TRANSCRIPT

SOP Working Group Meeting Toronto

14 October 2012

Attendees:

Sabine Dolderer, .de
Byron Holland, .ca
Allan MacGillivray, .ca
Roelof Meijer, .nl
Debbie Monahan, .nz
Leonid Todorov, .ru
Giovanni Seppia, .eu
Mathieu Weil, .fr
Hong Xue, Nomcom Appointee

ICANN Staff:

Bart Boswinkel
Gabriella Schittek

Roelof Meijer:	So I am Roelof Meijer from SIDN. Welcome everybody. We're a small group. (Inaudible) is our agenda for this session. We have until roughly 4:30. ICANN staff people are going to be here around 3:30, Bart? Is that the latest news?
Bart Boswinkel:	(Inaudible).
Roelof Meijer:	So what do we do --?
Bart Boswinkel:	(Inaudible).
Roelof Meijer:	Okay. Bart, what do we do with the 15 minutes that we have Carole and Larisa here and we don't have Kurt? We'll just start?
Bart Boswinkel:	(Inaudible).
Roelof Meijer:	Maybe you can use a mic because we are being --
Bart Boswinkel:	They will use a presentation, and there are two or three main topics on that presentation. I'll forward it to you and to Christina. It's first going back to say the

responses they provided to the SOP a couple of weeks ago, revisited and see what they've done with their comments. This includes the open question on the role of the advisory that was mentioned in part because that was still unclear. So it's cleaning up what was outstanding.

Then they go into what is the current new, the draft Strategic Plan that's up for comments, highlight a bit of the differences, and then when Kurt comes in, it will be very much about the future development of the Strategic Planning Process, because say, again, with the new CEO, there is new wins and so that will change. And maybe revisit a bit about the advisory because that's Kurt's -- that was Kurt's thing.

Another thing is, I don't know if you want to raise it or somebody else, and I think that's in response to your -- the point you raised, Mathieu, on the email list. There is hardly any difference between the, as far as we could see, between the current Strategic Plan and the new Strategic Plan, the redline version. It's more, and maybe that's something for the working group to discuss right now, what is the most effective way of providing income so you can make bland statements. That's one.

And maybe raise it either with Kurt or Larisa as well is how to -- what is the most effective and efficient way of providing the comments, so you can send out what we did last year. It was very easy for everybody but probably not very helpful.

Unidentified Participant: Another things we can do like I did in the plan is just change the years and still -- I was amazed. There's one part in the text where the previous plan said there are, I don't know, 120 million domains in 2011. And instead of putting the number of domains in 2012, they just changed are to were. And it was a very typical identifier of how they looked at changing this plan. I think they were really pressured into getting something in a very short time.

Roelof Meijer: Okay. Anyway. What I propose, very much in line with what Bart says, we have until roughly about 3:30 that we can ask them to wait 5 or 10 minutes inside when they show up. What I would like to do is get a first impression from those of you who read the plan already, and that should be everyone because Bart and I requested you to do so. And then look at our plan of work.

I said on the next slide, in fact it's what we proposed in the email I sent to you, and we will quickly look at the teams to see if there are any problems there or if we are all in agreement and we can proceed the way we (inaudible).

So maybe first, who wants to say something about his or her first impression? Apart from the one we just heard, there was very little change. What else is there? Who wants -- Mathieu?

Mathieu Weil: Well, there's a new CEO and obviously he hasn't even read the plan. So I think the plan itself is pointless.

Roelof Meijer: What was the last phrase?

Mathieu Weil: It is pointless to even look at this Strategic Plan and comment on the documents when it's not the actual strategy that is being and operated by the new management.

Roelof Meijer: Are you sure about that?

Mathieu Weil:	That's just my feeling. But I hear declarations by Fadi, I read things, and I look at this Strategic Plan. I don't see the link, which I can understand from the process time.
Roelof Meijer:	Okay. That's a good point. Sabine? Not in relation to Mathieu I hope, but your own personal observations of the plan.
Sabine Dolderer:	I think -- my first observations are similar to his, it doesn't change. But where it changes, it changes some place where I'm not sure if I read it right because you really thought that ICANN has very much more in the training and (inaudible) than it was ever, which means even more training enhancements and sort of assisting the (inaudible) to operate (inaudible).
	I see it especially on page seven where you see that the expansion of CNS is expected to increase the demand on training. We have seen a huge program for coming in new gTLD where all the new operators essentially have passed dramatically technical tests to be actually static in the roles, but they are now in the (inaudible) but they need training. And I'm not sure that that's the right assessment with regard to this process I wouldn't say.
	I would comment like we did last year. All we offer actually is a chance for a new discussion upon where ICANN wants to go.
Roelof Meijer:	Leonid?
Leonid Todorov:	For the record, okay, Leonid Todorov. You know, I've got a bunch of comments because I made some on the margins.
	Well first of all, yes, I would agree that the Strategic Plan is pretty much a mirror to what we're seeing already. Yes, there are some changes. Well, first of all, it's good that some metrics were improved.
	But my concern was that problems of, let's say recent challenges might have given rise to certain evaluation as to why they haven't, what were the causes for them, how they were remedied, how much effort and resources it took to remedy them, and stuff like that. So it was a perfect case from which I could have built some more or less improved Strategic Plan.
	Now speaking of certain things. I will just go through the text because I have these comments and I have to check them. Now, still metrics is kind of vague. I mean, the language is vague, and metrics are sort of murky. Sometimes it's even controversial, like for example, number of new gTLDs delegated annually is one of those metrics. So my question is simple. For example, what if no one applies for those TLDs, gTLDs? Or if everyone applies for them, I mean of those who are eligible for that, and actually their numbers go over? So what then? So this metric doesn't seem meaningful in the longer run.
	Now a couple of -- faster generation and publication of reports. That continues improvement of operational excellence. My concern is that, I mean, I can judge only and I can speak for those reports that I published and that I posted on the website, and I was particularly keen to explore the rushed version of those reports. I must say that the language is so poor and the translation is so poor that these reports are useless. And I'm sorry to be that straight forward, but you know, just in our inner circle I can use these words. So this is a huge problem because if you want to have a greater outreach, if you want to get people

engaged then they should have of course that etiquette, understanding of what is going on.

