TORONTO – Budget Process Ad Hoc Joint Working Session
Sunday, October 14, 2012 – 16:30 to 18:30
ICANN - Toronto, Canada

XAVIER CALVEZ: Hello everyone. I think we may want to wait another couple of minutes because I know there are other persons who said they would participate, including one or two Board members I think, and I would just want to give them an opportunity to participate from the beginning. So maybe another couple or three minutes, and by then we'll just start. Thank you.

So I know we're waiting also for Marilyn Cade, I think, who said she would come, Steve Metalitz who is going to come back soon, so we'll start in a couple of minutes. I think we should start. I think we're waiting for – well we're not going to wait, but we're expecting a couple more people to come, but we should start nonetheless. It's already 10 past the beginning time, so let's go.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: So this is professional but casual here so we're kind of an intimate setting so we can not only review our work but also get interactive in the work that we're going to present as a result of our multiple ad hoc sessions from Prague to this time here in Toronto. So what I'd like to ask is that everyone let us go ahead through the entire presentation, because it kind of flows and if we break the flow to ask questions they may be answered afterwards.

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.

So jot them down or test your mental strength, but we're going to go ahead and just go through the entire presentation. The other thing we want to do is just as a reminder when we created these three ad hoc groups in Prague, we said that we were going to use the timeline of Toronto for completion of these particular groups. So that's what we'd like to focus on is that today is a culmination of that work and this will be the completion of these particular groups.

Not that the suggestion cannot come from this group here that the same folks would like to work on the budget process from this point forward, and be the community representatives. It's just that this particular part on working on the process for FY14 should be considered coming to its conclusion with this proposal here.

ROELOF MEIJER: Since we're such a cozy group I want to apologize beforehand that I have to leave just before six. So if you see me walking away it's not because I'm bored or uninterested, but I just have other obligations.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you Roelof, and Patrick has indicated the same issue; will have to leave right before six as well. Is there anybody else that we should expect will have the same – yes, Steve as well.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I'm throwing a party at 6:30 so I think we'll kind of wrap it up and go celebrate at the Fellowship social. Anyone who is able to stop by

anytime between 6:30 and 8:00 – I feel like I'm doing a running advertisement.

MALE: On behalf of my neighbor I have to clarify that was bored and not board.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay we also remote participation and are we scribed or not?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Yes we are recording at this point and it will be transcribed. And we have on the team at home Xavier…?

XAVIER CALVEZ: So who is on the remote participation?

FEMALE: The people on remote participation so far are Aba, Maya and Petya.

XAVIER CALVEZ: So thank you for Aba and Maya and Petya to be on this meeting as well.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I'm sorry Carole, Aba was saying he couldn't see the presentation. If you could just talk with him there in the Adobe Connect Chat and I'll get started. So we, Marilyn and Chris, we just said quickly just to summarize this ad hoc process was meant to be from Prague to Toronto, so we are saying at the end of this session today, we consider

TORONTO

EN

this a working session to work on the draft proposal from staff as a result from the ad hoc sessions. And then we'll call this portion to a conclusion.

And then as the community would like, we'll determine how the community will represent itself going forward in the actual creation of the Framework in the OP Plan & Budget.

MALE: In Toronto you are in TO. So if you want to save some time you don't have to say Toronto, you can say TO – toronto.ontario. so TO, and then you look like you're the real in-crowd. So welcome to TO.

MALE: I have a question. These slides that you are presenting, are these exactly the same as you sent out? Thank you very much.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: They're exactly the same as the ones that are on the schedule; let me be clear about that. So the first draft process we posted on the Wiki is not this. That was the first draft for everyone's comments, and then we created this presentation and posted it on the ICANN website and the meeting schedule. And Chris and Marilyn, the other point we made for this session is that we're going through the entire presentation and then questions and comments at the end.

So as Chuck had suggested in a comment back to the agenda, we already had this posted and so we left it as it was, but we are going to do the whole proposal first and then have the particular leaders of the

ad hoc groups just share quickly their thought son the original objectives and the key things that they still think we need to do forward.

And then we were going to go through this plan rather quickly to leave more time for talk and less time for me. Lastly we want to do next steps, so how to proceed in creating the budget, the Framework and the draft ops plan. So as we mentioned we had the three ad hoc groups out of the Prague meeting, we've had multiple interactions, three conference calls per group over the past three months.

We've did a revised process proposal for FY 14 and we posted it for comment. And then here we are for the model update. The other thing I think we should point out is we had talked that this was for FY14, knowing that it's a transitional year. But we do hope that the process that we create can stand with improvements as we see it, and then just some of the modifications that may come as a result of the CEO transition and any other changes. But the process we're really trying to get to a place where we can lock it in and have normality.

So the process improvement we're looking at here is in the three working groups. In the strategic planning we were really talking in our groups about a clarity in our process, pre-planning interactions and how does the Ops plan link to the strategic plan. We talked about having objectives in the Operating Plan & Budget similar to the objectives that stand in the strategic plan.

For the timeline we want planned and structured interactions, therefore one point we will make here is that following this meeting Maya and I are already set to, depending on how this group would like to move

EN

forward on representation, we are set to begin the Doodle polls to set up the meetings till the end of the year. So we are listening to what you're saying, and planning and putting agendas out for those sessions in which you will interact with us on the creation of the Framework.

We also on a timeline perspective talked about clarity and volunteers time commitment, which should be reflected in pre-planning, and an expanded budget development timeline. Structure and content – we are putting in our process a frontloading of community input so that we don't run out of time and frustrate ourselves at the end of the budget process.

Content should be known, we should not all be surprised at what we see when the Framework and draft ops plan comes out, and we take into account the community expectations. Here in the planning process we are talking about that linkage to the strategic plan. There is a strategic plan session, community session on Thursday. Separate subject from our strategically planning our work, but we do want to reinforce the linkage to the budget and the strategic plan. So that community session will be on Thursday.

So we are talking about the community and Board having input into that plan, having input into the Framework, bringing the operating plan and budget online with more definition and Board and community input. And then the dotted line suggests that with public comment and budget approval we go forward with our draft plan into an adopted budget.

We have the budget timeline, which we have been refining along the way, trying to provide more detail. And Xavier would you like to comment on this part?

EN

XAVIER CALVEZ: I will. I was just hoping you could try to zoom it in a bit because I think that it's difficult to see it from here. I don't know if that's possible. Thank you. You want to bring it up a little bit, or can you, I don't know. Not necessarily wanting to comment in very much detail, but I think that we're going to get more into the details of that on this slide.

I think one of the elements that is trying to address a number of the comments that we have formulated within those groups is finding its application in trying to expand the phase of the Framework to make it a phase during which we can have an interaction between the staff and the community on an amount of information that's sufficient to have the possibility for community members to make the comments on this designing of the budget, on the content of the budget, on what is in the budget or what is not in the budget in a manner that allows that input to be taken into account to be, I would say nearly immediate reflected, so as to ensure that timely in the design that input is taken into account.

Obviously the point there is to avoid that we find ourselves towards the end of the process with this input validly coming then, but not possible to reflect in the budget because we're at the tail end of the design. And I think that's a very important takeaway from the various groups, is that we need to find a way to do that. And what we're suggesting is to expand the Framework phase, insert in it interactions with the community members and the staff on gradually expanding level of detail of the information, as well as sequential set of information like projects, like activities with a minimum amount of information which we will describe later, that we need to design that is sufficient to be

EN

able for the community members to understand what is determined to be input in the budget and be able to formulate those comments.

