
ICANN77 | PF – ccNSO: Strategic and Operational Planning Committee and Triage Committee
Tuesday, June 13 2023 – 13:45 to 15:00 DCA

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning and Triage Committee. My name is Claudia Ruiz. I along with Bart Boswinkel and Kimberly Carlson are the remote participation managers for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

Interpretation for this session will include Spanish, French, and Arabic. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session. If you wish to speak, please raise your hand in the Zoom Room. And once the session facilitator calls upon your name, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Before speaking, ensure you have selected the language you will speak from the interpretation menu. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if speaking in language other than English. When speaking, be sure to mute all other devices and notifications. Please speak clearly and at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate interpretation.

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.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcription is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in the Zoom session using your full name. For example, first name and the last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. Thank you. And with that, I will hand the floor over to Jordan Carter. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thank you for taking us through that, and thank you to all of you for being here right now. I'm going to start with some introductory remarks and then take you through the first half of the presentation, which is the Triage Committee. The mysteriously named Triage Committee, which I'll also explain. Then Andreas and Irina are going to lead us through some report backs from the work of the SOPC Committee. The scrutiny that they've done over the FY24-28 plan, a bit of a retro, I think, on what's happened since The Hague meeting a year ago, and then what's next coming on from SOPC. So I'll try and keep it to about 25 minutes for my bit and then hand it over to you. If I'm taking too long, feel free to poke me in the ribs.

The Triage Committee is the ccNSO's internal planning committee. It's called Triage because every part of the organization will send e-mails or requests for us to do work or join a working group or things like that. Originally, the committee was dedicated to helping answer those questions, support the staff for quick responses, and to make sure that

there's some Council oversight of how those were dealt with and bringing them up to the Council for decision when required. We'll look at the working model of that as the third thing.

But one of the things that we've done over the past couple of years is try to be clearer about the ccNSO's underlying plan or strategy, if you like, trying to make it a more easy-to-digest document. I'm trying to evolve that to be a bit clearer about the key items that we're planning to work on in the coming year so that you've got a ready and easy way to do it. We've been improving our internal planning tools as well, and we're going to give you a little snapshot of one of those as part of this presentation.

The ccNSO Council as part of that work did a little reprise of the purpose of the ccNSO, which had been discussed I think in 2020, and defined three goals for guiding our work, three goals that seem most apposite for our role as a Supporting Organization within ICANN. And that framework then lets us have an objective standard to measure incoming work requests against. If something comes in that isn't relevant to the goals in this one-page document that we're about to show you, we don't work on it. If we could go to the next slide, we'll see how we documented it. You don't need to read the whole thing in small font on your device.

For a long time, the ccNSO has seen itself as being a global platform for ccTLD managers to undertake policy and policy-related work and to cooperate and learn and to engage with other stakeholders. We've not proposed any changes to that statement, but we have developed three goals to sort of guide the work in a little bit more detail to keep

the global policies up to date and developing so that they meet our needs as ccTLD operators, to support the growth and development of ccTLD organizations, and to contribute to ICANN's broader work with a ccTLD point of view is how to sum those three goals up.

The outcomes that we're seeking from that work are also three, one for each goal. We want to make sure the policies are suitable for our needs. We want to make sure that the ccNSO is a positive force helping us evolve as registries, and we want to make sure that the ccTLD perspective and voice is included in the work of ICANN beyond the ccNSO zone proceedings. There are some foundations that that rest on. We want it to be easy to find a way and participate for new volunteers. We want good processes and information sharing. And we rely, of course, in our very high-quality support from the ccNSO secretariat and the ICANN staff.

That's the purpose and goals statement that we've developed. I think this is the first time we've shared it directly with the community. Is that right, Bart? We're going to ask you what you think about those goals through using the Menti tool, which I hope that you could open in your browser or on your phone by going to menti.com, M-E-N-T-I .com, and then entering the code. If you are on your phone, I think you can zoom in with your camera and then click on the QR code as well. Have we circulated the papers separately to the members list? Are the documents themselves available? They have them? Sorry. They're editorializing as I go.