Now internationalization. This is a tricky thing particularly because I represent the country whose official representatives have raised many times their call for a genuine internalization of the ICANN, meaning that ICANN should not be that American-led company, rather an international body. So I believe that what is put in this plan in terms of internationalization plays right into the hands of those critics, not only from my country but from some other countries who do believe that ICANN still is an American-led company and all these, let's say, all those warnings about internationalization is just a smoke screen to sort of you guys at the American influence, the continuous American influence.

I'll be short. Needs or exceeds IANA contract service level agreed performance. Does it mean that like in the Soviet times we should over perform --?

Roelof Meijer: Let me just -- I don't want to rush you, but just give me the highlights.

Leonid Todorov: Okay. So the highlight is like this. Yes, there are certain improvements. I could see that some people edited that more carefully than ever. Still, the plan suffers sufficient drawbacks in a sense that it's partly inconsistent, the metrics are quite controversial, and overall I wouldn't say that this plan was really built on say some problems of the past. I mean, they were not taken into account so as to bring in some meaningful improvements. Sorry.

Roelof Meijer: No, thank you. Thank you, Leonid. Byron?

Byron Holland: A couple of comments. One, I would agree with Mathieu in that not -- I know this is shocking, I'm sure, but not much is changed here, but I think the point is there's a brand new CEO and given the Strategic Plan is basically not changed at all from last year, clearly the new guy has not put a stamp on it. Some might argue then that what's the point of us making much comment because nothing's changed and clearly the new guy's going to have a dramatic change next year. I mean, that could be an argument.

I would disagree with that. I think it's important that we still make comments, that we continue to raise some of the issues that Leonid has just raised, like metrics, for example. So I think it's definitely worthy of us to comment even though little has changed in the plan itself.

I would also say, and this is reiterating some things that I've said before in terms of this is a pretty operational strategic plan. It's pretty nitty gritty in the weeds for a strat plan, and it's probably worthwhile to make comment about ICANN should probably back away from this plan and take a higher level view of it and think about some of the other things that I know, especially there's a number of us in this room that have participated in a workshop not more than a couple of weeks ago about big picture strategic issue space in this industry.

Many of us in this room are facing declining growth rates for the first time in this industry's history. What does that mean? Why is that? Where are we going as a result of it? What impact is that going to have on revenues?

Unidentified Participant: And on gTLD.

Byron Holland: And on gTLDs. Right. I mean, new gTLDs are down. While we may think oh, it's the industry is changing because all the new gTLDs. I mean, a general

person on the street and has no idea, and I guarantee you it's not impacting their domain name buying decisions right now, so why are we seeing our industry face significant decline in domain growth?

In the Strategic Plan, one would think that that would be an issue to be addressed. Clearly the ITU, WCIT, all issues around that. I mean, those are significant events that have the potential to dramatically reshape the environment that we're in. Why is not being addressed specifically?

And then finally, black swan events. They're real, they happen. Where do we see that? I think a Strategic Plan should at least be giving some attention to that. They do happen. I mean, a month ago nobody probably foresaw the Article 29 working group in Europe saying no, you can't store the data. And what does that do to the RAA that ICANN has been working on? I mean, that's probably small for a black swan event, but nonetheless, and then the results have been well we'll let Europe do one thing and the rest of the world do the other? I mean, that's not going to work.

But who's thinking about those material negative events that can come up out of nowhere and reshape the environment? So I just think in terms of the strat plan, where are those big picture items and maybe we could be making comment on that.

Roelof Meijer: Thank you, Byron. Anybody else? Giovanni?

Giovanni Seppia: Yes. I'd like to just agree with Mathieu. But I also think that I don't know how much of the comments that we have been making through the past couple of years have been presented to the attention of the new CEO and the new CEO staff. So my recommendation would be to summarize these comments that -- more or less those comments have been the same in the past two years and present a sort of high level paper, maximum of two pages, and just post it straight to the attention of the new CEO in light of the confidential, let's call it, meeting we had a couple of weeks ago in Brussels. Some of us, we were there, and he shared with us some goals.

And I think in the same -- with the same approach and same principle, we should have a quite friendly way of passing on some messages, some input to him. At the same time, I don't think we should take for granted that this is the final plan. So I understand that there's a matter of process that ICANN has to call something, but it could be that this is completely legit because there are public comments here and open, and I believe that the new CEO and the new CEO staff will have something to say about this plan. So it could be that we are looking at something that in one month's time will be completely different, and that is also to incorporate the new strategic goals that the new CEO has been sharing with some community members.

So I think that different elements, but my recommendation would be really for us to continue to provide the input and draft something really high, high level, not getting into specific details, but still present this document to him.

Roelof Meijer: Okay. Thank you, Giovanni. So the first point, that's what we've heard a few times now so we can leave it. We can try to check the ICANN sponsors here if this is something that is supported by the new CEO or if they expect that the whole thing is going to change either before or after the comment period.

And the second thing where you recommended that we summarize our comments and get a highlight two-page document out, I think that's a good proposal. Let's discuss about that when we discuss our plan of work.

We have had occasions where ICANN staff came rather late. They are very much on time this time. So not to discourage you from coming on time. Is there somebody who wants to make a final comment on his or her view, and something we haven't heard yet? High line view of the present draft plan. No? Okay. Then --

Unidentified Participant: I think that, again, I don't want to get into details, but I think that what we have now in front of us is something that looks like it was drafted without taking into account not only the fact that there is a new CEO and also the fact that there have been some public comments here on other matters like, for instance, the meeting, ICANN meeting stuff. And there are recommendations that have been drafted about ICANN meeting stuff. And there is a section in this plan about ICANN meeting which looks like nothing (inaudible).