And those comments can then be integrated as potential corrections in the plan. So it's a timely interaction during the design rather than after the fact. I'll leave it at that for now. We'll go through more details on that, and I don't know if there was any questions on this slide at this stage, which is directional timeline rather than a very precise timeline document yet. Steve?

STEVE METALITZ: Yeah I have…oh sorry.

XAVIER CALVEZ: She's going to beat me up.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: We have our battles. The other point I think we do want to, I was trying to bring this down just a little bit because you'll see on community feedback when we publish the Framework, we're talking about directed comments. And one of the things we heard over the summer in these ad hoc groups was about you tell us what you want us to focus on. You'll get more than enough comment, more than you can read if you don't tell us what you want us to focus on.

And so I think that's another very important takeaway here, is that we need to make sure the community understands and has built what they feel is important work, and we need to direct the comments towards where we need the community input. The community interactions and

reviews – we were talking about how we go forward allowing representation, advanced notice, and appropriate time for each of the documents. We never really got to a place where we understood from each of the communities exactly the time.

I don't think anyone can really be so exact on the time that the need, is it 30 days, 60 days, 90 days – not from our public policy comment standpoint which we couldn't impact, but really from a community standpoint on how your process works as you have to send out to community, wait for translations and bring back in. But what we do know is that we have to find that place where there's appropriate time for the review for each of the communities.

The interactions forums that we have currently are the Wiki, teleconference, webinar and face to face. We know that the best is face to face, we know that the hardest for us to do is face to face in an implementation way between meetings. But we know that those are our most valuable tools in getting the community interaction.

The Framework development we're talking about on a regular process year by year, an October kickoff regardless of when the ICANN meeting is we're talking about an October kickoff. We're talking about interactions with the community beginning in November and going through the end of February when we would publish the Framework for some kind of focused community comment.

We do want to maintain, no matter what, the transitional impact of the new CEO and a strategic plan process. We still want to always maintain input from the strat plan in order for us to move forward with the development of our draft operating plan and budget through the

Framework process. Words that you're going to be hearing a lot tomorrow are "programs, projects and activities" in the development of the management style that that body will be going forward with. So we want to make sure that those words make sense to us in the process, not so much a change, but perhaps a modification of vocabulary.

So it's kind of a clue I think what we're trying to say is that as Fadi presents tomorrow his plan for management methodology, the verbiage we've been really trying to follow as we maintain our process moving forward. But programs, projects, activities is where we want the community input in the Framework and the draft operating plan. Within those projects and programs and activities the expectation is that we will develop the scope of the work, attach a timeline to the work, the resources that are needed to get the work completed, whether that's external or internal to staff, and the metrics that we need to apply.

An example of what we're talking about here is the strategic plan, we would pull from that one of the priorities would be engaging stakeholders. And the program or the project or activity that would come out of that overall objective of engaging these stakeholders would be an outreach initiative. And out of that outreach initiative what are the expectations that we would increase meeting registration, we would do it between January and June, and we would rely for a resource on community expertise.

So again we're just trying to reiterate the idea of scope and timeline and metrics applied to those community driven projects, programs and activities. The Framework content as it stands today and we know it are

the 15 functional areas – and Xavier you tell me any time that you would like to come in – but the 15 functional areas in the Framework. We've included the core activities as well as in this Framework, specifically in FY13 just passed and that we're working in now, we try to provide more information on the programs and the projects.

The Framework content – we have the core activities of ICANN along with the programs and projects. Again, we're just reiterating the ideas that we need to have more details for you in the Framework process.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Can you go back on the previous slide? I think this is really important that we are, when we're done with tis presentation, able to comment on that particularly. Because our thoughts are that this is the minimum information that's required for you guys to be able to obtain an understanding of what the projects and programs are, be able to weigh in those projects and programs in terms of how they've been dimensioned in this Framework, whether it's two months, one consultant one staff exercise or whether it's an 18 month consultation with a 20 community members, five staff and so on.

It's a completely different dimension so that you guys can be able to formulate opinions on that. It's appeared to us that this information is the minimum. Of course, the resources part is where the budget information, the preliminary budget information would find itself, but we didn't want to ignore the notion of also bodies, so FTEs that would be required to conduct the project or the program.

So when we are finished with the presentation, one thing I want to make sure we hit with your comments is whether or not this is the right set of information in detail to be able to weigh in during the Framework. Because if it's not then we need to rework on it and find the right level of detail and the right content. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: Again, this is just another example, and I think most everyone looked at the pdf or the Power Point online, but it's giving you an example of in the Framework content for the DNS ops functional area. There would be an objective timeline metric deliverable and the resources needed. One of the things that I think has been a bit confusing to the community is that there can be a function that is both within core and can also be a project and a program. So I think this helps to show in an example form just that. Xavier?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Just to reiterate the point on the resource side. We've mentioned here personnel, travel, facilities or software development for analysis tool for example in the program, computing equipment, but also when you look at the site of a program it may not be as clear. We also want to make sure that a program is defined with the number of people within the staff that we're expecting will be participating to this project. Are we going to use consultants for a portion of the project?

And also when I said the staff measured in terms of FTE, the timeline should provide the duration of the project, possibly the main milestones of the project as well, so that we can have an understanding of the

TORONTO

structure of project and assign dollar values. Even if it's at an aggregate level for those components. So if we say there are this many for this duration there will be this much consulting for that purpose, and assigning a dollar value to that and potentially some travel and assigning dollar values to that as well.

So that's the type of information and the level of granularity that we're thinking about providing as part of the Framework, so that the input can be provided. But we're formulating that as a question for this group to weight in once we're done with the presentation. Thank you.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: And further to Xavier's point, we're saying in the Framework content we want to be very specific here about what we can produce. We're saying that it's high level estimate for the Framework. We'll provide as much detail as possible, but at the point that the Framework is developed we don't want to provide expectations that cannot be realized. And so in this discussion we do want to reinforce that.

On this particular slide we are just reinforcing the process of the input from the strat plan and the activities, programs and projects as proposed by the community during the Framework building process of October through February. That's where we want the community input. That goes into the staff to take a look at these activities, programs and projects, some recurring from the previous year, some new, how we can provide more detail.

We can refine the scope and the timeline and the resources in order to produce that draft ops plan and budget. Again, in different words, just

saying from the Framework to the draft budget overall FTE going into a confirmed FTE list with a hiring plan. Going from a high level project estimate to a project plan with estimates, so again, a specific project plan with the estimates from a high level. High level core activity estimates to activities with full costing by the time we get it to the draft budget process. And the early view gets more depth and detail.

Again from the timeline that we provided earlier, the interactions come during the Framework as well as during the creation of the draft operating plan and budget. The difference is that we are frontloading the input from the community into the Framework building, and then when it comes time to resource and estimate and develop the implementation plans, that is staffs responsibility with community oversight in the development of the draft operating plan and budget from the posting of the Framework in February through the posting of the draft budget in May, early May, May 1st.

Again, from a draft operating plan and budget standpoint the sample of the 15 functional areas with more refined estimates now from the same groupings. The sample again being the DNS operations going into the personnel, what support is needed, where the money is actually being detailed to be utilized.

