
ICANN79 | CF – ccNSO: Strategic and Operational Planning Committee Work Session
Sunday, March 3, 2024 – 3:00 to 4:00 SJU

JOKE BRAEKEN: Hello, and welcome to the SOPC working session. My name is Joke Braeken, and I'm the remote participation manager 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 will only be read out loud if submitted within the Q&A pod. If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. And onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Andreas Musielak.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Hello, everyone. Welcome to San Juan, so after the ICANN Hamburg meeting. I would like to start the meeting on behalf of Irina and me to all SOPC members and the secretariat for the contribution during December and January. It was a very hard time for all of us but we made it. I think we succeeded and have really good comments which we provided to ICANN Planning.

So this is the agenda for today. I have to admit, we have to stay a little bit with the Public Comment process for FY25 Operating Plan and

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.

Budget because we want to know and understand what went good, what went well, and where is some room for improvement. So this is agenda point two. So Joke prepared the Mentimeter. So you can post your thoughts, and then we can discuss a little bit afterwards.

Then point three, and this is a warm welcome to ICANN Planning. Becky, I think, Paul, and Victoria are participating online. So which means they will give a presentation about the trends update, the planning process, the strategic plan.

Then we have the Any Other Business next meetings, and closure. I'm think we can kick off with the review process, lessons to be learned. Joke, next slide.

Time for polling, which means—exactly. So please scan the QR code. And then it's up to you that we have good results afterwards. We will see the responses on the screen? Okay. So then we'll wait until we see a couple of answers. So we see it below. Please type your answers.

IRINA DANELIA:

Hi all. I just want to remind you that this year, we slightly changed our approach. So instead of doing separate operating initiatives and separate functional activities, we just attempt to group them by this [Matic]. I really wonder whether it helped, whether you feel it was a good idea, or we should not do this and keep the approach we used for previous years.

Also, it would be very helpful to have any reflection on the template. Did it help? Was it useful? Should it be maintained? Should it be

changed? Should it be cancelled at all? So please feel free to provide any feedback on this.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: We see seven answers. So we wait a little bit. I see there are more comments. David?

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks, Irina and Andreas. So I'll start. I've been involved in this process, I think, three years now, and the last two, leading a subgroup. I think over those three years in sequence has been changed for the better, despite the fact that in the first of those three years, we were pretty well organized, but we're doing much better in my view. So I'm the one that put the organization was great. My hat's off to you, too. I thought the organization was great. We basically had a meeting about what we're going to do. We then got the document from Becky. And we launched into what we're going to do, we were prepared, we were organized, we split into teams. I think it was in D.C. or Cancún. I can't remember. I thought it was just all done really well.

The challenge we have, in my view, is—and this is no offense, Becky, I'm sorry—the document is boring. It's long and it's boring. We have to crack that nut somehow. When people take off a slice of that, it's just a struggle. But I guess that's inherent, we just need to do some motivational things. I don't know. But I think that's the primary challenge. I just think the organization is super. So I'm not going to sit here and say we need to do any great changes for the next iteration. Thanks.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Thank you, David. Becky, of course, it's a challenge because I don't know how many, hundreds pages long. So it's really difficult for individuals to go into this thing. I know the presentation from your colleagues, so that's what I know. It's really tough to get feedback from individuals because they can't dig into all those pages, so you need to have strong groups behind to really go deep into that. I have to confirm what David mentioned, of course. But I have to admit, Becky, it's professional. From year to year, you see the progress that the document is getting better and things. Of course, David, go ahead.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thanks. Becky, my follow-up would be advice to you all. There is a lot of repetition. If it could be whittled down or somehow—I mean, the document is good. It's a great document. It's just we have to get somehow to grips with the Tome nature of it and maybe cutting out repetition would help perhaps. Thank you.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much. Hello, everyone. This is Becky Nash from ICANN Org Planning. I just want to, first of all, say thank you for inviting us to this session. And also that we do acknowledge that the volume of materials that we put out for public comment, including two Operating Plans, a five-year and a one-year, and then a separate Budget document, along with other resources like highlights, we do realize that it's a lot of volume. We are really interested in hearing feedback about changes that we want to discuss and propose

