

# TRANSCRIPT

## SOP Working Group Meeting

Costa Rica 11 March 2012

### Attendees:

Fahd Batayneh, .jo  
Lesley Cowley, .uk  
Keith Davidson, .nz  
Sabine Dolderer, .de  
Byron Holland, .ca  
Debbie Monahan, .nz  
Giovanni Seppia, .eu  
Sieger Springer, .nl  
Leonid Todorov, .ru  
Peter Van Roste, CENTR  
Hong Xue, ccNSO Council

Bart Boswinkel  
Kristina Nordström  
Gabriella Schitteck

Unidentified Participant: But we do have that recording, but you need the mikes because-- for any transcription that occurs. So, even though there's not somebody on the call, we just can't-- (inaudible) posterity. Just make sure to be on the mike, whoever is speaking.

Unidentified Participant: Thankfully, I made some notes of our informal discussion before this meeting. So, we were just reviewing the discussions we've had (unintelligible). And I think (unintelligible). I think we got to-- we were talking around the need to understand the process and where the (unintelligible) that process. There's a suggestion of an audit trail of input into the various iterations of the (unintelligible) plan so that people know what has happened to their comments and where maybe another part of the community has said, no, we disagree or, for whatever reason, they haven't made it into the final plan.

And, for some of us, it felt like quite a formal exercise, and it was maybe an idea that we should get some better skills for the strength and support across the community, particular initiatives. So it's not always very clear when something is in a draft whether that has general support or whether it's a particular initiative in, say, one part of the community.

It would have helped to have (unintelligible) document and the plan beforehand so that we could have done some pre-thinking and some thinking of ideas that

we would want to contribute to that discussion. It would be great to have some clarity to the objectives can be changed or not because we think we heard that they couldn't and that, if we we're at the start of this process, then one would hope there could be a certain amount of changing of those.

The choice of facilitators is very important for these sessions, and, obviously, it's quite a challenge coming to this, particularly with all of the complex terminology and acronyms. And so, for anybody, of course, coming in new, that's going to be difficult. But quite a challenge I think.

We also talked around the-- what we felt was quite a gap between how ICANN perceives itself vis-à-vis its strategic plan and our perception of the strategic plan and the process. And we appreciated being asked at an early stage.

Is that what I think we got to? (Inaudible) again on the phone. Okay. So, thoughts or comments as to that, anyone?

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Strategic planning is not new to me. When I was working with a large advisory committee, I was in a working group, a strategic planning working group. I fully agree with the colleague (unintelligible) want to prioritized list has been set, it's very difficult to change it. It's almost impossible to change it.

One typical example I can present here is that ALAC has been requiring ICANN to put back the at-large summit into its strategic planning in 2007. And, after five years, that still cannot be done (ph). So the issue here is that-- who set those priority lists? (Unintelligible). I don't know where this 15 items come from.

The second one I want to comment is the link between strategic planning and the budget. It seems that most people believe that the budget is kind of consistent with the strategic planning. And, if they could link up the two processes and combine-- well, at least, to a common process, taking into account each other, I guess it would improve our efficiency. For example, recently ICANN just presented a new budget for '12 to '13 budgetary year. It's a \$3-million budget for IBM (ph) issues. And IBM, it seems, is a prioritized item But, if we don't understand the people at IBM and we don't understand why ICANN needs \$3 million for IBM implementation, especially if not implemented by ICANN but by this registry. (Unintelligible).

Unidentified Participant: Other thoughts (inaudible)?

Unidentified Participant: I think there was an element that we have included in the paper that (unintelligible) put together, which is the optimization of resources, which is something that it was highlighted by several of the working groups. It's a bit-- (unintelligible) that we didn't touch on that during the meeting we just had. I think it's an important aspect. And I know that ICANN is working on this, but, at the same time, I heard some comments that are a bit contradictory. I think we should reiterate this point to the people that are working on the strategic and operating planning of ICANN.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you, (unintelligible). Anyone else? Okay.

So, we've only (unintelligible) minutes left. (Unintelligible)?

Unidentified Participant: I just wanted to say or warn the SOP working group for the upcoming work. It's-- We just finished the responses on the ops plan and budget framework. I'm trying

to get (unintelligible) into the room on Tuesday to have a response, again, what he thinks (ph) of the feedback now he wants incorporated for whatever reason. So he will try to be there.

What I know is, from ICANN's perspective, now you will have the budget-- the bottom-up budget. It means all the departments get involved-- department heads, in order to substantiate some of the elements in the budget and ops plan to put more flesh on the meat-- or meat on the bones. That's probably the expression. I'm so sorry.

And the intention is that this document will be published around early May, ahead, again, of the Prague meeting. So that means that, around early May, the SOP working group will probably need to schedule some time again to go through the ops plan and budget and to respond on the draft ops plan and budget.