One of the things we just were trying to reiterate was that we were providing more time on the front end with interaction in order to develop as much detail as the community needs in order to make better recommendations by the time the Framework is posted. And that we do need to be aware of the time constraints we have of the 45 days before the adoption of the annual budget that we do have to have a

draft posted. And that reinforces for all of us the time constraints on public comment side, which is why we want to frontload your comments and have enough interaction that there is not a surprise when we post the draft operating plan on the first of May.

Xavier, if you would like me to go back to a couple of slides that you'd like to provide more, to keep everybody focused for comment on…?

XAVIER CALVEZ: No I think we have already done that a little bit. I think we should – Steve had a question, I think we should try to address it now and see if there's a couple others knowing that what we're going to do is we're going to let the group leaders to provide their quick feedback I would say of the groups and ensure that maybe what we've not mentioned in those slides, relative to their group is being mentioned by them now so that we have that full input.

And then I think we should go down the path of the comments that all of you may have on what's there and by the way what may not be there that you think we need to take into account to finalize the input of this working group process so that we can translate that into a budget process over the next couple of weeks basically. Steve you had a question?

STEVE METALITZ: Yes, thank you very much. This is Steve Metalitz. First of all I just want to say that this looks very good to me and I think it helps address some of the concerns we had had about the previous processes. I was asking about in your timeline for the budget there's a reference to directed

comments with focus area to gather input. You'd publish the Framework and then you'd have a public comment period with directed comments with focus areas to gather input. Could you say a little bit more about that because I understand you can ask some focused questions, you might not get focused answers?

But if you could spell out a little bit more the kinds of input you would be looking for at that stage I think that would help us. I understand that public comments isn't the only means of interaction by any means, but it is helpful because it focuses people's minds on this a bit. So if you could talk a little bit more on directed comments with focus areas and how you see that working?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: In that Steve what we're trying to address is the fact that the comments that we receive sometimes are on the structure of the document. And I think we should say here that one of the proposals, we should have written in here but let's make it on record, and I really get this from Chris and your continual reminders to us of the past year where in a Power Point we presented in the Framework certain programs and projects and activities, by the time it got to the draft operating plan the structure had changed to a Word document and that's okay, but how we presented the information seemed very different.

And it's very hard to take that, so we end up getting comments on the structures of documents when we should just provide similar documents and have you focus on more important matters. That's a simple part of it, but we do want it to go from Word document from Word document and have it match to match. And we also are planning

on providing a summary at the draft operating plan level that says "here are the changes from the Framework to the draft operating plan." You don't have to search for them we're going to put them right out there in front. And again, it shouldn't be a big surprise because we should all have been working on it along the way.

The second part I would say about that is that when it comes to some of the core of ICANN – what makes the machine work, facility costs, some of the just inherent costs of doing the work of ICANN whether we did it or anybody else, what are those costs that are just going to happen. You might comment on how much you think we should spend or not, but we want you to focus on the work that's going to impact you; on the parts of the budget that are going to impact you as a community.

You can help us to determine what that is. We think, from this proposal, that it is the programs and the projects and the activities, not so much just the recycled, recurring, every year this has to happen. So if we're doing our job well and you can see the structure of ICANN, the infrastructure of ICANN, and that it's working properly – we've staffed it properly, you can make sense of how we staffed it, how we're using our dollars for personnel, for outside consultants – if you can see that we're making good choices on the infrastructure the focus really should then be on the work and the work that you need to see done.

So that's what we're trying to get to and I think we certainly do need some additional assistance on that, but one of the requests for the community was "focus us."

EN

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Another element to try to go down the path of allowing for maybe more efficient and focused input that we have thought of as well is as part of the Framework information that we share for comment, maybe actually formulating questions that we have. So that you see the question, you understand the question and then you know there is a question that's literally formulated and that there is input on.

Because obviously when we start gathering the input from the staff for example on their department or number of functions, there's always questions as to what do we mean by that, what do we think we should do, what's the sides of that so we can take a view in the Framework document. And at the same time associate a question on that view that we've taken, so that you understand yes this is an area where there's a question from the staff and we community members can provide input on that.

And if you see the question I think it will help focus those. So we don't want necessarily to suggest answer only the questions that we will have formulated, but at least those you know are out there and I think that could be helpful. Just another example of that type of focused interaction.

CHUCK GOMES:

Thanks Janice. Chuck Gomes. In the program, projects, activities period there is it anticipated that there would be ongoing interaction with the community during that period or is it all waiting for that comment period afterwards?

EN

XAVIER CALVEZ: So ideally ongoing. I think the - there's two issues; well there's more than two but there are certainly two issues that come up to mind quickly. Ongoing has a sense of speed that is nice to consider but not that all organizations can effectively participate to. So we had a quick discussion this morning with Tijani on for ALAC for example, and he will speak about it more. Providing input means getting an information, distributing it, letting the people work on it and consolidating the input back and reviewing it and then providing it back to the staff.

That's a cycle. There is a time associated with that and that cannot happen overnight, that cannot happen over two, three or four days. It's probably a longer process than that. So I think the calls, for example, that we can have can allow for reasonably immediate feedback with questions asked and maybe opinions formulated, especially if we can provide the documents ahead of the calls themselves so that people can take the time to look at them.

So I think the calls can help have fairly immediate feedback and interaction. We need to find the right balance of the number of calls, the notice that we give for those calls and the notice that we provide with putting documents, making documents available so that they can be reviewed so that the calls are more efficient. So we need to find a balance with that.

But I would like that we find a way to make it as interactive as possible, with the understanding that there are limitations that I'm expecting that you're going to share with us, of what that can be. So I hope this helps answer your question. I think we have Roelof and Marilyn.

ROELOF MEIJER: Two comments.   First of all, by the way, I think this is really an improvement, so a good way forward. One of the things I think in the present procedure but also in the present final outcome, the operational plan is that we have a lot of details in there. And as the Chair of the ccNSO SOP Working Group I take part of the blame for that because the community itself has been asking for a lot of details.

So in this new approach I would recommend that ICANN the organization puts the brake on a bit if from the community there is a lot of demand for details. Because if you look at the plan now I think it's overly detailed and that always leads to more discussion on the details and you get into this circle where you will never come out of again.

My second comment is that we had a strategic and operational planning working group session next door, before this session, and we were discussing on how to provide input on ICANNs draft 2013-2016 strategic plan. And we have decided that we will not comment on the plan itself. We have delivered the recommendation to ICANN staff to forget about the 2013-2016 plan, to maintain the present plan until the new CEO together with the ICANN staff has come up with a new strategic plan.

There is not really a point in adding another year, that year being 2016, if we all know that in 2013 there will be a new plan. So I think the process is going to interfere a bit with our timeline here. Because we see input from the strategic plan taking place in July through September, and I think until roughly about now, but we know that there is going to be a significant change in the strategy somewhere in the course of the first two quarters of next year. And I suspect that it's going to influence the 2014 operational plan.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Let me let Marilyn answer and ten I'll try to comment on what you said.

MARILYN CADE: This is Marilyn Cade. Let me endorse…

ROELOF MEIJER: That's the first time you endorsed me.

MARILYN CADE: Beware…

XAVIER CALVEZ: It's on record Roelof.