So I think that there's sort of different layers. So how much of this plan reflects the public comment here that (inaudible) and through which you get some recommendation, how much reflects the new ICANN CEO vision of ICANN? So I think probably they cannot (inaudible).

Roelof Meijer: You've made the point. Thank you. So what I propose is that the two other parts of our working group member's only session, work plan and teams, we will do this after we have had the discussion with the ICANN staff. Is that okay with everybody?

How are you on the agenda? Do you have to rush off? We have until 4:30. People will have to rush off immediately after 4:30? Leslie does. Okay. We will try to stick to the time then.

Maybe before you start, I was so concentrating on looking at this side of the room that I didn't see you coming in. A very warm welcome and thank you for being so on time. And we'll make sure that next time we'll be ready for you.

So I don't really know when you came in. I don't know if you have heard all the comments that people have made on the present plan? Okay. Well, I'll give you the -- because the most important one I think is about there's very little change in this plan as compared to the previous one. We have the impression that two factors are of an influence. One, there is a new CEO. We've heard him speak. We've asked him questions. We've had responses. We have the impression that his strategy is not completely identical to the one that we have on paper here, so what can we expect in changes from his side in the near future? And is there any point in seriously commenting on the present plan?

And the second thing is -- oh yes, of course. And the second thing is, and I think you've just heard Giovanni say that there were other processes that provided input to this plan. We don't see that input, and that reinforces that first question. Is this something that we should really take serious and take the time to comment upon it or is there going to be something else and were you pressed for time?

I tried to formulate this whole thing a bit politely.

Carole Cornell:	Hi. This is Carole Cornell, Director of the Project Office, and with me we brought Larisa Gurnick, who has been helping us with the Strategic Plan and the consulting, and also Xavier is here also. And Kurt will be joining. He is giving a presentation and he was trying to get down here as quickly as he could from that presentation.
Roelof Meijer:	Thank you.
Larisa Gurnick:	Very good. No problem. Hi. So our slides are now up on the screen, and just to address your questions. What we were hoping to talk to you today is first and foremost about some things that were brought to our attention back in Prague, some comments made, and the fact that some responses were put together and acknowledgment of some items that probably still need further discussion.
	We also wanted to give you an idea of what it is that you see in front of you as the Strategic Plan and the fact that it's really a representation of a process that was committed to and there was debate and discussion as to whether we even stick to this plan at all or whether we pause and wait for Fadi's direction and work and ideas to be reflected. And the ICANN team felt it was really important to stick to the timeline and the timeframe that was promised and committed to. People provided comments. We incorporated those comments that were wording clarifications and some accomplishments, but you're absolutely right in the sense that no substantive change was made to the plan, and that was with the expectation that this plan would just close out the direction that we had been on when the new CEO arrived.
	And then finally, the third point on the agenda is to talk to you about the future direction of ICANN strategy, and that's something that we'll -- I'll walk you through as part of this presentation.
	So I hope that that addressed some of your questions from an agenda perspective.
Roelof Meijer:	Okay. From an agenda perspective.
Larisa Gurnick:	From an agenda perspective.
Roelof Meijer:	Yes. So we'll be patient and we'll follow the agenda.
Larisa Gurnick:	Very good. Okay. All right. So I wanted to just -- okay, thank you. Bart, next slide please. I promise you the slides -- one more, please. The slides are very straight forward and I promise you there's not going to be a whole lot of text going on there.
	In response to what we've heard from this group as well as other groups in Prague, we had put together a document that was posted on the public comment website, and I have some copies of that here. And we touched upon a couple of items, and in the interest of time I'm not going to go through everything that we had heard and what the responses were, but I just wanted to reiterate that the comments that you and other community members made had been heard.
	So for example, things like the substance of the Strategic Plan needs to be elevated. There needs to be more -- it needs to include more vision, more plan for the future, more analysis of the serious risks and considerations that are impacting the industry. That metrics need to be formalized. All those things that I heard you talk about as we walked in, we acknowledge and we recognize you

don't see resolutions of all of those items as of yet because these are some steps that will be put in place in the next version of the planning cycle, and I will hold off on making specific comments on that because that's what Kurt's going to talk about.

So for example, one of the things that this group mentioned, further development of areas such as focus on prioritization, more meaningful metrics, accountability and responsibility for strategic initiatives, Fadi tomorrow will actually be talking about a process and an approach that he is putting into place that will address the focus on prioritization and the metrics as well as accountability, and that will be the management system concept that he will provide more detail on, so I will hold off on providing details at this point, but I just wanted to share with you that information will be coming tomorrow.

And then we also have a cross constituency working group on Thursday, so the timing of our presentation on Thursday to provide the update takes into consideration the fact that the new CEO will have an opportunity to introduce some of his thoughts and ideas tomorrow, and then we will be able to make reference to all that on Thursday when we have a strategic planning session with the stakeholder groups as a whole.

There was also a lot of discussion about cross constituency working group. This group in particular questioning what the mission and the objectives of that group would be and how it would interact and possibly overlap with the work of this group. So we understand those concerns, we acknowledge those concerns, and we are committed to develop a plan which really looks at all the different working groups and what their charter and mission is and to come up with a proposal for working group, a cross constituency working group who would look at the planning process as a whole, both strategic as well as operational and would provide some feedback to ICANN, both in terms of the process and also in terms of the content.

So our plan is to have that prepared for the next planning cycle, which would be 2014 through now we're talking about 2019. So that's one of the changes in the planning cycle that you will notice. Earlier when we were making comments about the next planning cycle, we were still in the mode of a three-year planning cycle, but now with the discussions that have been taking place with the board and with the new CEO, with Fadi, we are considering a five-year planning cycle, which also was one of the comments that this group had brought up to ICANN staff in the past.

Let me pause at this point and see if there's any questions or comments on the information coming so far. Okay. Next slide, Bart. Thank you.

