bottoms up, but also deliver solutions and address issues, so that it drives the pull for everybody to come there because they know, they come to ICANN their issues, this is the right place for their issues to be addressed.

And that we, that ICANN can enable the solution, not necessarily that we solve it, but that we actually enable the solution efficiently.

Byron Holland: Yeah, because I think it's the cooperations piece, that gives you trust. If you do that well, you will get trust. And upon that trust, if you do the multi-stakeholder model well, then you get legitimacy. And we need both in this organization and we can't have one without the other, no matter how effectively we make a widget, that's only a piece of it.

In order to have legitimacy, it's doing the multi-stakeholder piece well. And then together will enable us to tick off these boxes.

Larisa Gurnick: This might be stating the painfully obvious, but to go back to our original question, where do we see ICANN in 3 to 5 years? Is it then an organization that has mastered the operational and the multi-stakeholder model to achieve that excellence?

Unidentified Participant: (inaudible)

Larisa Gurnick: Alright, so just moving on because I'm mindful of the time. We have to be out of this room a little bit earlier than we originally planned. So, thank you so much for your participation and for feedback and speaking candidly. We will have the transcription from the recording hopefully. We'll have notes that Carole has been taking very diligently. And what will happen next is that all of this will be considered and digested and there will be a written response to this group that formulates what the next steps would be.

And that's certainly, this is all going to be very helpful in terms of the meetings in Prague where we look to do this sort of a forum and framework even more effectively and productively in a broader group with representation not just from one organization, but many different voices who really will speak to the multi-stakeholder point of view. So, thank you very much.

Kurt Pritz: I'd just like to, Larisa, thank you so much. This was Larisa's first exposure to anybody in ICANN at anytime, anywhere. So, a pretty stunning performance I think. And just to put one more thing onto Larisa's to do list, (inaudible) we're also taking back away to improve on our interactions with the community, the broad community on formulating the strategic plan.

So this will be very helpful in that. And then you can expect to see from us the results of that and our requests to participate in the next round, if you would. It would be terrific. So, again, thanks very much.