MARILYN CADE: Let me endorse that idea. I was going to say something else first but I'm going to follow up on this. So here's my observation about this document – nothing new in here. And in fact, I would strongly propose having supported CEOS before who have created businesses and reengineered them, that the CEO needs a good amount of time to spend more time learning and thinking and not just putting forward documents and proposals because we have a timeline.

And we have the flexibility I think to follow this brilliant suggestion. So I will comment on that and will come back and say something, but the thing I was going to say was I am enthused about the creation of this kind of interaction and I think it has significant benefit and I'm going to

TORONTO

repeat what I have said before. In order for us as responsible leaders in our groups to deliver to you what you need from us, some of the time that we spend on this has got to be done not in competition with other commitments we have during the ICANN meetings.

So whether that means that we have to have the support to come in and half-day early, because we all have working responsibilities Saturday and Sunday. So whether that means we have to come in a half-day early or we have to stay the day after, I'm just going to repeat that. Because you want us to be effective and you want us to be effective, and we want to be effective not only for you but for our own communities. And so as we look at this, I also may disagree with Roelof here on the level of detail. I'll turn to Chris on that at another time.

Without a level of detail, at least in analyzing the direction we're going in, it's impossible for us to tell you if our communities support those directions.

XAVIER CALVEZ: So I'll try to respond quickly to that one because I don't think that's mostly contradicting what Roelof was saying. I think it actually reinforces your point Roelof is that we need the right amount of detail, not too high level, but not too much either. And I think that was part of Roelof's comment. And this is also part of what I want to make sure we manage to count on in this group is, the information that we suggested is it that right level of detail so that you can comment on it.

And certainly I think at the time of the Framework our challenge for the staff is going to be to provide sufficient amount of details on each of the

programs at the time of the Framework so that you can have the opportunity for the right input. I'm less concerned with us providing too much detail at that time because it's honestly I expect to be challenging to be able to complete the right level of detail across all programs and all functions in the Framework, but I think we should aim for it nonetheless.

On the strategic planning, as you've understood I'm sure it's obviously tricky this year to be able to really formulate and redesign the linkage between the strategic planning in the ops plan or the budget at this time where we have a new CEO and that's been formulated by Roelof and the ccNSO Working Group next door earlier. And I think that things will become more clear starting tomorrow morning when Fadi makes his presentation on the management system.

But I think that as the time goes and over the next few days and few weeks we will be able to adapt the structure of the ops plan and budget to reflect the management system we're going to try to go by on a daily basis to monitor the activities that we do. And that will help in the next year to have a more clear link in transparency between the strategic objectives and their explanation into the ops plan and budget.

So and just to talk about timing Roelof you were mentioning that you were expecting somewhere in the beginning of the next calendar year we should have some news coming out of a new strategic planning process from after the arrival of the CEO, and that should have an impact on the FY14 ops plan. Is that right? I'm glad I reformulated.

ROELOF MEIJER: Two changes to what you just said. The beginning of next year, what I said is the first two quarters, so that's a bit of a longer period. And I was not referring to more clarity on the strategic planning process, but more clarity on the strategic plan full stop.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay. And the way I'm looking at it, so I understood and that doesn't change entirely the point that I wanted to make, I think that the clarity on the strategic plan that will come out of that period, whether it's first or second quarter, in my views will be an input for the budget process that we start in October next year. Not for the budget process that if we are in the second quarter we'll be basically finishing then because we'll be just publishing documents at that time. And so the input in that obviously will be too late to affect the budget of the FY14 because it will be done somewhere in May and June.

ROELOF MEIJER: Yeah in line with what Marilyn just said then I think it's not realistic to expect from the new CEO that he comes with a complete strategic plan within the next few months, but I would expect that during the Beijing meeting we would at least get the highlights of any significant changes in the strategy. And in Durbin we would get a fairly well-worked out strategic plan. Is that realistic I think? I would be able to do that so…and I'm not ICANN CEO.

XAVIER CALVEZ: That makes a lot of sense to me as well, my only point was that let's take Durbin as an anchor point of a new strategy or an adapted

strategy, my only point is it's too late to affect the FY14 budget which will be already voted upon. That's my only point. I'm not saying that the strategy should not come there, I'm just saying I would expect that potentially even earlier than that time frame there will be a new, the formulation of a new strategy. I'm just saying that that is too late to affect eh budget of the FY14.

ROELOF MEIJER: So is your conclusion than that the budget of 2014, or the FY2014 will not be affected by the plans that the CEO has, or is it that the plans that the CEO has will affect the budget but they will probably not yet lead to a plan or the high lines of a plan. Am I making myself clear?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I think so. My answer is that I expect that the input - let me rephrase – a new strategic plan that would come out let's say in Q2, in the second quarter between April and June 2013, will not affect the budget of the FY14 that will be approved around the same timeframe because it will be done. We will be at the end of that process. What I would expect is that that new strategic plan would influence would be an input into building the FY15 plan which will start in October 2013.

ROELOF MEIJER: But what would be your answer to my first question? Do you still know what it was?

XAVIER CALVEZ: No sorry, you probably need to reformulate it.

ROELOF MEIJER: The plans that the new CEO of ICANN will develop over the coming months, will they be taken into account when ICANN draws up the operational plan for t FY14 or not? I understand that it will not be in the form of a finished strategic plan as an input for your operational plan, but will his main strategic views be of any impact on the plan or we will just carry on until he has done his whole thing and then in 2015 we will take that into…

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess we are living on the end on this on the current strategic plan. We may from my point of view start to have a discussion on a new three year plan, but in fact we didn't and that's good. We have a new leadership team and what I think will happen is that there will be developing some urgent projects and that will affect the current budget maybe, if it will not be so much and it will affect how we will build the next year fiscal year budget.

But the planning will be done, as you say, in the beginning of the next year in 2013 and will affect the budget one year after, as the budget for the FY15. In fact the urgent project will be embedded in the new strategic planning I am sure. But it will not be yet ready to be as a plan to be embedded in the budget next year.

And to add one point, I think we have a little flexibility with the budget with some non-affected expense, and that could be one way to give some room for the new CEO to be able to act within a budget decided

but with some flexibility. I hope that it answers at least one part of your question. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: And I think we'll try to conclude this conversation there, but to me it's not the CEO defining the strategy, it's the community.   So what the CEO can do is suggest a different process and a different format of the strategic plan and submit it through the process of development to the community to weigh in on it. It's not the CEO that is going to come in and say "this is what we're going to do from now on." So I just wanted to make that clarification.

I think we have Alain in the queue and Paul.

ALAIN BERRANGER: Thank you very much.   I wanted to make a comment about this discussion because it's almost – well it's not irrelevant what we're doing, but this is a closing meeting for this other group, so I guess we should all have a chance to speak. And I think really we're in a bit, to make a comment on tis previous discussion, a bit in a guessing game. As you know the CEO announced three weeks ago the four priorities that he would concentrate over the next three or four months. And I think that's been a public comment.

And so the budget is a reflection of an orientation, a strategic direction be the leader and I don't think the budget structure isn't going to, shouldn't need to be a constraint on the pace at which the CEO wish of not to instill change. My other, to come back to this meeting, my other comment – I have a question in terms of where we are in the agenda

because I didn't want to make my comments or suggestions outside the agenda process. So is this the time now for comments and questions?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes.