specifically as we finalize this five-year period and move into the next five-year period with more visualization, more tables, more summarization. And the question would be then, is it less narrative? So those are things for a future meeting that we will definitely reach out and want to engage on with this group about some ideas that we have to make it more manageable. We do hope that the table of contents—because it's never expected to be read cover to cover, but that the interface or the clicking from the table of contents, we hope that that was an improvement to help readers navigate it without having to go all the way through over 200 pages. But thank you.

IRINA DANELIA:

Yes, Becky. The table of content is very helpful and really helps to move from one piece to another. And also the color identification is really helpful. So thank you. The formatting is really good.

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR:

I'll just jump in because I think we're talking about already ways to make the process a bit easier. For me, I deal with the problem that I don't really expect the members of my working group to read the document by actually doing that myself and providing comments using the template which I found very helpful, and then putting that out to people so that they have a smaller document to consider.

As I did it this year, I was trying to highlight matters that had come up in our discussion about what's important to ccNSO people, and what the matters that came up in the World Café. So on reflection, what I was trying to do was some way of prioritizing that mountain of

material. So I'm not sure that it's only about how the material is presented from narrative to graphics and so on. I think there's a prioritization layer that would really help. And for me in that, when I'm thinking about my own budget processes at .au, the missing piece are the risks that we're trying to manage. When I do my own budget, I say, "This is our strategy. These are what our stakeholders are telling us. These are the material issues that we're managing. These are the top three risks." And then I try to align budget in a way that progresses the strategic objectives, but helps manage the risks because that's where I want to put the money. The things that are going to bite us, I want to put the money there.

So when I was reflecting, for example, on stakeholder engagement, for me, it's very high risk in my world. So I put a lot of effort and a lot of resources into it. If I knew, for example, that ICANN didn't really see stakeholder engagement as high risk, then I would understand why resources were not being allocated to that task, perhaps in a way that I think they should, but when we're dealing with the outcome of various processes.

So that risk piece I think, is really important. My main message, I think, is some sort of prioritization around what's important to help us wade through the document. And second thing, one easy and quite crude way of doing that, is to highlight variations, anything that's plus or minus 5%, look at that. That might be a first step. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Thank you, Rosemary. I think we should first focus because this is actually the follow-up questions. We are actually on the next slide, by the way.

So I think we should go through the points mentioned here. Yeah. Who posted simple process? So probably you can tell a little bit about that. I think Irina mentioned that in the beginning. So we changed a little bit the approach. I don't know if it was really easier or much smoother for the subgroups to have a clear focus on certain things. I would like to understand if actually it was possible to focus on certain areas instead of the whole document. I don't know. Since, David, you know that since many years, was it much easier to focus on certain areas instead of the whole document? That's probably good feedback.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you. I very much appreciated Rosemary's comments, and I think they're helpful in answering that. From my personal perspective, I think we could explore that. That would put a little bit of a burden on the co-chairs because somebody has to read the whole thing, just in case. We all know why. I think maybe the chairs and the chairs of the subgroups would be that group of four or five people that would have to slog their way through it. But you're right, to focus on risks that are maybe the CEOs among the group such as yourselves could say, "These are what I focus on. This is what looks to me to be important to the management of a ccTLD." We could organize that way. And as long as someone's backstopping us on reading the whole document and flagging things that may be hidden, then I think that would be a great way forward.

I want to mention, Rosemary, in my group, I had a vice chair, Abdalmonem. He's not here. I want to give a shout out to him. He was very good. He and I were corresponding regularly as we were with our group. But I did expect everybody to read it. That was probably a mistake. I mean, I don't know. But I think your approach sounds pretty interesting.