It would be nice to get a sense of what you think for that statement. Do you support the purpose and goals? We'll leave that open for a wee

while. That's interesting, it shows the relative levels. With all of this stuff, one of my key motivations is trying to keep it simple and try to keep this stuff as simple as possible because—I mean, you know how we are. Sometimes in ICANN, we'll use 10 pages when one page could do. So we very strictly told ourselves these are one or two-page documents. There are still some votes coming in. But I think we can give ourselves a collective tick that that statement of purpose and those goals as the underlying core of our plan for the ccNSO makes sense to you. So I think we might move on from there. Thank you. There'll be another question before too long.

Then we thought, "Well, if we've got this nice three goal structure, why don't we put the plan in a similar structure?" That's what we're about to show you next. And then we'll also use that structure to report back against the plan on a quarterly basis using everyone's favorite tool of traffic lights. Green is good, orange is please pay attention, red is a problem. Each quarter, we'll assess the plan against that and publish a quick update on this soon to be revealed two-page document.

This is not an exhaustive plan of all of the work that the ccNSO does. What the document does is the high-level overview of critical activities. It's a set of headlines, if you like. But the idea is to say, "What are the major work efforts going on in each of the three goal areas for us to be able to see and get an easy visual read on?" It's also a bit about timeframes. So if something's going to take less than three months for the community to do, we want to include it. Could we go to the next slide, please to start? Okay. That is not what I was expecting to see next. We're going to start with quick—okay.

Sorry, let me just finish that introducing. Bart is going to first show us the actual online tool where the whole detail of the work plan is kept to give you a bit of a teaser about how that is, and then we'll show the abstraction afterwards. So, Bart, over to you.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Thanks. First of all, please focus on the left-hand side. You can see my cursor. This is an activity portfolio. The reason for calling it a portfolio is, as you will see in a minute, you've got basic activities, these are projects or ongoing things, etc., they are combined at a higher level in other areas. And when you really start combining everything into everything, you start talking about the portfolio, and portfolio is ... the Triage Committee will oversee it and monitor what's going on. But that's why it's called a portfolio for that specific reasons. You have portfolio management, program management, and project management in the usual thing. And this is really about portfolio management.

As you can see, you've got the policies. That was goal one under the statement that most of you supported. Second one is the global platform for the ccTLD. So the ccNSO is really the global platform for the ccNSO, then you have the ccNSO as contributor, and then some foundational activities. And the last one—and that's the good thing about having a tool like this—it's a kind of repository of upcoming events which not been discussed but which are and may be relevant in future such as a holistic review.

If you start looking and drill down in these various things, the policy function of the ccNSO—and this is where you can see it, I will not go

into the details. I need to scroll up again—you can see that the major policy development processes have been assessed and have been quantified. Some are already in progress and some are still open. Like this one, the review mechanism is in progress, it's nearly done. I will not show this otherwise, it's becoming too detailed. But this is clearly the policy function. We're talking about basically the PDPs. The second—and I think this is for you the most interesting one—is the whole series of activities of the various working group. Again, they're focused on the activity. That's why you see DNS abuse, and DNS abuse is done by the DNS Abuse Standing Committee. The program is really around DNS abuse. Another one is Internet governance for ccTLDs. It's the IGLC as you heard this morning, but it's really done by the IGLC. Again, there's more details but it shows you at least how this works. I'll go into a little bit more detail in activities.

This is really the SOPC and everything it does. I've already prepared this one. It's the ccNSO governance. This is really the GRC. You heard [Sean] this morning. What you can see here as well is all the activities of the GRC, the main ones, in the way that projects are captured here, including the dates. What the Triage Committee can see is which are ongoing and when they will be finished and which are pending, waiting to start. And there are end dates and start dates so very neatly—and you can add new ones.

So this is really how this whole structure is built and the more details. You can really go drill down at a more deeper level, for example, including checklists or sub task. PDPs, they all have public consultation, which is clearly a smaller sub task of a project. It includes work for the working group, staff work, etc. This is how it's built.

Now, I want to share with you one more thing. That's the nice thing of having a tool like this. Scroll down. For example, what you can see here, and that is not really numbers, but this is the ccNSO work plan for the upcoming two years, starting the first of July. And we do have already ongoing work from the previous fiscal year. These are the activities which are in progress, mainly 10 that have been identified, we have to do it, but open. So really pending are 16. Between now and the end of these two years, they will start at one point. This is a very high-level overview of what's going on, and we can even include something that's been closed. That's the evolution of the work of the Triage Committee as well.