ALAIN BERRANGER: The one question I have, which I am not sure I understand is let me go to my notes here – a question and a suggestion. My question is what is meant by "core activities?" They seem to be two silos or two budget packets – core activities and program and budgets. For me, although I'm not an accountant and a finance person, these are terms I'm unaccustomed to in a budget. There's the programming and projects, so those are what the organization wants to do this year. And then there is general administrative direct and indirect costs, whichever way you want to do it.

So I want to clarify that. I don't necessarily need an answer right now. What I wanted to, my suggestion has to do with FTE's, so full time equivalent personnel. And you know what is, it is easy to account for what you pay for. So staff you pay, and you can ask them to do time sheets – I don't know if you do or not. But then you get a full exact distribution of FTE of staff.

And then if you are a consultant, then there are contracts. And that's easy to account for. Now there's a third very important resource in the not for profit sector, and the last time I looked ICANN is a not for profit, is volunteers. There is a huge resource base that comes from volunteers because of the multi stakeholder process. And I, having

been a not for profit before, I have struggled and I've seen management struggle with the accounting of volunteers.

So I looked into this a little bit and if you look at the Council on Foundations and you ask one of the leading organizations on best practices for not for profits, there's been in the last five years a very strong push to account for volunteers in one way or the other. It's not a cash in, cash out situation so it's not a truly T account process. But I think it's very important, perhaps not this financial year, probably not this FY14 that we think or we have a process by which we think about this.

Because you hear Marilyn talking about constraint on time and volunteers' time, and you've heard it from me and others before. So not to delve too much into it, I'd like to put this on the agenda; either on the continuing process for FY15 that we think about that. Because if we don't try to estimate volunteer time, then we don't really have a handle on it, and it's a really superb resource and that's why I'm reflecting on this and putting it on the agenda, long term agenda. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I think we have Paul and…

PAUL DIAZ: Thank you Xavier; Paul Diaz. The conversation has gone from when I raised my hand so I just need you to clarify a point. We were talking about strategic plan, and what we're seeing up here about budget plan, you kept referring to potential new strategic initiatives from the CEO

and tying them to presentations at ICANN meetings. the strategic plan doesn't necessarily have its meeting schedule as the driver of the calendar correct? I just needed clarification.

Much like our budget it is set, built around actually, the fiscal year. Good, thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: I just want to comment on something that Alain said. I think that actually I don't call myself a volunteer; I call myself a stakeholder. But I do think there is a cost associated with the way that work is done, whether it's staff or stakeholders. So I kind of think, I don't have the answer but I'll talk more to Alain later. I don't have the answer but I think assessing the implications of a broadening and deepening of stakeholders who are engaging in policy development does have budget implications.

Not just outreach and awareness to educate people about ICANN, which is an expense related thing and a good thing to do. But also the fact that we may go from, just as we went from say 150 to 700 registrars, that was a big scaling up problem. So if we go from X number of stakeholders in each of the GNSO constituencies that will be a cost issue. And some of that, I think, is going to have to be reflected in the – so I'm not so sure that's the CEOs plan. I think that is a consequence of what is going on anyway.

TORONTO

XAVIER CALVEZ: I suggest that at this point we have the leaders of the three working groups just doing a quick overview of the working groups thoughts, notably those that haven't obviously been brought up yet so far in the presentation or in the discussion. And then we take further comments on the various points that we've talked about, timeline interactions with the community, between the community and the staff on the design of the budget, and the level of detail as well. I think at least those three subjects we can touch.

Chris do you want to start for the Content and Structure Working Group?

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Chris Chaplow with some comments on the content and structure. First thanks for this presentation. I think that it's gone a long way forward in the right direction. I liked it when I looked at it on the plane a few days ago and going through it now even more. I say that because I found the budget process proposal document a bit high level. I missed the third call unfortunately in the group, and thankfully Steve was on there enough.

I've since listened to the recording and I understand it a bit more, but I think this document now really supersedes that battle and this is the one we can work to. I agreed simply increasing the public comment is not a solution. We also agree that the Framework is the key to this, the Framework plan. And that's the area that, certainly from structure and content, is the one that we've got to concentrate on.

I noted Aba said on the last call, and actually it's a slide up here opening up the Framework and the tools that we've got – we've got the Wiki, we've got the face to face, we've got the webinars, we've got the calls. Unless we can think of something else those are the things we're used to. We're not going to come up with an app to solve this problem. My view is that the only way we're going to progress this through the work on the Framework will be to have something like calls at probably a month frequency because at the end of the day it's not the Wiki it's the calls that are the intermediate deadlines that push us all to finish work or (inaudible) and so on.

I still think it's a work in process. I don't think we can stop now. There's a lot on here but there's also some more detail on the Wiki. You noted at the beginning that this group is sort of closing now, and I suppose that's right as a process point of view. And if it was that we were stopping and handing over to a completely new group, I think it would be a problem. So I think it's really this group and more inclusive the need to carry on.

I think there's no sense in having the three groups from now on. I think we've got to merge into one group. And I leave it to others that understand procedural matters better than I as to what format the group is. I think the last groups just been called ad hoc study groups or – I think that worked and it didn't seem to cause any issues or problems.

A couple of more quick points. The priorities, we're in agreement that they shouldn't just be written down in isolation and we've got some work to do around those. The core activities, 80% of the money is spent on the core activities and they were near two pages in the last

Framework plan, so we've got some work to do expanding those. And projects, well there's a lots been said about projects. And I think we're in agreement with what I've seen on the slides.

I think I would take it a little bit further with the information that we put around the projects. But from what I heard Fadi say at the NCUC meeting on Friday, I think he's taking it about five times further than even members around this table would. So it would be interesting to see what he has to say tomorrow. And I hadn't picked it up, but I note what you were saying to draw attention to programs, projects and activities, so we'll have to look and think about that.

And I was going to suggest, remind Steve that the comment on the guidance on the comments actually did come out of our work group. Because although we haven't taken it to great detail, it was a concept that giving the community a blank piece of paper to write the comments, everybody wrote them in a completely different fashion and then the replies to the comments, and we exponentially multiplied the threads and made the whole thing difficult to manage.

And it was an attempt really to make the process more efficient really, which is what we're about. So I think those are the highlights that I wanted to say.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you very much Chris, that's helpful. Roelof, do you want to complete feedback on the Strategic Planning Working Group and add to anything that's already been said? I know you need to leave in 10 minutes so I want to make sure we got you.

EN

ROELOF MEIJER: Well maybe just one, that of course – a response to your remark – of course I realize that it's not ICANNs CEO that makes ICANNs strategy, not even for the corporation. But I do hope, and as a working group we hope, that the new CEO will take into consideration more of the input that the community has been given over the years on the present strategic plan. So that was more my point and that's the reason that I think that, or I hope that there will be an impact of the change in leadership on ICANNs strategy and strategic plan.

So what we as a working group will do is we will make a high level compilation of the comments we have been submitted so far and we'll submit that to ICANNs staff and the CEO as input for this new strategic plan.

XAVIER CALVEZ: And you're referring to the ccNSO SOP Working Group?

ROELOF MEIJER: That's correct.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay. This ad hoc working group that was working on the strategic planning mapping to the budget, I just wanted to ask if there is further input on that?