I already touched on the next bullet point. Multi-year strategic development schedule. This group provided some feedback and recommendations that we do a five-year plan and that it becomes something that's implemented consistently and predictably. And that is in fact the direction of the next strategic planning cycle, as I mentioned. The five-year cycle with the idea that things like vision, mission, and macro-level goals and objectives would be determined at the beginning of that process, shared with the community, finalized, and then would really guide the operations of the next certainly two to three years if not five years. So we anticipate that the planning cycle will change quite considerably from the annual mode that we have been in for the last couple of years.

On the point of better understanding of costs of strategic projects, I know Xavier has a couple of clarifications that he can make on that point, which also fit in with the work that's been going on to create better linkage between the strategy and the operating plan on budget and the management system and the linkage that the team has been working on will probably address the issues of cost and details and visibility and transparency. Xavier?

Xavier Calvez: So as it relates to the better understanding of the costs of the strategy projects, I think, if I understand correctly, the point that part of what we are looking at into the budget process improvements, which we will be talking about in 40 minutes, starting in 40 minutes, with the working groups that had been put together, we will suggest and try to finalize what this working group changes that address that. Without trying to go too much in details, providing more information on the scope, the deliverables, the metrics, on the resources, the timeline, and of course the details of the costs relative to projects, we're expecting that this should help, both at the time of the budget but also then at the time of the delivery of this projects and during the year when those projects happen to be able to report on those projects as per those findings. And the planning part of it will help in the delivery and the clarity of the information we can provide on costs and on timelines and on deliverables on those projects.

Also, during the working group that will start in 40 minutes, we will try to address the part relative to make a clearer link between the strategy claim and the content of the budget, which we will try to address with the actions in the projects to those strategy objectives that exist in the strategy plan.

Roelof Meijer: Thank you, Xavier. Leslie, you have a question?

Unidentified Participant: Yes. Thanks, Xavier. It's great getting a better handle on costs and have a transfer and have a (inaudible). A comment that I know I've made for a whole number of years, so apologies if I'm sounding like a well worn record, is there planning -- is there going to be in this new cycle a loop where at a very high level one looks at the potential plan and then works out the costs of that to see whether that's a good way of spending money or whether it's affordable, or whether an actual fact you might have spare resource left over that you could use to do more, because that kind of loop thus far I don't think has really existed, or if it does, it does it in a secret room somewhere that we haven't seen.

Roelof Meijer: This was a question you addressed to Xavier, right?

Unidentified Participant: It is. So is there going to be a phase in this new strategic planning process where at a very high level one looks at the financial implications of the strategy and says yes, we can afford that? Actually it's lower than budget, so we can afford to do more? Or, oops, we've suddenly got this huge bill that we're not going to be able to afford?

So I know previously we've gone all the way through a strategy process and then the budget comes at the very end with that is my perception.

Carole Cornell: Hi, this is Carole. The answer is we're doing two things. The new tools and management process we're going to use is going to have the ability to do an up-front business case evaluation of what something would cost in time. What I'm hesitating to say is where that is and how quickly it gets to you and back and how that circle goes. But will we be doing an evaluation before we launch a project in terms of cost and effort? The answer is yes, it is part of that operating plan. You'll see it in the operating plan as business case. So yes.

Xavier Calvez:	So the reason why I was looking puzzled was because I had the impression you were talking about that loop within the strategic planning process and not as part of the budgeting exercise, which is -- so I think you were answering a slightly different question.
Unidentified Participant:	Correct. That's when it's all been agreed and now you're working at it at another level.
Xavier Calvez:	So let me try to reformulate your question just for the sake of making sure I have understood it. Your question is about an existing check or loop to your point of when we formulate as part of the strategic planning process, the strategy end use, strategy objectives or integration to formulate, at least at a high level, a cost assessment of implementing or trying to achieve those objectives to check at a high level strategy plans that the organization can afford those objectives.
	I don't know for sure that in the past we have looked at that aspect of the plan, and I wonder, and I'm sure Kurt, when -- he's coming. He told me he was just coming. I think Kurt may be able to have a perspective on that.
	I feel that the way we currently develop the strategic planning is not conducive to getting that done and I understand your point. I have the impression that I'm a little bit used to seeing a strategic plan formulated with what you have in mind included of developing a strategic plan on a multi-year basis with sufficient action plans formulated on an annual basis with amounts that, at a high level, high level P&L, high level cash flow, that helps figuring out whether -- how to get there and how the realism of the plan is.
	So I hear you. I don't believe we have a --
Roelof Meijer:	Xavier, sorry to cut you short.
Xavier Calvez:	Yes.
Roelof Meijer:	But I think you've already answered the question, at least I would translate your answer as probably not but we'll ask Kurt.
Unidentified Participant:	Yes. I currently knew the answer to that question that no you haven't done it previously. I am just suggesting there is a loop going forward because it isn't just a money issue, it's a staff resource issue too.
	So I, in my naive way, view sometimes the ICANN strategic process as a shopping list that people just add things they'd like to eat next week onto the shopping list without any feel for the overall size of the affordability of the bill.
Roelof Meijer:	I think it's a good question. And I think we've all experienced this kind of process is not yet in there, and maybe Kurt can tell us what they did before. I think it's not very much, otherwise we would have known. But carry on.
Larisa Gurnick:	Thank you. I just wanted to also add that while the process for the new planning cycle is still evolving, and certainly this comment I'm taking it down and we will make sure that we address it, but from a discussion perspective, the Strategic Plan as it's being envisioned on a go-forward basis is a much higher level, more strategic document that really creates -- provides a roadmap for planning out specific projects and activities. So it's not going to be visioned to include the details in nearly as much detail as what you have seen in the past. So it will be

truly strategic and then the handover will be for the next process to really evaluate what it's going to take from a resource perspective and the timing perspective as well.

Roelof Meijer: Larisa, thank you very much. Kurt, very much welcome. How are you?