This is the basic tool that we are using to assist the Triage Committee in overseeing and monitoring the work of the ccNSO. This is also what we've been using assisting working groups and committees in managing their work. With this, I'll hand it back to you, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Thanks, Bart. So we wanted to make it clear by showing that that there is some sophisticated planning stuff going on behind the scenes, not just the abbreviated key point version that we're talking about in the current document. This is what the activity portfolio looks like for the two years. For each of the goals, there are some things that we're going to do and they're just listed there.

If you took a look at the global policies column on the left with the two green boxes, what that says is that those are going in or on track. And the fact that says '23-'24 just means it's in the slate for this coming year. We refresh this work plan each year around now. So for the start

of the FY on the first of July. You can say that everything that's going to '23-'24 will be intended to be started and worked on this coming year, and then things in '24-'25 are the following year. So it just gives us a bit of a longer planning time. Some things take longer than a year. But it's also a way to forecast what will be coming down the track at us in the future. Then this time next year, we'll reassess it. Hopefully, we've done all the '23-'24. Some things might have changed. We might need to change some of those '24-'25 ones. Then we'll present also the second year forward from that as well.

Then the reason the color code is there as well is because we will use this document each quarter to just say this is how we're going. So if you ever felt like asking yourself, "What is the ccNSO planning to be working on and how's it going?" you'll be able to use this two-page document to find out the answer in a relatively easy way. On the first page of this one, you've got the three goal-related topics. And if you flick on to the next slide, there are some bits of work that are in the foundations area.

These talks will be available through the wiki and so on for further review. But we were going to ask you a couple of questions using the Menti tool again on this about whether we're giving enough detail. We could write a 100-page plan or Bart could share his old Gantt chart that was a large PDF. But we felt like this would probably be broadly adequate for the lay reader, for someone who wasn't trying to dig into the detail. And that it was more important—because we don't want to take up your time trying to understand the planning process because you're busy people, but way easy to dip into and get a clearer sense of

what the critical things were. Do you want to add anything to that, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes. I see somebody said no. What is always interesting is the next step in this type of discussion, understand why somebody doesn't feel like this is sufficient.

JORDAN CARTER: If they're happy to share. I realize that it's a bit of a dry start to your Tuesday afternoon. But we decided to test the approach with you to see what the opinion in the room was. For both of these, that's a pretty solid blue bar or green tick, depending on how you want to think about it. I couldn't swear to remember the order. We're going to also talk about the role of the Triage Committee, which I sort of preceded earlier.

This lovely colorful diagram is essentially trying to show you that we basically deal with incoming requests, either from within ICANN or more abroad. Triage Committee is empowered to make a decision about most of these items. If it's a big significant one, we put it up to Council, for the Council to discuss and decide at its next meeting. But if it isn't, we can usually make a call about things and testing them against the strategy, decide whether to include them on the work plan or not. And we'll be introducing the Triage Committee reporting, that long skinny green out to the right in the middle, from 30 September. The report will come out after that.

We don't say yes to everything because we get asked to do things that are intriguingly irrelevant to the mission of the ccNSO, as you've just described it. I think over time, what this approach will let us do as well is to look at the interrelated dates like the Gantt chart that comes up in the tool that Bart showed you. It's a really good way of making sure we don't do something like, "We're going to schedule an ICANN meeting and the conclusion of a PDP and the start of the holistic review all at the same quarter." We'll help us make it less likely that there'll be burnout or shortage of volunteers to keep it to work that we need to do. Is there anything else you wanted to point out, Bart, on this diagram? No? Okay. Next slide, please.

This is just an illustration of some of the requests that we get that have been tracked. It is an ambitious Google Doc, which I think is publicly available. Joke, is it publicly available or is it not? No. We saved you all from that. But it gives a bit of a nature of the sorts of decisions that come up.

BART BOSWINKEL:

The tool for the Triage Committee is not publicly available. You can view this on ccNSO website. And if you're interested in the type of requests that are coming in, just have a look at it. It's one of those pages for the Triage Committee. What you will see as well, and that's the interesting one, is this way, we capture all the incoming work. In one year, sometimes you had 65 or around 70 requests coming in or participation or action by the ccNSO. So it gives you a rough figure why you can't do it, or an indication.