So, as soon as I know more, I will send out an e-mail to the SOP working group list, so we can, hopefully, schedule a meeting well ahead of time and so everybody can attend at this time. And I will ask again if (unintelligible) could run through the ops plan and budget as he did last time because I think that is very helpful for the working group, as well, one or two days after the budget has been published, to provide some more insight in some of the elements of it.

So that's the schedule ahead.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Thank you. (Unintelligible) managed to get in our comments on the operational plan framework. (Unintelligible) work on that. We just thought we'd touch upon-- how was that for you? Did that work as a process? Obviously, it's a bit difficult to have that conversation with Roelof not in the room. But, if there are any particular thoughts or comments, it would be good to capture them now. (Unintelligible) leading the subgroup, which is wonderful. Maybe (unintelligible) would like to comment. Giovanni (ph), (unintelligible)?

Giovanni Seppia: I think that-- I don't know. The process is a good process. And I think it's soon to be quite valuable for ICANN. The feedback we have been given is sometimes satisfactory; some others not.

One thing that I'd like to point out and is also something mentioned is that, sometimes, the documents that we are given to comment on and to provide input are really (unintelligible). And, sometimes, it's quite difficult to interpret what's behind the title of a project. And that's something that, you know, provide a comment. But it's based on a lot of assumptions. So a bit more flesh in the meat (unintelligible) is always welcome. And this is what probably all the other coordinators of the various working groups would need to (unintelligible). It's also in the interest of ICANN that we provide comments and input that is even better and, probably, even more constructive. So this is just my only remark at this stage. Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: (Unintelligible). Sometimes I have also (unintelligible) with the timing. (Unintelligible) some e-mails coming in, let's say, (unintelligible). This is three days later. (Unintelligible). That's something I'm really puzzling (ph). And the SOP committee is one of the most (unintelligible) on my priority list, and, therefore, I usually respond as soon as possible if I get enough comments. But, still, sometimes it's really tough, especially when we're talking about-- there are subgroups of subgroups. (Unintelligible) coordinate, frankly, some stuff I sent out. I have to apologize. (Unintelligible). I'm not sure if that's a process which is

(inaudible). It sometimes may be a telephone conference. But even the telephone conference sometimes gets information-- yes, we have to have a telephone conference next week (unintelligible). But, usually-- it's very often times an issue. And maybe we find a way (unintelligible) now, and then (unintelligible). Then I know that there is something, and I can actually prepare for it.

Unidentified Participant: I understand. So, in that sense, what Roelof and I normally try to do is to do it as quickly as possible, as soon as we know it. And it, unfortunately, is-- this time, fortunately, the public comment period was more extended, so we were way ahead of schedule. And that's a good thing. But sometimes it's really, really compressed, and maybe, just as an observation to strengthen what you're saying, is what I see from where I sit with all the different sub-working groups is that some people do not respond. And that's-- although they know it's coming and we've discussed it already at the Dakar meeting or at other meetings, we just see that some people, although they've-- they're a member of the working group or some of the sub-working groups, they do not respond, just as an observation.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible) request. (Unintelligible) a little information we could get, the more sometimes I think-- it's helpful for me sometimes (unintelligible) comments to reiterate our usual comments, more or less, because we have to. And I think that that's one of the things where I was (inaudible). But the question is: Is it really part of the power play, or are they really interested in informed dialogue?

Unidentified Participant: I think sometimes it's incompetency, or timelines just slip for various, good reasons. And I don't know about you, but I always find I've got something to comment on on the day I have a board meeting, for example, which makes it impossible to do anything else but my board meeting. Okay. Does anyone else have anything to add to that?

So I think what I've heard is that the SOP process is a good process overall. A bit more detail in the original documents would help us with making informed comments. And time (unintelligible) can be challenging and, especially, if there's not enough notice. And it would be good for us to continue to try to plan ahead so that we can comment and have enough time to (unintelligible) comments in their thinking and then the compilation. Okay.

Unidentified Participant: Sometimes it would be helpful to have a Website where you find all the documents in a compressed form because some of the information (unintelligible) e-mail started to (unintelligible) all the information.

Unidentified Participant: I'd say this working group has a Wiki space.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah, but sometimes a link (inaudible) but not the document. Sometimes I've started to search on the Website. Sometimes it's helpful if I get an e-mail (unintelligible), and all the information is there.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. I'd say what we've tried to do-- because I noted-- again, this is an observation-- that some of the working groups sometimes use Wiki spaces, and others don't. Maybe it's a good thing, again, to start really using Wiki spaces because they're there-- right for this purpose. And sending-- we posted the documents on the Wiki space (inaudible), and then it's easy for you to digest it and look at it.

Unidentified Participant: No. I'm happy to use it, but it seems that sometimes that we have-- I get lost with all the information where I find it.

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Right. Anything else before we wrap up this morning? No? Excellent. Thank you very much.