Kurt Pritz: (Inaudible).

Roelof Meijer: Have a (inaudible). Sorry, I forgot something.

Sabine Dolderer: I have a question, a followup question or remarks from Leslie. You said that you will be associated a business proposal to each project, a business plan. If there is a business plan, (inaudible). I'm a little bit puzzled because if ICANN is in the not-for-profit area, if you associate a business plan to approach it, obviously that doesn't really (inaudible) but you have I think more to look out in costs versus benefits, risks versus things. Have you any understanding how you want to view that and how you actually measure that or will want to measure it? And also how to approach it if ICANN took over, how they actually will change the emphasis in the market. So perhaps if you looked at the new gTLD program, you see that now to start a registry it's becoming much more costly and the change isn't completely in the area. Has ICANN planned to deal with that or to take that into account or address that?

Kurt Pritz: Yes. So that is a very challenging question. We have in our new management mapping where we're trying to capture all the work we're doing. We have an initiative, one of the higher level ones, that tries to determine how we take the public interest into our decision making. So when we're thinking about costs and benefits, we're not thinking as a for-profit company, we're thinking as ICANN in its role. And so some of those benefits are monetary, you know? Which business option pays off or is the cheapest, but we have a different goal. We all share a different goal, as you know, and that's primarily acting in the public interest or for the public benefit, and there's many sub-bullets to that.

                    And in an attempt to -- so we say that a lot, but I don't know if we know what it really means, and in an attempt to answer that, we build that into our decision matrix, in our decision making, how do we take the public interest into account? Does that answer the question at all? Because it was the first thing I thought of. I thought it was so good.

Sabine Dolderer: I'm not really sure that we're talking about the public interest in that area. I'm sure that the public interest is ICANN has offered a lot of (inaudible) but the question is according to projects following -- (inaudible) following strategic plan from ICANN, how you actually decide how much you want to do, why you want to do it, and which level you want to do it, which is something I think a little bit different?

                    Of course you can do all of the work because it's in the public interest, but the question is is it worthwhile? Where actually is the limit?

Kurt Pritz: I think most of what we do comes from community recommendation. So on the GNSO side, they identify a list of projects they'd wish us to undertake and the GAC gives us advice and gives us more counsel, and then those things have to be prioritized in some way. And the way to do that I think is when I talked about serving the public interest, it was certainly the subset of serving the public interest within the ICANN, within the narrow ICANN (inaudible) of technical coordination.

And so then the projects have to be prioritized, and the idea is that ICANN takes an amount of work and does an amount of work that it has capacity for, so it has a tool for laying out its whole menu for the year under the current version of the Strategic Plan and does that work.

Roelof Meijer: And Kurt, just before you entered, Leslie asked a question if you had a system in which when you look at your strategy, your overall strategy and your new strategic plan, if you have a system whereby you make a rough calculation on how much that strategy is going to cost you and if you can afford to pay?

We got the distinct impression that such a system is not really there, and I think the question that Sabine asked is a bit -- well, not a bit, is very much connected to that one, because if you do that and your calculation shows that you have not enough money to do everything you had envisioned in your strategy, you have to make a choice. And how are you going to decide which project you are going to do and which ones you are not?

So that's more or less the second question. If you have a project, how do you determine if you're going to execute it or not and how do you determine afterwards if it has been successful or not. And the first answer, or the answer to the first question I think cannot be well -- and you are not saying this, but if it's the recommendation by the community which makes your list of projects, then there is the risk that the louder a certain part of the community shouts, the higher their projects are on the agenda. So maybe we should not go into this discussion now, but I think this group would like to hear at one time or another, but before the end of the year I would suggest, or maybe we could do it in Beijing, how do you actually decide on which projects you are going to do and which ones you are not.

And if we have that question, I'm sure it's not really clear to the community on how you make those decisions.

Kurt Pritz: Yes. So we're going to talk about strategic planning in a little bit, but working with Fadi, our vision of the plan is that it's really a higher level strategy, that it indicates a vision and a mission statement and then true strategic, what I would call macro-deliverables, such as globalization or internationalization, defining some large goal with regard to that and maybe as operational as physical presences where ICANN is located.

I think the answer to your question really goes to our operational planning where we publish a plan and say here's the objectives for the year, here's the projects for the year, and they're open for community review. Xavier and I and others have all heard that that planning process probably needs to be longer because there needs to be a clear definition of what the projects are and then time to debate what they are.

I understand your point -- I'm painfully aware of your point about the loudest voice because I heard the loudest voice all the time, and it's shrill.

Roelof Meijer: I wasn't even suggesting anything between the lines.

Kurt Pritz: But it's really important to strike the right balance and make sure all the projects are considered in some sort of open way.