JORDAN CARTER:

Yeah. The other thing that we do through this process is to make sure that we managed, too, the resources that we have available. That's an underlying concern as well. Could we have the next slide, please? "Are there any questions?" is my question. If you do have any questions, you have some friendly Triage Committee members around the room. I am. Tanya is. Irina is. Though she's not in the room, she is on the line. And Nick Wenban-Smith is on. I think Chris Disspain is as well, isn't he? Somewhere between those people, hopefully, you know one of us, would find one of us friendly to approach and ask you a question if you have it later. But thank you for taking the time to look at that. We'll let you know on the list when the first report is out after the first quarter of the FY. I will hand over to you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Okay, Jordan. Thank you. Welcome to all. Welcome to the SOPC update. Irina and I will share a little bit the agenda items. But first of all, for those who are new at the ccNSO, brief words about the SOPC. SOPC was founded in 2008 in the Cairo meeting. Basically, we are the group, we are the committee who is entitled to give or take a strong position for public comments, and in particular, for the operating, planning and financial budget. Since 2008, we are basically the one community who continuously give feedback and somehow a sparring partner for the ICANN Planning Team. While other groups and committees come and goes, we are stable, and with the continuity, we could improve and help ICANN also to improve the whole planning system.

Okay. We are already at the agenda. I will start with the major findings. Basically, the review process, what we did in the beginning of this year, end of last year. Then I will hand over to Irina who will give an update on the results one year later to The Hague ICANN meeting. The interesting session about what we should change and some points of that to even we change in the charter later on. Then the last agenda point will be more interactive point where we will also use Mentimeter to see what should we do better, what are the interesting points for the future. Next slide, please.

Okay. Starting with the major findings. We were focusing on the 11 operating initiatives. Among them, to understand a little bit, is strengthening the root server system. Another one is the implementation of the new gTLD auction proceeds, which means some of the ccTLD managers, they have also in their portfolio new gTLDs. Then also another point is dealing with the ICANN reserves. As you can see, most of these 11 operating initiatives are also of concern for ccTLDs. Then this is basically important to reach the objective and the goals in the ICANN Five-Year Strategic Plan.

Then you have another section, it's the functional activities. You have five different functional activities or five service coverages, technical and DNS security. The other one is policy development and implementation support, community engagement and services, ICANN Org governance, ICANN Org shared services. And the important part is that these functional activities have led to the following results. Next slide, please.

Now we have the major findings. The first two points is we need to see that ICANN Planning is doing a very good job. So it takes into consideration major items like the inflation in most parts of the world, also the post COVID activity. So all is taken into consideration. The structure of the documents is really solid. This is a really good improvement over the past years. It's not something which changed from last year to this year. But we can see that it's a clear trend.

And the other point is the ICANN Prioritization Framework, which helps us to translate into operative initiatives. This is more or less a new initiative. And we also appreciate that this is a new tool which helps us to understand the goals.

Then there's still room for improvement. That's the other three items. We see a clearer or better—we can still improve the engagement with the community, which means also that we can improve the matrix which ICANN provides to the community. And what we can see in general is over the whole 11 operating initiatives that this is more gTLD-oriented. We come to that on the next slide. Therefore, Kim, please next slide.

For us, it's important that what we couldn't find in the planning documents was the Pilot Holistic Review, which is important. Give me a second. That's a different slide. Basically, the holistic approach is the initiative to improve the review process. And therefore, we think this is important and should be part of all the documents.

Then we have the geopolitical monitoring. We think it's important that ICANN should, in general, intense the exchange with the regional organizations like CENTR, APTLD, LACTLD, because they are the

experts in the area. That brings me to the next point. This is even more the case for the next point when it comes to the involvement in the development of national legislation. ccTLDs are directly dependent on the jurisdiction where they are located. I think, basically, they play a key role in that area. And if ICANN tries to exchange with partners in this region, they should always take into consideration the ccTLDs.

Then we have the policy development need to ensure the support of Board consideration. This is another point which is of importance. Basically, we should have feedbacks in a timely manner. We have the projects like the retirement of TLDs which took more than one year. This was also fine when we said the ICANN Board should work on a very much timely manner.

Universal Acceptance is one of the examples we can say. In particular, the ccTLD perspective is not fully taken into consideration because, as I mentioned, ICANN reserves is important. We have the Universal Acceptance as one of the examples where you may know that IDN TLDs, in particular, we are all in this area active so our view should be taken into consideration.

As a key result of our annual review process is that we have created somehow a backlog where we want to monitor together with the ICANN Planning Tool the findings, which is the pending findings. So far, we got positive feedback from Becky and Xavier that that is a good approach, that will help us to reduce the workload on the one hand see the progress over the next years.