ROELOF MEIJER: Sorry, I misread your question there. As a member of that ad hoc working group, no, I have no further comment.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Tijani, do you want to provide feedback on the Timeline Working Group, and I think Chuck also has a certain amount of input, so the two of you, but if you want to start Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, I asked for the floor before because I had other comments. But if you want me to give an overview of the work of the timeline ad hoc group, there was two main points in our group. The first one is that the timeline of the budget elaboration is tightly related to the strategic plan elaboration. And we thought at this time that it is too late to wait for the strategic plan to be adopted. We proposed some proposals, such as begin before the strategic plan elaboration, or shorten the time of the strategic plan elaboration.

Second main point was that we need more time for interaction with the community. It was a very important point because it was a failure before in the process. We didn't have time to react, to interact with the staff because there was one public comment and the time is not enough for a community like At-Large to have time to have the feedback from the ALSes, from the RALOs and then to ALAC.

Another point also of timing, we said that we need more time to interact with the staff about the additional requests. If we don't have time to have the right interaction we might not be well understood by the staff. And then we will have not the right, if you want, interaction,

the right impact on the final budget. Those are the points that we raised in our ad hoc group. And Chuck…?

CHUCK GOMES: Tijani did a good job of covering the points. I'd like to call your attention to slide six, and thanks for putting that up, you knew I was going to ask for that right? And kind of translate what we did and what Tijani said relative to this diagram. Obviously our task was to deal with timing, and he said it very well. The timing of the process just flat didn't work. The draft budget is – on May 1st it was actually mid-May prior to the past year.

That's the firsts time we got detail. And so that's the time when there was great analysis and reaction but there's no time for response, no time for interaction. In the GNSO today, in talking with Fadi in one of our sessions we talked about this idea – it's not enough just to listen and just receive input if you can't interact on it. And so the May 1st time for interaction, and that's the first time we get detail, just flat didn't work.

So one option was to move the draft budget up earlier, and we talked a little bit about that. But what we ended up with, and what staff put together was this one here. And after we drilled down on that and understood what was happening, the key element, in my opinion, is that programs, projects and activities time right there. And that's where we need to get enough detail so that we can meaningfully respond with enough time left to have more interaction and do that.

And so this, the way this solves the problem that our group grappled with, the timing issue, the key is to get enough detail in that one section so that we, all of us as stakeholders in the community, can react intelligently and have that. And of course that's why I asked the question is there going to be interaction there because if we just wait for that directed comment period that might not work, and I understand the challenges there so I respect that.

But that's the key and we're probably going to have to learn after we do this once or twice, but if there is enough detail there and the projects do have to have quite a bit of detail – and hopefully Chris', the group that Chris shared about dealt with the additional detail that's needed. But we need a pretty good level of detail there. I think if you're going to err I would err on more detail if you can. I understand the realistic-ness of that.

And if you err on more detail it's probably better for us as stakeholders than to err on too little detail and then we get it on May 1st and it's too late to do anything.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, that's very helpful. Chuck when you see the slide where it's listed the components of the information that we intend to provide – can you put it up – as part of the Framework; does that make sense to you. And obviously we don't necessarily have a detailed example of what we're talking about here. But if we provide that information, and when I say that information is on a given project – the objective of a project, the timeline, when it's supposed to be completed, wheat the

resources are in terms of FTE, consulting, at least the big buckets of the resources, right.

The metrics, how do we intend to measure progress and completion of that specific project?   The timeline with probably the milestones associated with the completion of that project. Do you think this is an information, at least on paper, that would be sufficient in your views to formulate an opinion on the validity of the project and the validity of how it's been designed so far?

CHUCK GOMES: I think so. But the reason I say it that way is because it really depends on the level of detail you give on the resources, which is probably the big area where the cost issues are. If that detail approaches what we used to get in the draft budget I think we're on the right track.   Now understanding that there are some areas there that didn't even have enough details, I fully appreciate the limitations of how much detail you can give that early, but the more there is the more it's going to help us to intelligently interact with you and the community in terms of that.

So yeah, I think those are good broad categories; how much detail you give, especially in resources, not minimizing any of the other categories but that's probably where the costs are really going to be shown. Does that help?   Does that answer your question?

XAVIER CALVEZ: It does. I think that probably as a next step we need to work with I think Carole and Janice and Aba to try to design at least an example of a function, what I would call a core function. And I didn't answer Alan's

question earlier which I will need to do on a function of day-to-day job, trying to give that – designing an example of what we mean we would like to provide in as part of the Framework. Do the same thing for a project.

Take a project and just give you a picture of what we think we could provide and see how that matches what you're expecting is necessary, and try to do that in the next couple of weeks to try to gauge that. Because this is key, right, to your point the whole rationale that we have here is to expand the Framework with more detail and more interaction so that the validation of the budget from a content standpoint has been performed before the draft detail is being finalized and before it is being put for comment.

So at the time it's being put for comment on May 1st let's say, the only thing that you have to do is look to see if all the input that you've provided, and the comments that you've' made have effectively correctly been translated into the details. But you don't have any more to wonder about a project or… So I think we should try to do that because this is so important. Because of course we have one shot at this. We need to design this level of input. We need to communicate it to the staff, have them think through it, formulate the functions, formulate the programs and the projects as per those templates, get them back to us, start interacting.

And then we can start sharing right away. But we have one shot at asking the right information to the staff so that this gets back to you with enough information, so I want to make sure we do that right. Carole.

CAROLE CORNELL: This is Carole Cornell. I really want to manage expectations, so I'm listening and I want to be cautious. The new management system, which I happen to have seen a little bit of, is going to take a lot of work for us to get to that level. And one of the areas that we are the most concerned about is resource planning. So I would like us to be cautious about how much we want to promise we can get done in this first rollout, because I am concerned about how much we could share and have with some meaning and make it meaningful.

So I'd really like us to manage the expectation that we are going to strive for something but I want us to then turn around and say remember the timeframe here, how much can we put out quickly in the timeframe you're suggesting. Because we are going to have to put it in a system and we're going to have to work out the requirements and do all that, and we have some of that in play, but not a lot of it at this point.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks Carole. And like I said, we're not going to get it right the first time anyway and with the restrictions you just mentioned that are real and we have to live with, it may even be less desirable in terms of our ultimate goal this time. That's okay, as long as it's communicated to the community and as long as we have this longer terms target that we'll be able to achieve a lot better in FY13 and even better than in FY16. I'm okay with that because we're heading in the right direction and we have a plan, we know that the resources are going to support that going forward, that's fine. I can live with that.

EN

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay that's very helpful. I think Tijani and Chris.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you Xavier. First of all I don't agree with those who said that we don't need to react on the strategic plan this year because the new management will change the strategy. From where you will [grow] your priorities is from the strategic plan.   And also, any strategic plan proposed should be updated according to the community comments. And this is the good management of the new CEO to make really the comments of the community integrated in the strategic plan. And then we will have a strategic plan that we will be able to use to [grow] our priorities for the budget and the operating plan, first point.

Second point, we didn't, we spoke about before but we didn't consider it in this work. What will be the process for a multi-year project? We didn't say here. And it is an important point that you have to consider and to include in this process. I think that this presentation has two main pages that we have to consider, which was the page five and six. This page and the following one. Because the interaction with the community will be efficient if the form of this interaction is well done and if the forum of this interaction is also well done.