Roelof Meijer:	I know one of your major topics for being here is to take with us about how the strategic project -- planning process is going to be in the future or from now on. But, Larisa, do you have more slides? Have you finished or -- because I want to finish your part first before --
Larisa Gurnick:	Actually, we are on to the next slide, Bart, please?
Roelof Meijer:	And did you have a question, Bart? Do you want a mic or --? Oh, okay.
Larisa Gurnick:	Okay. So on this slide we've already talked about the fact that what you see in the current document, and that's 2013 through 2016 Strategic Plan draft, the thought behind it was if we wanted to follow through on our commitment. We posted a plan that people had provided feedback and comments on, so we wanted to follow through with that process. And it's updated to reflect just a few areas, accomplishments and some wording clarifications, and does not offer any substantive change.
	And the idea is that the board will approve this plan somewhere in the December/January timeframe, and that will close out that year's plan and commitment, and ever before that, the process for developing the next Strategic Plan, the five-year vision that incorporates the new thinking from Fadi and working with the board. That's what's going to really kick it off.
	So at this point, Kurt, I'll turn it over to you.
Roelof Meijer:	Just a question, because that was an important one from this group. Do you actually expect that let's say an enhanced version of this draft will be submitted to the board for approval in December? So a plan which does not really have the stamp of the new CEO on it?
Kurt Pritz:	Yes, and we discussed this and I want to hear what you think too, but we've gone down this path where the SOP and others have provided input into the plan and we've amended it in accordance with your comments. And now we're sort of nearing the end of that cycle. And so because that effort's been expended, we want to follow through on that and publish the next version of the plan, which is sort of stay the course and start, but at the same time start talking about a five-year strategic planning cycle that Larisa is about to -- not a three-year cycle but for a five-year plan that Larisa is about to talk about and talk about reformulating the way we go about it to make it more meaningful we hope for you and for us.
Roelof Meijer:	So, would you want us to comment on that?
Kurt Pritz:	Sure.
Roelof Meijer:	Mathieu? I think I know what he is going to say.
Mathieu Weil:	I'll try to surprise you, Roelof. I think the timeframe that's set here is December/January is like three months after the new CEO's coming. I state my personal opinion, as is usual to say here, but I think ICANN needs a new Strategic Plan by then. And three months to deliver a new strategic plan is rather standard in terms of outlining some significant differences from the former one. And I think I, and I wonder if this is shared in this group, would perfectly welcome and certainly not feel alarmed if the process was slightly changed to accommodate to do this important event and if this enabled ICANN to take a new direction faster because the time is short.

Kurt Pritz:	Can I ask for clarification?
Roelof Meijer:	Yes.
Kurt Pritz:	So I guess I'll --
Roelof Meijer:	Maybe -- can I make a suggestion, Kurt, because I saw that Giovanni also wants to comment? Maybe we can get just a few comments in and then see if you still need clarification?
Giovanni Seppia:	Hi, Kurt. Yes, I mean what surprises me is the fact that we are presented a plan which is a plan that goes from 2013 to 2016. So this plan has a validity that goes beyond the course of this year and beyond next year. So the community is shown something that should last them to 2016.
	So I would like to say reformulated plan, there have been I think three months to redraft the plan is quite a challenge for a complex organization that are based on what they call the model because of course that implies that you have to open processes to listen and to collect input from the community, which in some cases is not so easy.
	But at the same time I heard that the new CEO would like to have this at a high, high level. So my thought is wouldn't it be better to, as Mathieu said, let's say resize the business process in terms of timing and make sure that the time the board approves the plan, which is between December and January, it approves a plan which is not this plan but -- three pages plan but a plan that reflects the new goals, the new vision, the new everything that probably is going to be put in place? And again, that's because this is going to be more consistent with the fact that it's a plan that is 2013 to 2016 plan, not just a two-month plan.
Roelof Meijer:	Thank you, Giovanni. Somebody else? Leslie?
Unidentified Participant:	We've all started as new CEOs, right? You don't come in and start doing a new plan straight away. I think we're being slightly unrealistic. Of course you're going to come in as new CEO and want to change things. Whether you want to (inaudible) over all of the strategic plan work done to date, I suspect not.
	I think we need to be a bit more realistic in what we're asking for here. I'm hearing people saying there's going to be lots of changes because the new CEO. Of course there will be, over time.
Roelof Meijer:	Okay. If I may make a comment myself. I think I'm a bit in the middle of both statements. And the thing is that the present plan that was approved by the board last year runs until 2015. I think at least we should expect that by 2015 there will be an alternative, I'm sure, that will be somewhere in the first half of next year.
	But I wonder if it's not easier for the community to get a grasp on the fact that you will not change the present plan from 2012 to 2015 and 2013 to 2016, but if you just send out a message, listen, if we change the plan now there will be few changes, so there's not really a point because we know that somewhere in the course of the first half of next year there will be a major change in at least how we deal with the Strategic Plan. Maybe not even in the strategy, but at least in the way we deal with the plan, and there will be some strategic changes. And that we just live with the present plan until the next plan is there.

Because this is not the plan that ends in 2012. It runs until 2015. And the only reason to change it is we see changes that have an impact next year and all the way towards 2015. And as long as we don't see those, you can -- and you can even decide to issue a statement, well we see these changes that will be incorporated in the next Strategic Plan, but we will stick to the present one because there's not much point in spending a lot of time and energy of the ICANN staff and the ICANN community arguing and discussing about something that is going to be invalid within the next six months.

Is that something that we could all agree on? It is a compromise between the two statements. Leslie, do I make -- am I making sense? Sort of? Kurt?

Kurt Pritz: I think we're all in agreement. And when you read the version of the Strategic Plan that was published back in September, you will see that all it is is changes that were -- that reflected a change in the environment. Some things got done, some situations changed, and some new tasks, but not a change in direction. And it was based on the feedback from the SOP, it was based on the feedback of different advisory committees that were interested in this.

So what this version of the plan is really meant to be exactly that. It's meant to be here's a slight change to the plan that brings it up to date and we're going to finish it now, and because we've been at this process for some time and we are going to, going to the next slide, we're going to reset our process for something bigger.

So whether we decide to have the board approve this, I'll say unremarkable, but this change to the plan as the new plan or just it lie, you're right. I think it's sort of irrelevant. We did want to recognize that the SOP did work and contributed to it, that ALAC did work, that other committees did work, and so we made changes based on their input. And we didn't say -- so very frankly, we didn't want to say thanks for your input and your effort, but we've decided not to update it. So we wanted to pay respect to that, do some work, and then reset the objectives.

And Leslie, thank you so much for that comment. Fadi I think is pushing for a new version of the plan by Beijing or slightly after that, and I think that would be remarkable. But to really focus our efforts immediately after this on that, on that new version rather than what we're doing here.

Roelof Meijer: Well then I'm a bit afraid of the message you will be unwantedly sending out to the community if you change the plan along the lines that you envision now and you call it the 2013 to 2016 plan and then we have to explain to everybody that well, don't take this too serious because the CEO is working on the new version, but of course he cannot get that ready within the next two months. So live with this one, but it has a very short time span.