Okay. That would be the short overview of the most major findings from this year. If there are no questions, I would hand over to Irina. Are there any questions? Please go ahead.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you. Anil for the record. First question is that point number three. You said that ICANN involvement in the development of national legislation in close coordination with local ccTLD. What role ccNSO expect local ccTLD has to play in the national legislation which are making the ICANN involvement because the legislations are made by the politicians, and consideration, how effective the local ccTLD will be there to influence the legislation? This is question number one.

Question number two is Universal Acceptance. Now, here, this is a very common step which ccNSO has taken. And I suggest that ccNSO should appoint a liaison officer to UASG for this close coordination with the UASG. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

For the second question, probably this is a good question for the Triage. Okay, go ahead.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Anil, there is a ccNSO appointed liaison to the UASG. I don't know the name of the gentleman. Joke, you may know the name. He's rather active reporting back. So that's one. And it will be part and it will be subsumed by potentially a kind of committee on Universal Acceptance by the ccNSO. Again, to avoid overlap and all the initiatives that are

going on, it will just focus on if there is a role and try to identify the role of the ccNSO with respect to Universal Acceptance, avoiding overlap with the regional local initiatives, etc. So there is already a liaison established and it will be subsumed in that new club in the new committee. Thanks.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Okay. To your first question, basically ICANN always plays an important role because it's a global player, and we try if there are new legislation, upcoming legislation, we should find solutions for all of us. Nevertheless, ccTLD is located in a certain jurisdiction, which means we are very much depending on, not like gTLDs which are not in each case depending on a certain jurisdiction. For Germany, for example, we are depending on the German jurisdiction. So if ICANN is approaching some of our politicians or so on, GAC representatives, we should be always involved to avoid misunderstandings in the interpretation of the upcoming steps. I hope this answered the question.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN:

Thank you. I agree with you that GAC may play a much better role than ccTLD manager in influencing the national legislation than the ccTLD manager, but definitely ccTLD manager may give their opinion to the legislator as to how effective they will be. That is a question. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Yeah. But it should be not only the one party or the other. Xavier was first and then Bart and Jordan.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you, just to give a bit of color to what ICANN tries to do in that respect and to the point of the question, it's politicians who develop laws in the various countries. What ICANN tries to do is to have ongoing engagement with the people in the governments, in the ministries, who think about and write legislation so as to provide facts to try to explain how the domain name system works and how therefore it should be taken into account when laws are developed. Of course, we don't influence the laws directly. But if we can help the people who write them having a better understanding of the DNS, of how the Internet operates, then we help these people develop laws that are either better protecting that Internet or supporting it or staying away from it when it's ideal. And to address this point, when we have that type of engagement with governments, the coordination with the ccTLD operators who may be well knowledgeable of the people or of the topic or both is always helpful so that we don't either step on each other's toes or use each other's help to reach out to these right people or to provide the right messages. So that coordination is always helpful to be more effective in that engagement. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: So just to give a brief answer or add something, I think we should even go a step further, not only explaining about the domain industry. Because in certain areas, politicians do not understand what is basically the outcome of if there is something wrong written. So that's

why it's important that we influence and talk to them. It's not that we want to change, but one word can change the whole thing. Please don't get me wrong, I think we should have a common approach, which is not always possible. But if ICANN, ccNSO, ccTLDs have a common approach that helps us to avoid misunderstandings. So I think Bart was next. It's fine. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER:

Just one more perspective on this, from my point of view, which is that if ICANN is talking to a government, a bad way for the ccTLD manager to find out is by that government telling the ccTLD manager later. So I think what this is saying is that if ICANN is dealing with local authorities, it's a courtesy to keep the local ccTLD in the loop so that it isn't a surprise. Because we're all on the ground in our countries, we may have an insider perspective that ICANN that its global level couldn't possibly have access to.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Exactly. But I think we see improvement. Please go ahead, Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA:

More of a comment. I understand the situation completely about ICANN and ccTLD coordination in development of national legislation. I was just wondering about how this item is drafted. Is it more about ICANN? Or is it also urging ccTLDs to coordinate, raise awareness among ccTLDs that they have to monitor ICANN's activity so ICANN should or must do something? It's just not clear to me who should

follow these items? Who is this directed to? ICANN, ccTLD managers, or both?