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR: One of the improvements—and I'm sorry, I keep going to improvements, but I'll just table it now—is maybe we could share the process of each working group so that each of us understood and maybe could learn from each other.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Okay. Should we go first to the second Mentimeter and then discuss all the points? Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: Ellie, because this was the first time you participated, and I think the newcomer's—

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: I know. That's the comment from her, I'm pretty sure.

BART BOSWINKEL: Newcomer's vision and view is always very interesting. I know you asked me some questions before you started. So what was your experience in going through this?

ELLIE BRADLEY: Thank you. Ellie Bradley, .uk. Unfortunately, I also missed the introductory session in December. So I felt like I was definitely playing catch-up. But very helpful resources were provided, particularly useful to see what had been done in previous years just to give some context. I found the question framework really helpful in terms of determining what was needed. But actually, it felt very well-organized, really clearly managed by the chair and co-chair of the group that I was involved in. I read all the materials. Once I'd got a bit of background, then I found it really interesting process I think to be part of, actually.

BART BOSWINKEL: Thanks. That's always an interesting one, the newbie.

ELLIE BRADLEY: I think just knowing what's expected was helpful. And as soon as I was clear on that, then it was good.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Okay. Then let's stay with what went well and then going to the other. I think I put one point here, which was sharing results online. I think at a certain point, moment, we shared the Google Document. I think we can do that immediately with the subgroups already. I think, Rosemary, you did that. And that helps also for the chairs to see if there's progress. So I think if we do the next public comment, start immediately with the Google Documents, so we get at least the feedback of the progress in each group. And we don't have to reach

out by e-mail and ask, “Where are you? Do you have any questions?” So a Google Document, I think, that’s what we should use for the next public comments. From the beginning, we can start with three subgroups. And then once we consolidate the data, we put in one big document, and go on with that. So I think that was an improvement for this year. And that helped because I see here, SOPC members were focused to deliver on time. That will help because we see there is progress. And that will help at least, I think, for me, and I think it’s because of Irina that we remain on time.

Okay. So what do we have? Divide into three teams. I think we can divide to more than three teams. Okay. We’ll see what ICANN Planning will do for next year. But I think three teams was appropriate. Any comment if we should have less or more? I think this is okay. Okay, perfect.

Then Irina’s timetable was helpful, task was clear, workload was manageable, documents were available in good time. So I think this all stick together. So if we’re sharing results online, then instead of sharing via e-mail, we can do that immediately in the document and then see and work on the different parts. What you mentioned, though—David, go ahead.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Good point. Thank you, Andreas. I think when we organized for the next round, make a point of that at the beginning to indicate results, progress along the way in a Google Doc. Because some of us disfavor Google Docs, but can overcome that if we know that this is not just for

end results, this is for progress reports. So I think it just needs to be explicit. I think we'd be happy to do it.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

I'm from Germany so we have GDPR concerns, Google Documents. But nevertheless, I think working around in different time zones with many people, it's absolutely helpful.

Okay. What else do we have? The timetable was okay. Overall, I think it went well. Better time of the year. We discussed that last year. And I know ICANN Planning had difficulties to change that. I think that's why we had in the ICANN meeting in Hamburg a discussion if there will be major changes. Becky confirmed there won't be major changes that helped us, so we had the operative initiatives. So we had at least an idea of what can be part of that. I think that helped us also a little bit to understand if there will be major changes. I remember from FY23 to FY24, there were changes in the initiatives or the naming, which was difficult because then we were stuck, because we had to consolidate the initiatives and understand what was the changes, really. It was really helpful to have this pre-discussion. And if we can't change the timetable, I think that helps. Bart, you have a question?