And at the same time you extend this time span with one year to 2016. So I think this group will support the recommendation -- oops. I'll stop talking and let one of my members talk.

Sabine Dolderer: (Inaudible) I expect (inaudible) to acknowledge the effort that we put in. It's important that you get (inaudible) which is to make the plan more strategic. So I think the explanation to say we're not going to pass a new one is actually the best acknowledgement that we can -- taking into account the comments we've just made because I think that is a significant one.

	And so I think you combine both and actually come out with a lot more (inaudible) we've listened and instead of actually putting that extra year on, we'll just stay with the current until the new one actually comes through, representing the new CEO and taking into account all the comments that the community has made.
Roelof Meijer:	And we had a suggestion by Giovanni that we're going to talk about in a few moments, or if we still have time, and that was to send kind of an excerpt of our previous submitted comments on the strategic plan, make it a high line, two-page document, and send that to you and the CEO directly so that can be taken into account when you formulate the new plan.
Kurt Pritz:	We have one more slide I think, right?
Larisa Gurnick:	Yes, and -- I guess I'm done.
Kurt Pritz:	Thank you. We'll see you later.
Larisa Gurnick:	Well that was easy. As you will see, all the points, they're included on this slide, are things that we've been talking about. So we don't have all the details flushed out obviously, but we do know that the strategic planning cycle will take a five-year perspective.
	We do want to accomplish the plan being much more strategic, and we envision that the vision mission and macro-level objectives, once they're set in place, will survive from year to year and will really guide the development of work that is done and perhaps will also clarify the prioritization of the work because the objectives will be stated clearly and there will be agreement and understanding from sharing these objectives with the community as to what the organization is working toward accomplishing.
	The management system implementation, which we talk about as a bridge between strategy and results, once you will have the opportunity to see more details of it, what it does is really it creates a link between the high level strategy and the operating plans and budgets in the sense that it tackles some very specific objectives, goals, priorities, breaks things down into projects, and has individuals accountable for the completion of these various elements of work with timelines, budgets, metrics, as well as standards of what was expected and then, by comparison, how we were able to deliver on those expectations.
	So that's a lot of detail that's wrapped into this concept of management system implementation, but it is in fact the connection that we envision will connect high level strategy and objectives to the work that actually goes on a daily basis in the budgets and how the work is being evaluated to check its effectiveness.
Roelof Meijer:	Thank you. So, Kurt, have we also covered what you wanted to discuss with us, or --? Because we seem to have -- I think it's good that we had a mix between this part and looking ahead, looking forward to the next plan and how changes are going to be made in the strategic planning process, but I don't know if we've covered everything that you wanted to tell us.
Kurt Pritz:	So, two messages we wanted to convey, and we've covered them, is on the current path we were on with the existing strategic plan and amending of that. We were going to finish that because the SOP and others have put time into it, there's been meaningful contribution, and we wanted to reflect that.

And the second thing we wanted to convey was the development of a new strategic plan with our new CEO and some of the thought that's behind it, at least as to it's form and see how we wanted to participate together in formulating that.

We talked about the first one, and we're considering whether or not we should go ahead with posting that -- finishing that version of the strategic plan or saying we have feedback on this version of the strategic plan and we've decided in accordance with your input and also with what our CEO wants to do, we want to go about it a different way.

And then for the second, we'll be -- well you know we'll be starting by crafting this vision and mission that shouldn't -- at the end of the day it shouldn't be a surprise to anyone, but the form that the strategic plan takes will be different than the current version.

And third, we might want to talk then about how the strategic plan and the operating plan and budget fit together. We have a very high level strategic plan and we have an operating plan that's rich in detail, at least we think it is. How do we bridge that gap so there's sort of a clarity about what projects are in and what projects ICANN is undertaking.

So this strategic plan, if it's a true strategy, won't have operational projects in it. And then we think it looks a little bit operational now. And so we want to be able to make sure you have the tools to engage in the debate about what gets done suitably. So we'll have a high level strategic plan, we have a very detailed operating plan, and I don't know if something needs to be created to fill that gap or how we can best have that discussion.

Roelof Meijer: Okay. So, Kurt, on your first item, we are in this process. We have committed ourselves to it, and we're going to execute it and come up with a new draft for the 2013 to 2016. I think, but I'll be happily corrected by my fellow members, but I think you have the strong advice from this working group not to follow that procedure, to stick with the present plan, communicate what you're doing, and of course take comments that you've received previously into account when you come up with the new plan.

Our first impression is if we look at this slide that it is very much in line with what we recommend and the comments on the present draft would be from this community, and we will support that process by compiling a high level document of our previous comments as input for the new plan.

But we agree on that? I think we do, right? The changes are work, so and I think we were discussing that briefly.

Kurt Pritz: So to the extent you're telling us to do less work, we're for that. And what we --

Roelof Meijer: No. Yes, I think what we are telling you or suggesting is that you spend your valuable time on the new plan and not on the present one.

Kurt Pritz: I understand that. I appreciate that sentiment. Yes, and so we'll preliminarily accept that and we'll review the plan as we have it marked up and see if there's changes in there that we think have to be agreed upon, but my first thought is that there are none and that we can take your advice, understanding that we want to consult with some other parties too, but understand your strong advice and we agree with it.

Roelof Meijer: And believe me, there are some changes. They need to know is right a short paper on that instead of coming up with a new plan with the next three years --

Unidentified Participant: Maybe the SOP can suggest put this in as a submission.

Roelof Meijer: I think that's what we'll do. It's a major comment on the present process. Yes. So, any questions for Xavier, Kurt, Carole, or Larisa?

Kurt Pritz: So this is my job, the strategic planning stuff, and I see in the very near future, consulting with you, either as a group or individually, on how we're going forward. I have a lot of questions. This is the one group that's full of CEOs right? And I'm kind of flipping sometimes, but no kidding. I'd like to consult with you going forward and learn from your experiences with regard to strategic planning and Fadi does want to get this done as soon as is practicable. So in the very near future, if you would, I'd appreciate additional consultation. Right now I'm still doing new gTLDs, but I'm hoping to stop that soon.