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: The finding was clearly towards ICANN. Really, what Jordan mentioned, to avoid that we—okay, please go ahead.

TATIANA TROPINA: Sorry. Then my question is, don't you also want to urge ccTLD managers to pay attention to this? Because I might well imagine the situation when ICANN is engaged, they try to move the ccTLD but the ccTLD will say, "Not interested, not responsive." There might be a situation. Why only at ICANN? Why don't you want to also raise awareness amongst the ccTLDs that certain processes are happening on the national level? And they better pay attention at some point.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Bart, you first.

BART BOSWINKEL: I understand your concern. But please keep in mind the context of what we're presenting. This is about ICANN's planning. There is another group that really goes down and to that detail, and that's the IGLC. But this is really looking and it was identified as an issue by the SOPC. So really looking just at the Planning documents. And we wanted to draw your attention to it or the SOPC wanted to draw your attention to it. So this was an item in ICANN's Planning document and with a comment from the SOPC and this is the summary of that item.

So this is not the place to really discuss it. But you can see it touches a really [inaudible] expression.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: I don't want to leave a question open. I think we have during the ccNSO sessions always policy sessions where we discuss amongst ccTLDs. And there are always people from ICANN and we have sessions with the GAC, we have the sessions with the Board. So I think we have exactly the platform to discuss things like that. But here, as Bart mentioned, this is about ICANN Planning. Other questions?

EBERHARD LISSE: It's me. I find it quite worrying that after 30 plus years of domain names, we still have ICANN wanting to involve or in a way communicate directly with national governments. I keep working on the case that there might be a disagreement between the ccTLD and ICANN, or there is an exclusion from the government side of the ccTLD and talking only to ICANN itself. So I'm not very sure about why this would be necessary to happen or why this would be in the intentions of the ICANN Board.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Thank you, Eberhard.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Don't be afraid. If they talk to your government, they become party to any lawsuits you want to file.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: But I think that should at least stop at this point. But we can see there is room for discussion. And I think, Alejandra, probably that is a good starting point for session probably in Hamburg or so. Okay. So at this point, I hand over to Irina. Irina, please?

IRINA DANELIA: Hello, everyone. This is Irina Danelia. I'm speaking in English. May I have the next slide, please? I don't think that's the one I need.

BART BOSWINKEL: Next one, Kim.

IRINA DANELIA: Maybe next one. So while Kim is looking for the right slide, I want to start. So a year ago, many of us went to The Hague for the first post pandemic ICANN meeting, which was again held—it was in-person participation. That meeting was used by the SOPC to run a session to consult with the community on what and how the community, the ccTLD managers, expect us to do. There was a good moment because both Andreas and I just became chair and vice chair. It was a good moment because we finally met altogether.

Yeah, perfect. This is the right slide. Thank you very much.

So at that meeting, we suggested the renewed purpose statement for the SOPC. As it was mentioned during first part of the presentation about the Triage Committee and the goals of ccNSO itself, SOPC

contributes the third goal which is contributing to the overall ICANN activities. SOPC deals mainly with reviewing the ICANN Strategic and Yearly Operating Plan and Budget and PTI Operating Plan and Budget. As the purpose stated, it was suggested that SOPC should aim to provide high quality input focused on topics relevant from a ccTLD perspective and to be a voice that matters to ICANN and the community to help ICANN in [inaudible] its processes and to keep ICANN honest, sound, and stable.

We should result in the ccTLD communities are really taken into account. Actually, quite well, we are considering us at the SOPC as kind of a watch dog of ICANN's planning process. That statement was supported during the meeting. We also consulted with the community. What should we do and how we should focus and structure our efforts? The question was whether we should focus only on the ccTLD relevant strategic initiatives where we are going to pay attention to overall plan and budget documents.

On this slide you see the results of polling which we got at that time. So as a result, we called by our consideration the entire ICANN Planning and Budget document, including all the strategic and operational, all the operating initiatives and functional activities, but aimed to focus our view really on the ccTLD needs and not going deeply into those areas which are relatively low relevance for ccTLDs.

CLAUDIA RUIZ:

Hi, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Yeah?

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Apologies for interrupting. Do you have a wired headset by any chance? You sound a bit echoey for our interpreters.