We need an interaction which will bring really the point of view of the community to the staff, and I don't think that the call and a few hours will bring really the point of view of the community. The urgent points that we need, a call will be out of those interactions on the [growing] on these five interactions. We need at least those five interactions to bring

TORONTO

the point of view of the community. And we have to give time to the community to really consult and give the real point of view of the community.

There is something that I want to emphasize. The Framework, by definition, cannot be detailed. It's high level. So we will not expect, I will not expect sufficient details in the Framework. That's why perhaps I don't know, perhaps it's an idea. Perhaps we can make the elaboration of the budget a little bit more long to have more interaction during the budget than during the Framework.

The Framework is very important because we have here the definition of the projects. We have the priorities. We have the definition of projects, and actions. We have all the elements of those projects, but we don't have details about the budget, the money. And sometimes you may agree 100% on one project in the Framework, and when you have the budget of this project you may disagree. So perhaps we need more time for the budget and perhaps a little bit less time for the Framework.

I don't say that the Framework is not important, it's very important. But the budget is more important in my point of view. That's it. Thank you.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Chris and then Chuck.

CHUCK GOMES: Well in fairness to what Tijani just said, that's what I was saying as well originally was that we needed to move that draft budget way up and get

EN

that detail in. Now what the alternate approach which your team worked on was to give a lot more detail in the Framework – I agree with you historically it has been very high level and it's very hard to really make significant comments then.

So either we have to get a lot of detail during that Framework period, not the first Framework but maybe it's that process where programs, projects and activities information is given, then maybe we don't have to move that draft budget up. But the clincher is how much detail we get there. So I think we have the same goals. I'm comfortable with trying this approach and seeing if it works. But then you have to have more detail in the Framework.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Chris

CHRIS CHAPLOW: Yes thank you. I was just going to give a detailed answer to the question you asked Chuck earlier about the reporting items against projects, and it gave me time just go pull out the BC comments on the FY13 budget and really to read into the record the items that we've suggested. And project number status, staff member responsible. Whether a project was nested under another one and references and links to information of background materials on the ICANN website.

And obviously with respect to what Carole said, that Rome had not been built in a day and the management systems, but that would be a goal for us.

EN

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I just wanted to comment, after listening to all this, just a couple of things.   Working on this with the community has been a great interaction. To feel success at the end of each of our discussions and then to actually want to get on the phone for the next discussion because you know it's going to be positive and forward.   Working together, it really was a pleasure and I really felt positive and accomplished out of it.

But I think part of it, because now we need to go into a couple of next steps before we walk away here today, I think part of it came because we had four to six people on a call. And I know as we want to make sure that every stakeholder group or constituency or supporting organization or advisory committee or whatever you want to say, we want to make sure everyone's voice is heard in this process.

It really was, for me, manageable for all of us because there were fewer people on a particular call. But then you're challenged, because we do want everyone to have the voice, and you can't have multiple calls on the same subject' we've all tried that before. You can't say "okay we'll meet on Tuesday for six and then eight…" – never, never works, right.

So I just want to be thinking about this as we're going to be asking out for next steps. Chris yes, I think from a process standpoint we are smart to do what we said we were going to do and we were going to travel from Prague to Toronto with these ad hoc groups and say "okay this part is closed but we need to work together to implement this."   So obviously we need to determine how to do that and who should be part of it, and this is those next steps.

I think it should be the same people if you're asking me, right Chris. I mean you can't hand the baby over before the whole process is complete, and if the volunteers who have currently been engaged with us have the time and energy to continue this with us and be the representative back to their community wonderful. I think we should have that continuity, but again, I'm mixed in between here because we haven't had representation from all of the groups. And I know that makes it larger, but there are some that haven't. The GAC has not been part, it's everyone's choice.

I'm just not sure Marilyn, I'm saying to open up again and say now we're going to start with a community building a Framework – is it the proper thing to do to open it to all the constituency leaders again to say do you want a representative on this next process on this step of walking through? I'm throwing that out there as the community is going to tell us how would you like to do next steps to build a Framework and draft operating plan, in an engaged interaction.

MARILYN CADE: Janice it's Marilyn speaking. I don't understand, and maybe we should be clear when we say not everyone has participated. Which stakeholder group has not participated other than the GAC?

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: If I'm going from memory I'm not sure. We had Alain at NPOC. I don't think we had someone from the NCUC, if my memory…

MARILYN CADE: But like Robin was here today.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yeah but she didn't participate in working groups.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I mean on the ad hoc actual groups from Prague to here.

MARILYN CADE: Oh I see.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: We had four to six people, sometimes three on each call. So…

MARILYN CADE: So David Cake is from the NCUC.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: I do know that today.

MARILYN CADE: Robin is from – I just wanted to be sure I knew and David is here – I just wanted to be sure. Because I was looking around and thinking everyone was here.

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: No, no, no. I meant specifically has been engaged with us on those calls. And so I want to open it back up, that's why I say it's been easy

with those people. I think it's been very successful.   I think we need to have the engagement, but who are we to close it off and not open it to – we did this out of the group that came to Prague to that working session and said who wants to work with us from the folks that were there. Just opening this up and saying how to proceed.

CHUCK GOMES: I think Carole wanted to say something, and I'm willing to wait Carole until you're finished.

CAROLE CORNELL: Hi this is Carole. I just wanted to say that there is a Thursday 10:30 meeting this week with the strategic plan consultations where a lot of this input will come up, and Fadi and a few Board members will participate in that session. So they are going to participate and listen and we will talk a lot about some of that high level strategic planning and some of that direction. I just wanted to bring it up because it came up earlier in the conversation. Thank you.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks, Chuck again. To the conversation that – and actually I guess it was Chris that raised it first of all about having some continuity in the people working on this and then the discussion between Janice and Marilyn. This week in the GNSO – or this week, it seems like a week already. We saw the completion of a working group for a PDP that happened in quite timely fashion.   And the working group itself probably about six months. And everybody knows what the reputation was for PDPs.

EN

And there's other steps that have to be followed, but the point is this particular group was a series of PDPs where we've had a lot of continuity. It's wasn't restricted to have - new people could enter at any time. So I think you're right, and Chris is right, and certainly I'm willing to commit to continue participating on this and I'm sure others are too.

You can save a lot of time if you can have some continuity of people. It doesn't have to be restricted to them; it's always open. But that's a very helpful thing to do.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Question for you Chuck. In your participation and when you provide input when you participate in the calls, how do you take into account the constituency that you represent in your role and their opinions potentially on the matters that we deal with with the budget process?

CHUCK GOMES: There are two ways. This is Chuck again. There are two ways that happens, at least two. Number one, historically I'm aware because I've been involved for quite a whole of positions with regard to the budget. And in my particular case I've stayed active in the budget process since the beginning of ICANN, remember Marilyn.

And so I'm pretty aware in a general sense of positions of the registry stakeholder group with regard to the issues that are involved, but that doesn't always cover it. In cases where I need to go back and get feedback from them, and I also am communicating with the stakeholder group in that regard on an ongoing basis, so forwarding them

TORONTO

information – I know Paul did the same thing with the registries – so that then we invite feedback that way. So that's an ongoing process.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you.

CHRIS CHAPLOW: I'll just add to that, and simply – Chris Chaplow. Referring back to the BCs positions, the BC documents that we've submitted over the last couple of years, and actually what we've done in this past group wasn't actually difficult because it was process rather than policy. So it will actually be more of an issue moving forward I will say. And just to add, my suggestion would be yes to send back out to the constituency Chairs the invitation for the next group.