BART BOSWINKEL:

More question for Becky for next year. Would that be feasible as well to do that kind of session at the AGM again, like we did in Hamburg? That you at least give an indication because by then you will know if and how the new Operating Plan will look like if there will be major

changes to it, because then we already penciled it in and that makes the planning of for this group easier as well.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you for your comment. Definitely the team will be engaging a lot about the suggested new formats for the FY26 through 30. We at this point can only indicate that as we are in the process of supporting the Board on development of the next Five-Year Strategic Plan, we will be clear on providing linkage from what was our current Strategic Plan that will be ending at the end of FY25, and then what the future will hold, including linking to certain aspects of how we present the data.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

And of course, we are starting a new Five-Year Strategic Plan. We expect changes, of course. But I think that is what we will focus on the agendas next meetings. I'm pretty sure the next five-year strategic cycle will be one of the tasks which we have also to comment.

Okay. What else do we have here? So Ellie mentioned already as newcomer, it helps to see what was produced in the last year. So I think that we should also share that probably beforehand. We also tried to follow up certain points. Maybe it was differently because last year we did in a table, and this year it was more in the comments. You remember we had a big, big long table? I don't know if there's a preference in the room to have a table rather or write it down in a Word document. Probably somebody can comment on that. You remember we had a very, very long table for FY24. We changed it a

little bit. Is there any preference here in the group? So it looks that we stay with the current approach.

Okay. So I think we can go to the next slide, the next question, Joke? Okay. I'm pretty sure we answered a couple of the questions. But nevertheless, even if we discussed it already, please post it again because that will be in the notes.

Rosemary, can you post two comments? Is that possible? Or only one comment? Oh, it wasn't allowed?

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR:

I wasn't allowed back in.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

So then probably before submitting, you should probably add all your points. Okay. I think you can still type if you want. I think there's very good feedback. There's so much rich feedback provided by the groups.

Do we need more time at the end of the process to draw out the key themes so the end submission has maximum impact? I don't know if you're aware of that. We as chairs with Bart, what we are doing, we consolidate the data before we share again with the whole group. We try to already reduce to the main topics and we see within the group. So we have different preferences. But we come to a conclusion. The question is if there's a better way to doing so. But I think it helps because at least we need to read most of the documents. I think Irina read 100%, I'm around 90%, Bart I'm pretty sure also 100% of the documents. Then when we get the feedback, so we consolidate the

feedback, and give it back to you guys so you can give your final remarks. So if there is a smarter way to do so then I think this is very good remark. But I hope the main focus maintained in the final document. Ellie?

ELLIE BRADLEY:

Thank you. So that was my comment. I have a huge amount of sympathy for how hard that must be when you're drawing together so many disparate and different approaches from the different subgroups as well. And I just wondered if front loading the process, recognizing all of the previous comments on timeframes and calendar and everything else would give a little more time for that because it must be extremely hard to do. It was in no way a criticism. It was more just whether there'd be an opportunity for it to be really punchy at the beginning in terms of what are those key themes that are coming out from all the different groups.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Irina, more questions. Do we need more time at the end of the comment period to do exactly that? I think we did it actually quite good this time.

IRINA DANELIA:

I would say that this year, it was for the first time we felt quite comfortable finalizing the document not in the last day before submission, honestly, and thank you to everyone for the timely deliveries from the subteams.

Can we have even more time? Hypothetically, yes, but that will mean that each and every subgroup and each and every member will have to start working on this right after the plans are published, meaning before Christmastime, which always seems challenging. But it's very good to have at least the working methods of the subgroup settled before Christmastime and to give people idea that what they have to deliver, let's say, by January 10-11, that was the first submission date, which is quite challenging. So answering your question, yes, it would be great, but I'm not sure it's feasible. But probably what we can do, we can ask the subgroups or individual members, when making their submission, to mark what they consider to be a really critical point which needs to be highlighted in the final consolidated document.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Okay, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

What would also help is probably because that makes it harder is you see this difference in styles and tones and everything else of the various documents. You need to cherry pick a little bit from each and every document and try to get same tone to everything. That's the editorial work and the hard work. I think the higher level you do and the more precise you are, the easier it is, because some of the comments were very wide-ranging. Wearing a little bit of my ICANN Org hat, it makes their life hard as well to respond to very wide-ranging comments. So the more precise you are in your analysis and what you want to share with with ICANN, the easier it is for us as well, I think.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

First of all, I want to also respond to Irina. That's why I was asking her, it was my same feeling. So this year, we were not under stress to publish the comment. So we did it the week before the deadline. Since I'm the chair, and even the co chair, we never had this before. So it was really great. It was no stressful. We could really relax, type in, and sent out, which means everything went well.