IRINA DANELIA: Unfortunately not. I cannot change it like this. I can come closer to the microphone if this would help.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Okay, one moment. Can you just maybe speak slower and closer to the mic? See if that helps. Thank you very much.

IRINA DANELIA: Okay, I will try. So can we go to the next slide, please? So the second question from the SOPC to the community was to which extent we should consult and coordinate with the community? Here, again, you see the results of polling conducted a year ago. And one of the comments we had was, “Well, you have our mandate. So do your job. Don’t expect ccTLD manager to work together with you. But please keep us informed.”

So after we prepared for the comments to the latest Operating Plan and Budget of ICANN, we shared this document in the ccNSO mailing list. But also we want to have an exchange with the community to understand what are the most important topic for the next round, for

the next plan. This might be one of the talks for the next ICANN78 in the fall. Next slide, please.

Also, we had an idea that maybe coordination with other groups within ccNSO would be a good idea for SOPC to get additional expertise in the areas where we might have not have enough knowledge. So this idea also got support. And a great example was their joint work with the Technical Working Group to provide input on the PTI Plan and Budget. We want to continue such an engagement in the future. Next slide, please.

So the last question was regarding whether we should engage with other groups outside the ccNSO community. Again, this idea got support. But by certain reason, we did not do this for the past planning cycle but to keep in mind the idea to do it in the future. It was not easy and feasible, honestly, a year ago, in the past year, because some groups changed their mandates and we really had a very limited time during the Public Comment period. But this is still in our agenda and we want to continue to work in this direction.

So with that, I return it back to Andreas, I believe. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Any questions? Xavier, please?

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you, Andreas. Irina, the very last point on this slide says, “Limited time to submit comment prohibits coordination.” What type of coordination are you thinking of in that comment?

IRINA DANELIA: It would be good to have an opportunity to meet with the representatives of, let's say, GNSO or ALAC which are doing the same job as SOPC. But we really couldn't find time this year at least.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: I can confirm. We'll come to that in a minute. It's really tough for us because we as SOPC group needs time to find a good approach, talk about the findings, and in the next steps, talk to other ACs. It's really difficult. But we will come to that in a minute.

Any other questions? Okay. Then, Kim, next slide, please.

So what you can see is basically the outcome of our SOPC meeting in Cancún. We discussed what went good, so you can see that really here, but you see what went not so good or we see room for improvement which is mentioned with cons. Basically, what you see is—and I mentioned that in my presentation already—it's the lack of ccNSO context. I think you can probably say it's more gTLD-oriented than ccTLD-oriented. As I mentioned, all of these 11 operating initiatives, we see a clear mandate for the ccNSO or the ccTLD.

And you see on the right-hand side, the fix is how we can improve that. As we mentioned already, to have stronger engagement with the community and use the AGM, which is the next meeting.

The next point, which is in brown, is balance between strategic level and details. This is more an internal thing for the SOPC. Because

sometimes we do not focus only on the strategic or we have difficulties to see if even, let's say, an operative point is of importance to evaluate.

Then what we also see it's complicated for new members of the SOPC and also for new members to be transparent to the new members of the ccNSO in total. Which means what we did, we want to use the AGM to understand, which is the ICANN Hamburg meeting, to discuss the strategic level and use the Progress document. So we should probably also discuss what is the Progress document. That is basically the findings which we want to collect in a backlog and see if there's progress.

Then we have the strict time and deadlines. Xavier, this is basically the question you raised before. And probably I start with the blue one, the scheduling is very tight, which is basically in November and we have to finalize it in February. So this is the timeframe where SOPC can really act on it. And you have to be reminded that brings me to the strict timelines and deadlines for the SOPC, you have to bear in mind this is always year-end business where we all in our own ccTLDs and registries have things to do. And in addition, we have to focus on the ICANN planning. That's the difficult part, Xavier. That gives a little bit of answer.

Then in addition, to try to discuss this with other groups makes it difficult. So unfortunately, for the moment, we see no fix how you can start in a different timeframe. But for us as SOPC group, we see we should at least have more discussions before the official planning process or the timing starts. That's why we're focusing on the AGM meeting in Hamburg, have discussions with groups. Kim, that brings

me probably to the next slide where we have some ideas we want to share.

So what can you expect from SOPC in the future? It's basically not in the future from five years from now, but more or less how we can improve the process. As we mentioned, this is the open issue backlog. So we want to track the findings that will help to reduce the workload for the SOPC and we can also share with the community and with the colleagues from ICANN Planning where we see progress and where we see probably room for improvement.