Roelof Meijer: Well I think we all joined this working group to do exactly that, so I think you can count on us in that perspective definitely. Okay. Thank you, guys, and good luck this week. Have a great week.

Okay guys, just know, we're just going to do the work plans, and the teams that there will be a change in what we're going to do, so I think we can do that quickly. But shall I move over to you, or can you throw me the cable somehow? Sorry? For the next -- yes, I will. Nope.

Okay everyone. So I think that we'll change what we're going to do over the next few months a bit. So what I would suggest is that the first next step would be that Bart and I compile a draft message to ICANN in which we will say with only one major comment on the strategic plan, and since it's not -- doesn't have any new vision from the new CEO incorporated and it has only a few changes, we strongly recommend that you do not make a new plan, you stick to the present one. If you think that there are significant changes, you publish those in a separate document but stick to the '12 to '15 plan.

And we also recommend that the next plan will be ready before the second meeting of ICANN of 2013, so before -- that will be Durban, right? Yes. So we can have our first input in Beijing and a much further work out version in -- yes, suggest that we have something tangible in Beijing and have something very significant in Durban.

And the second thing that, and that is something we can task ourselves with, is that we come up and we do that within I would say within the next six weeks or something, we compile a two-page high level document of our major comments. Shall we make a draft on that one as well?

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible).

Roelof Meijer: Yes? Do you agree?

Unidentified Participant: Yes, I'm willing to review the document.

Roelof Meijer: You are such a nice guy. Thank you. We'll make use of that voluntary contribution.

Unidentified Participant: It was kind of pushed --

Roelof Meijer:	No longer voluntary.
Sabine Dolderer:	But I think we should also come up with sort of a recommendation, and I think Kurt touched the point which makes me actually a little bit nervous, he said that we have a high level strategic plan and that goal will be actually translated into a huge amount of operational details. Where I think we should really -- when we see how ICANN is currently actually losing themselves in details, a detailed look -- of course because the community is asking for them because some of the people within the community need (inaudible). I'm not sure about that.
	But the question is I think we should address that to -- it's important to maintain a clear focus and to pass that additionally as a ledge.
Unidentified Participant:	Yes, I think you touch upon a good point. I think in the messaging, say first of all, we're looking forward but that we want to at least understand, or the SOP wants to understand the process and both say what we've heard, the links between the operational plan and the strategic plan and how this will work in the future, and how that process will look like these processes. So that the SOP is informed very early on the stable process and to know what to expect and that you know what is and understand what the link is between the strategic plan and the operational plan and how that will be bridged.
Sabine Dolderer:	That's one part, but it's also a channel perception, how you define your role and your vision and (inaudible). Because what I'm finding is sometimes puzzling is of course there is a lot of demand coming from the community, but there is also a lot of issues ICANN jumps on and says yes, of course that's our business instead of neglecting that as part of their business, as part of their roles, as part of their roles, and that's -- they should make a very clear understanding how that decision making is dealt with.
Roelof Meijer:	Okay. No, that's a good point. But we will -- Bart and I will compile this two-page document and will submit it, and if this is missing, you can add it.
Unidentified Participant:	Sorry. Maybe I think that's one -- if you look to the thread of all the submissions made today, that's one of the recurring themes. And so in the two-page highlight, that's one point that needs to be addressed, or at least forewarned this is a major concern of the SOP. Not so much in response on say this strategic plan, as in the information for Kurt and Fadi.
Roelof Meijer:	Okay. Leslie?
Unidentified Participant:	Yes, just a point. You were talking about getting bogged down in the detail, but Roelof is right. We, as a committee, had asked for further detail on ICANN projects and milestones and so on because we didn't feel that there was sufficient control over those nor were some of the projects very clear as to their scope and therefore their costs and duration.
	As a practical suggestion, I mean I went back as we were talking to some of our previous contributions, and I think if one had the time, it would be really good to go back to two or three of those and draw together some of the common points because actually I think there's some points that we have been making for a long time that have not yet been heard and are slightly more powerful if we are able to reference back we first raised this point in response to the 2007/2008 strategic plan, for example.

Roelof Meijer:	Yes, okay. So Bart and I will make the draft. I would really, really encourage you to look well at the document and go through previous comments and see if you feel that something is missing and then add it.
Unidentified Participant:	The sense I get is we'll be in a bit of hiatus, maybe even till after Beijing, in other words you'll finish this little piece that goes in. I think there's real opportunity to give advice on what a strategic plan should look like in a normative sense. All right? In other words, what should be in it, right? So maybe that's something that's worth thinking through.
	Are there anyone here who thinks our process is quite good, because actually the fear I'm hearing is if it's quick it's going to be so general as to be useless. So I think it's worth telling them these are the elements one would expect to see in a plan, like environmental scan or some of the things we were talking about already. So in other words, to center our expectations in a general sense, which is not obviously commenting on the existing piece of paper. So that's my comment.
Roelof Meijer:	Yes. Good suggestion. We'll do that. Although one would hope that Fadi would very well know what should be in there, but we can still make the recommendation. And I think that will be an improvement from how we sometimes (inaudible) we say that this is not good, but we also suggest on how things can be improved. So yes.
	Anything else? Okay. Thank you very much. I think it'll give the high line of this outcome presented during the CCN. Is that meeting right? I have a 15-minute slot or something?
Bart Boswinkel:	Tuesday morning. Yes.
Roelof Meijer:	Okay.
Bart Boswinkel:	Just after your update.
Roelof Meijer:	Thank you very much. I think this was -- I feel this was a good session at least. We got some concrete stuff from ICANN now. Just hope that they will do something with our major recommendation on this process, but we'll go and push for that. Thank you all.