But I think besides the editorial work, which Bart mentioned, sometimes we have clarification questions. So we have to reach out to the subgroup, at least to some person, and ask, "What is the meaning about that?" which means we need to also a shortened timeframe to clarify certain points because we read and we have different ideas what could be the answer for something. So that's why I think the editorial part is the one thing, but we need also time for clarification questions. So to understand what was the clear meaning of a certain comment.

Okay. So what we have here on the Mentimeter, communication on progress to date on the method subgroup uses. I hope we gave the answer in the slide before if we use this Google Documents. I hope this is the answer. Or do we have any other ideas which can help? Thank you, Becky. Becky mentioned that she can only be here for half an hour. Thank you very much. Is there any other idea how we can have some improvements? No? But I think if we use the Google Document, that will help us.

Engagement process, a shift to focus group discussions. I think we gave also a little bit the answer with the other slides to say, "Okay, we

have the focus.” What Irina did this year was really to say we share the responsibilities. I think this is a good starting point.

Okay. Sharing team approaches so we learn from each other. Rosemary?

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR:

That was my point earlier, Andreas. I just would be interested to understand how David goes about his team work and how Stephen as well. I was wondering, when we’re thinking about Google Docs, perhaps without burdening every team with every other team’s everything, if there was just some way that we could just see what others were doing. So the first point may relate to that one. And the second point—

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

With point one, I think she probably should share the approaches. You can start, Rosemary, what was your approach? And then we asked the other chairs of the groups what was their approach, and we can learn from different approaches. Please go ahead.

ROSEMARY SINCLAIR:

We’re happy to do that now. Yes. So for my group, the first thing I needed to do was to get everybody’s contacts. So that was an important step number one. Then the way I went about it, partially because of the time of year, it’s a very difficult time of year. Secondly, I knew Leonid was preparing for APTLD, I knew Pablo was preparing for ICANN79, I just knew from my real world experience that they would

not have time to go through the whole document. So my approach was to take input from ccNSO discussions at previous ICANNs and use that as a lens to review whether the parts of the documents that I had in my multistakeholder team reflected those discussions adequately. I did that through all of the material that we had been allocated. Then I sent that out to my group for any comment that they wish to make in a very open way. So that people felt, I'm sure, and that was the feedback that I got, that they didn't feel I was preempting their contribution or the process in any way. They saw what I had done as a more useful resource to them, given the time constraints that I had. In the event, I got support from the members of my group that were able to respond to me. And it was after I got that support that I provided that document to the chair and co-chair. When you sent the document back, we didn't get any further feedback. So that was my approach and that was my reasoning for the approach.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Who wants to share? David, please.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you. My approach with good help from Abdalmonem was I went through the document myself very quickly. So that in my first communication to the team, I could highlight some things that might be of interest to comment on. I tried not to preempt, just like Rosemary mentioned, and just would put them out there as these are issues. And then there was one thing in the budget, there was one column of numbers that didn't add up correctly, to highlight things like that. I'm a fan of the way Rosemary went about it. But the way I

went about it was, frankly, to ask members to read the pages assigned, whatever our group pages were, and to comment. And then Abdalmonem and I would periodically come back to the group and say, “Does anybody feel we need to have discussion meeting, etc., etc., or just submit items?” It worked out reasonably well.