You see most of the points are focused on the AGM in Hamburg. We want to really discuss and probably start with the last point. We know that there will be an induction of the strategic planning cycle. And we see a clear role from the SOPC in this. We want to discuss this with the chairs of the ccNSO Committee and chairs of other working groups in Hamburg. So please approach us if you want to discuss that with us, if you have any ideas. In addition, you want to identify initiatives and activities you believe are relevant for ccTLDs. As we discussed in The Hague—and Irina has shown the results—our focus will be more ccTLD-oriented. So it's good to have your feedback. So next slide, Kim.

Now we come again to the Mentimeter. It's the so-called word cloud. So you can enter some words. What do you want the SOPC to do in the next round of the planning process in particular? So please take your mobile phones and add what you think, what is important for us, what we should focus on as SOPC. Bart, can we see the results?

BART BOSWINKEL: When these people start typing, you'd be able to see it.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: I think really use a little bit more time than before because typing a word is a little bit more time-consuming. So we have 10 answers, we wait a little bit.

BART BOSWINKEL: You're able to enter multiple words as well.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: If I'm not mistaken, as bigger the word is, the focus is on that. What we see is security, I would say. So probably somebody who typed that in can tell us what is exactly the idea behind? Is there anybody who wants to share their ideas already? Okay. Nevertheless, I think we take all those things into consideration and share our idea of it in Hamburg.

Prioritization, I think this is an important part. I think this is from the one point of view, as we mentioned before, is should we look on strategic points or on operational points? I think we should balance and have a clear focus on strategic points.

What else do we have? ccTLD managers, exactly. This is why we are here and have you involved in the process.

Irina, do you see anything which you would like to know, or Bart? We keep this still open for a while, right? Irina, do you have any comments from your side so far?

IRINA DANELIA: Thanks, Andreas. I would be interested on scrutiny. Definitely, if somebody who posted this could elaborate a little bit on that liaison role.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: I think what I would be interested in how we can better communicate. I think this is important. Because basically, we have the mandate from you to review the budget and planning process. So I would like to know how we can better inform you since this is one of the words in the word cloud. Any comments to that?

TATIANO TROPINA: Sorry, I wanted to comment on scrutiny, actually, because Irina asked about it. I think that you already are doing it with the budget and strategic plan and everything and this is basically your main function, and I believe that I was the one among those who put the word scrutiny. To me, this is what you're already doing. That's what people want you to continue doing. So, just kind of good job, please keep it up.

I didn't put communication but I did put information. But then again, I do not think despite one tiny confusion which I had, which we might talk about later, because I don't think that there was really a confusion and I will explain why in the conversation. I think that information you supply right now is absolutely enough, and I'm personally very happy with these sessions. And to me, the fact that I put information was not like you're doing it badly. For me, it means that I just want to continue getting this information and I want you to continue to communicate. I

don't know if anybody can suggest a better way perhaps. But I think that many of these words are not kind of about improvement but about keeping up a good job. At least that's how it was for me.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

So basically, you're right. We always share our findings, which was a 10-page document at the beginning of the year. It's always tough to go through that and get feedback. So currently, I think this session is very important. And you see we focus only on the major findings. You can imagine that in 10 pages, we had more findings like this. But I think we will try really to see, watch this, and that is probably prioritization, what is meant to see, okay, what are the major findings and share after the whole process with the community. I think that is one of the learnings.

Okay. I think we can still leave it open or close it now and go to the next slide. There are any final questions or any points we didn't cover so far? No? You still have time to raise your hands. But nevertheless, we want to encourage our colleagues from the ccTLDs to join the SOPC. As I mentioned in the beginning, we do a very important work and we invite you all to join us. Don't be afraid, as we did in the past, so we have always, Irina and I, we are willing to help you. We have also very experienced ccTLD managers and experts from the ccTLDs who will help you out. So there is not that you should be afraid of us. So if you want to join us, approach Irina or me or the secretariat and we will make sure that you will be part of the SOPC.

Okay. I see no hands up. So I hand over to Jordan to conclude the session. Thank you very much.

JORDAN CARTER: Not much to say in conclusion except thank you for your attention and participation in these two topic discussions. My wrap is up there. It's coffee time. Come back at 3:30. Thanks.

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Thank you. You can now stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]