And I think what we'll probably see is similar groups to the one we've got now with hopefully one or two more on board as well.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. Tijani can I call on you to react to the way Chuck has described he manages his involvement in the representation of his constituency? And can you draw the differences that you see with At-Large with that process? Because I think, I suspect you're not going to have the same perspective. So can you please share that?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: It's different because At-Large is a representation of the end users all over the world. So we have the five ICANN regions. Each region we

have a RALO, what we call a RALO is the Regional Organization. And each RALO is made of several ALSes, At-Large structures. And the At-Large structures are our bases if you want. So anything we need to have the point of view of the community, we need to go to the ALSes to have their point of view that goes to the RALOs and then go to the ALAC.

So it is a little bit long and I think that we need to give time to this consultation. If we don't do it we will give you the point of view of us, of ALAC people, which is not fair.

XAVIER CALVEZ: What do you think would be the minimum amount of time – and I recognize it depends on the type of information dealt with – but if we provide for example the list of projects, not even yet details but maybe the beginning of the Framework elaboration we may throw at you guys a list of projects – last year, this year, the one that carried forward and so on – not necessarily a lot of information attached to each, but a list of projects.

If you would have to venture a guess, how much time do you think it would take for the At-Large organization to provide comments on that type of information?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Not less than three weeks. I don't think that we can have an good representation in less than three weeks.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yeah. I was afraid you were going to say more than that.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: If we have your information on time, in this case we can perhaps meet inside this three weeks.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay, so I'm gathering from what you're saying just now, and maybe what you're not saying, that plenification is key in when that period would be happening for you guys to be able to plan for it. And also commitment to the document being available ahead of time, so I suspect there's a bit of a logistic that needs to be respected for that to happen, right. Okay.

So we're going to need to take that into account. I would also like to have the ccNSO perspective on the same subject, because they have their own process. Alain you had a question or a comment?

ALAIN BERRANGER: With the NPOC, and I don't know what David experiences with the NCUC, but consultation and participation, if I may use a metaphor, is like a marriage – one party proposes and the other party disposes. So it's important to offer the opportunity to participate, but it's not an obligation to comment. So what happened in the case of our members, they are not, ICANN is not a daily preoccupation for them in the sense that they're non-contracted, so they want to just make sure that through the list that the important issues, or issues that may be important to them are flagged.

TORONTO

So the practice we take now, and it's a very young practice, we have less than a year's experience, is we just post it. And if we get no response than we just have to go to the Executive Committee. And there again, we may have non-participation. So it's a matter of judgment and I'm afraid that may not be completely satisfactory. But in terms of timing, it's not a great issue for us. We can turnaround in a week on those five bullets there.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Okay, thank you. I would suggest we stop the conversation there and that we just lay out the next steps from here, so that we can conclude on time and if possible a little bit early. You're interrupting me and completing what I'm going to say. So what we need to do –

JANICE DOUMA LANGE: You complete him is what he's saying.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes. You see the input that she provides and correction? We're like a marriage. Sometimes we feel like an old couple. First of all I want to turn around what I said I think we should do on providing an example of function and projects on the type of information that we're suggesting to provide so that we align ourselves at least on a tentative level of detail, so that we can work on that instruction. I think that we also basically need to provide a comprehensive approach that comes out of this working group on the timeline, on the content of the process, on the participation.

EN

So we said invite a number of people, let me rephrase, invite every one of the organizations and let the ones who want to participate, participate. And by the way, if there is no continuity in summarizations from some people, that's fine, they come in when they come in. They provide their input, hopefully it's not disruptive, but hopefully as well there's going to be a number of anchor points in this consultation where there will be continuity.

And not trying to call names specifically, but Chuck said that he was going to try to commit to this process. I know Chris has been committed to the process in the past as well to ensure that he checks all the boxes. So I think if we can count on them it sounds good in my views. Yeah I didn't try to call everyone. I think we still have work to do on defining the timeline and starting putting dates in this timeline. And also, the sequence of the information we're going to release for that consultation.

So I took the examples of projects for example. I think that in the development process of the information from the staff, we may be able to have first a list of projects, without necessarily a lot of details. But that list can be brought together after let's say two, three, four weeks. And even can be a draft. I want that we can be very open on sharing with this group a draft list of projects. And that's a relatively limited amount of information, but that if we're ready, a number of people can say "well I don't see this and that in that list"; that's already input that's very useful.

Or "what do you mean by that" and "if that project that you've indicated here is shaped up like this I don't like it, if it's shaped up like

that we do like it"' that's already input. So I'm thinking about that's a first phase and then the next phase is we take that input, we refine the list of projects and now we start putting the information about it. So that's the sequence of events, an example of the sequence of events that I'm describing.

ALAIN BERRANGER: Two things, I was very rude. I did not introduce my colleague, [Eduar Mohay] from (Inaudible) in Costa Rica. And he is the acting treasurer of NPOC and has kindly volunteered to join with me in this meeting and perhaps future activities.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you for that.

ALAIN BERRANGER: And then core activities versus projects and programs – what's the quick answer? What is a core activity?

XAVIER CALVEZ: Quick answer is a project, it has a specific purpose, a beginning, and end, dedicated resources to it and you're trying to accomplish something that within a certain timeframe you finish. A core activity is more a day to day activity. So paying vendors, we do that a bit every day and forever. So it's a day to day type of activity. I'll leave it at that but that's basically the notion.

ALAIN BERRANGER: Thank you very much.

XAVIER CALVEZ: No problem. So we're going to close here. We're going to produce a document that summarizes the comments, that tries to take the next step basically in the budget process. I think we need to also formulate the notion of how we're going to have this working group designed. And there's a number of questions that we need to answer on the timeline associated with the interaction, the number of interaction and starting putting dates around those interactions. And we're going to share that document – I need to circle back with the team, but I would expect in the next two to three weeks I'm hoping some personal development will not affect that timeline. Yes Tijani?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: I think for the next steps what we need to define well is the timing of the interactions and the form of the interactions.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Yes agree. Thank you. Let's conclude here. I want to thank everyone for their participation throughout the past three months. I think that's been a great response from the community to the offer and the approach that we suggested to work on budget process improvement. For me it was a key element of being able to make progress on the budget process.   There's been, I know, for a long time in the organization comments on improvements that are required, so in my views we need to continue this process that we've initiated over the past three months.

EN

We'll need to refine together how we make it happen, but unless we do these kind of things, and again thank for your participation to all, unless we do these kind of things we're just never going to make incremental progress. So to me any progress that we manage to put in this process that will start in the next few weeks is great, and I think we'll need to carry out that process improvement approach that we've gone through over the past three weeks in next year as well, and just continue that on a go forward basis. Yes Alain?

ALAIN BERRANGER: Maybe one question. So do I have a sense that the decision has been made here that we will go to a single working group now?

XAVIER CALVEZ: I would say yes. I think splitting the working groups where there's a lot of interactions on the subjects has proven to be maybe useful at the beginning, but I think at the end it made sense to merge them. I think Chris's suggestion, you guys are nodding so I think you'll agree, and that makes sense to me as well. It's easier for us as well from a logistical standpoint to manage. Great. Thank you very much guys and looking forward for next steps.

[End of Transcript]