But, as I said, I I’ve heard two things today that I think make great sense. One is—and that’s my comment up on top—read less but with the leaders backstopping by reading the whole thing. And then two, Rosemary’s suggested approach of it’s the subgroup chair that sort of takes on the whole thing and perhaps points out areas of particular interest for more in-depth review by the group. Thanks.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Okay. I don’t know... Atsushi, maybe you can share your experience.

ATSUSHI ENDO: Sure. My team method is very much same to the one that David mentioned, that he divided into each member assignment, assigned a page, and then ask them to read it and comment. Honestly speaking, it’s not easy to read whole document. So that’s our approach. Some members are doing very well. And some do at least that they can do. That’s the output. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Thank you. When Rosemary sent her comments, they were really, really good. But I fully understand. So once you get this paper, it’s difficult for you to get your own view on the things. So I think it really

depends on the subgroup. I think you should decide what is the right approach because there's no wrong or right. Because with Rosemary doing already a very good in-depth research so the others can comment on them, why your approach was different. So you give all the opportunity to say, "I have probably a different view," and then consolidate. So I would say the subgroups have to decide what is the appropriate rate. So I think there is no wrong or right from my point of view.

I think we're running out a little bit of time. Is there any point we should really discuss now or probably wish to take this and discuss probably in one of our next meetings? Atsushi?

ATSUSHI ENDO:

It's very good to confirm the membership before the process starts end of November, it is very important. Unfortunately, not all members can contribute. I fully understand that each member has another commitment or something that they cannot allocate the time for this, but it's good having that in end of November. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

I fully agree with you. I think in November, it's the last option to do so. We do that every year. And it's basically also in our Bylaws to ask. Bart has an eye on that if there's really participation from certain members or not. That's why we, frankly, ask if they would like to contribute. I think we should do that always in November at the latest. David, you had a short comment? I think it's the last comment.

DAVID MCAULEY: It's along those same lines. But it's the comment at the top, change of subgroup chairs. I think that's interesting because it's an opportunity and we have to allow broad sharing of these kinds of opportunities. If that's something that comes to pass, I would hope that those of us who have acted as chairs would stay involved as members. It might be helpful. I don't know. But I think that's an interesting thing because this business of reviewing these plans and these budgets is also an opportunity for development of members. Anyway, I sort of found that one very—

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: That's my comment. I think it's important, but it's difficult to find the chairs because they need to experience it. If we change the subgroup chairs we need to have experienced members within this group so they can help them. That's important.

Okay. Then I think we should go over to the next agenda point and ICANN to Paul. I don't know who's presenting the topics from ICANN Planning.

BART BOSWINKEL: I think Victoria.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Victoria? Okay. Victoria, please go ahead.

VICTORIA YANG:

Thank you. Thank you very much for inviting us to the session. It's a pleasure to be here supporting you remotely. Hi. So let's move to slide 10, if possible. Thank you.

So this next agenda is about the next Five-Year Strategic Plan. I only have few slides, as I understand that we want to focus on the discussion. So please just allow me to briefly introduce you the planning approach and timeline, and then we can discuss how the SOPC can actively participate during this process.

The general approach here is we first start with environmental scan. I believe that many of the community members participated. We had seven sessions in total. This happened last September to November. The idea of the environmental scan is really to collect information from the Community, the Board, and Organization about what is our opportunity and threats in the next coming five-years and what is ICANN's current strengths and weaknesses. When we say ICANN, we mean everyone in the ecosystem: Community, Board, and Org. So, we focused on the structure, the process, and the effectiveness, etc.

So, after the environmental scan, we did consolidate all the input we received. The idea of the environmental scan is so that whoever is going to formulate strategy, in our case is the Board, formulating strategy for ICANN, they are informed joining this process, and they are getting diversity input from the Community, Organization, as well as the Board themselves, to understand that our internal and external environment so that they can formulate strategy for the next five-years.

Once the strategies are formulated, which is the second phase, we move on to developing implementation strategies. So this is the phase where the ICANN Executive Team takes a more heavy lead during this phase and where needed, depending on the strategy communities will be also participating during this phase. And once we have the implementation strategy, we move on to Action Plan. The Action Plan to be noted is more impactful for the Annual Operating Plan and Budget because this is a more detailed plan with budget allocated. So, this is the general approach. If we move to slide 12, I want to show you the timeline.

On the timeline, up to today, we have finished the environmental scan and analysis. The Analysis Report is supplied to the Board. They are currently in the phase of developing strategies. Once we have any draft strategy available, we will start working on implementation strategies. These two phases are almost parallel with each other. At the same time, once information are available, we will be developing draft plan as well. So the heavy lifting for developing and drafting the plan is really between January to May. In June, we aim to publish the draft Five-Year Strategic Plan and Operating Plan for public comment.

So, for community participation, we had community involved in the environmental scan. So the next phase for community participation will be providing comments on the draft strategy. This is before the public comment, and also providing feedback on the implementation strategy. The idea here is as we have draft a strategy available to share with the community, we will have webinars and share whatever is available and then get your feedback so that we can refine those strategy and implementation strategy before even going out for public

comment. When the plan is published for public comment during the summer, of course, everyone can again comment on those, and then we can take back your comment, analyze them, and revise the draft plan. I think this is between now until August is the heavy lifting period for the Five-Year Strategic Plan and Operating Plan.

Before I turned back to the audience here to start participating and provide feedback, one more thing I want to highlight is this year we have many deliverables from Planning Team. As Becky mentioned earlier, we are at the end of the current five-year period. So we are planning for the next five-year. Besides this timeline you are looking, which results in a Five-Year Strategic Plan and Five-Year Operating Plan, I want to just mention we also have the PTI Five-Year Strategic Plan that has to happen. Of course, our usual timeline by the end of December, we have the Annual Plan and Budget for ICANN, IANA, and PTI. So it's a very heavy year for the SOPC, I can just imagine. So we are here to support you, and where necessary, we are happy to join your working meetings, engage with you, and let us know how can I help?

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Victoria, thank you very much. We really appreciate your support. I put it the other way around. If you need any support from us, because we know the workload is really, really heavy now this year in particular with the Five-Year Strategic Plan, so let us know, and we'll try to help you somehow.

To this slide here, you mentioned, Victoria, that there will be some webinars before the public comments start. Is there already a

timetable available so we can prepare ourselves for that? It would be my first question.

VICTORIA YANG:

Very, very good question. As much as we try our best to have a schedule, unfortunately, things are very fluid. As you can see that from developing strategy, developing implementation strategy, and then draft the plan, these three phases, although it's a little bit one after another, but then it somehow happens in parallel altogether. So there's the timing of the webinar totally depends on whether or not the information will be available. So we are having weekly working meeting with the BSPCs to discuss about strategies. Once that's available, we have to discuss implementation strategies with the Executive Teams. So when we have webinars with the community, we want to make sure that we have sufficient information to share and get your feedback rather than just have the webinar for updates. I would say early to mid April is my best guess. Don't hold me account for that.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

No, no. That's fine.

VICTORIA YANG:

That's my best guess. Ideally, we want to have two webinars before the public comment so that we can socialize those draft strategies with community before we even finalize the draft plan. That's the idea. We don't want your next participation to be the public comment. We

want to make sure that in between, we can have community input as well. I hope that makes sense.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Fully makes sense. Bart, you wanted to add something?

BART BOSWINKEL:

Victoria, this is Bart speaking. How do you envision these webinars? Is this you will be presenting and taking questions, comments during the webinar? Or you will provide some time afterwards for people to ask questions? Because I think that makes quite a difference having a webinar and people asking questions, comments on the fly is not the best use of time. That may be something to consider. You don't need to answer now. But it's almost like a mini type of public comment, and then a limited timeframe. Otherwise, I think you will have a lot of people attending the webinars, and some may or may not ask questions. But then the purpose is that you've presented the material, and that's it. Thanks.

VICTORIA YANG:

Very good feedback part. Yeah, this is very good feedback. We will definitely take that to our Communications Team and say, "How can we best utilize the webinar?" Rather than presenting, we want to hear people's feedback. But I understand the challenge of asking questions on the fly. So yeah, that's a good feedback. I would say, just out of top of my mind, if we have draft strategy available, we can announce the webinar while we provide some preview, perhaps even rationale, so that community can be prepared, come to these webinars, and

exchange ideas and provide feedback. So the webinar will be in general share draft strategies with rationale, and then get people's feedback.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Okay. We have five minutes left, or six minutes. Victoria, one more question. I discussed with Irina, and that will bring me back to the agenda next meetings, so we will discuss if it would be possible to have a meeting in Kigali about the Five-Year Strategic Plan with this group. So if you are in favor, because then this should be published, and I think instead of having this remote discussion, we could probably have a internal discussion here for an hour, two hours or so, and be very focused. So probably you can give in Zoom your hands up if you like the idea of have a meeting in Kigali about that so we can see that, or raise your hand here. I would be in favor of that. Okay. That's good to hear. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL:

The risk is what you're running to have a session. It makes perfect sense to start it, but I think by Kigali, you need to have organized the groups and everything the way you want to provide public comment, because if you look at the schedule, it starts at the Kigali meeting.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Exactly. And in August, when I see properly here, which means it would be a good kick-off from my point of view, that that's the idea. So you recommend to even start earlier.

BART BOSWINKEL: In the sense of internal for SOPC that you know how you want to organize it, because you will lose some time in Kigali already trying to organize it. You got the feedback. So between now and, I would say, the first webinar is a good time to start thinking about how to organize it, because then you can come in prepared into the process itself.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Okay. I think that's a good point. I think we should really focus that we have a meeting in Kigali probably a bit longer for those which are interested, and start the in-depth planning from there onwards.

Okay. Just one feedback, Victoria and Paul, I attended one of these environmental scans, and was really one of the best meetings I attended in the recent months. So I have to admit, it was really good session. I liked it very much because it's a really good starting point. So this is my feedback to you guys.

Irina, do you want to add something? Please.

IRINA DANELIA: Yes. I just wanted to ask Victoria whether the results of this environmental analysis and environmental scan are available not only for Board but for the entire community?

VICTORIA YANG: Yes. We did receive some feedback during the Prep Week webinar. The Board actually led a session where they shared the high-level outcome

of the environmental scan, and also a draft Mission Statement for ICANN for Fiscal Year 2030. Joining that webinar, we did receive request to share the community input from the environmental scan. We are currently taking that request under evaluation. If that will be published, we will announce that and make sure that you have access and you're aware of that. We do have a Fiscal Year 26 to 30 Strategic Planning webpage. That will be where it's most likely published. So we'll let you know and announce that.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Okay. Thank you, Victoria. Thank you, Paul. To conclude today's session, I suggest that I will talk to Joke and Bart and Irina to summarize what we agreed on the findings of how we can improve the process on the public comment, make a short summary, and send it out to you guys. Then, as I mentioned, we will prepare another meeting for Kigali. If there's something in between, I recommend to attend the webinars so we are good, prepared for the Kigali meeting.

BART BOSWINKEL:

As an SOPC that you'd meet between now and Kigali, so around the webinars. So you have a real good sense of how you want to organize. I'm very scared of the workload is coming your way.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

I think end of April probably is the appropriate date. So we will find and circulate a possible date for remote meeting. So thank you very much. I hand over to Irina, if you have some last words.

IRINA DANELIA: Just thank you to everyone's participation. Thank you to SOPC members, to ICANN Planning Teams. Thank you to our secretariat and for great support. Let's keep doing our work.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: I have nothing to add. Irina mentioned everything. We had a very fruitful discussion. Thank you very much and have a successful ICANN meeting.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]