
PRAGUE – 2013-2016 Strategic Plan Development I
Friday, June 29, 2012 – 08:00 to 10:00
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Patrik Fältström: Patrik Fältström, Chair of the Security and Stability Advisory Committee.

Carole Cornell: Good morning. This is Carole Cornell from ICANN staff.

Larisa Gurnick: Larisa Gurnick – I'm an outside consultant facilitating the Strategic Planning process. Good morning.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr from all sorts of places in ICANN world, but one of the hats I'm wearing is as the liaison to the ccNSO from the ALAC and welcome.

Paul McGrady: Paul McGrady from Winston & Strawn. I represent new registry applicants among others and also I'm the author on a treatise on domain names for publish by Lexus Nexus and lastly I am the Chair of INTA subcommittee on Internet Governance and Contractual Relationships and it's in that role that I'm here to observe and learn about what might be coming down the pike.

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.

John Berard: My name is John Berard and I'm daunted by that bio. I'm a member of the GNSO Council from the Business Constituency.

Rob Hogarth: Good morning. Rob Hogarth - ICANN Policy Staff.

Marilyn Cade: My name is Marilyn Cade.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoeben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoeben. Good morning.

Carole Cornell: We're just going to give one more minute and then we'll get started. We were hoping that either Akram or Kurt would join today since they both said they would try.

So I can tell you a humorous story. You know we've been trying to have this meeting and we've moved it around because we had a couple of requests and people said no one would show on Friday morning. I am so pleased to see that so many people showed up for this so thank you so much to start with. This is terrific. It's a good way to start off on a meeting of this kind.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Cheryl Langdon-Orr here. I suspect more may trickle in really; it's very likely.

Carole Cornell: Okay, good morning everyone. As we said, we've said everyone's name for the record. My name is Carole Cornell and we're going to proceed by doing the strategic plan discussion and we're going to go through several contents and we'll also give a little bit of feedback as we do about some of the feedback we received on Tuesday because we think it's very applicable to the conversation we're going to have. And Larisa Gurnick is going to start the discussion.

Larisa Gurnick: Good morning. I think you meant the session that we had on Wednesday, not Tuesday. Real briefly, our agenda is a strategic plan update which all agendas start out with some nice ideas, but then we're flexible to understand what the needs of the group might be. So based on our last discussion, the strategic plan update took us about 45 minutes, so I'm just giving you a heads-up as to how this might go.

Then we will talk about significant trends and strategic priorities based on some information that has already been gathered from brainstorming sessions with different community groups as well as ICANN staff. And then we'll talk about linkage between strategic plan and the operating plan and budget and some possible ideas for measuring progress more effectively and then wrap-up.

So the session objectives for this session – and we are discussing two of the strategic planning pillars – DNS stability and security and healthy internet governance ecosystem. So the discussion will center around those two particular pillars and the idea is to get feedback from the community's perspective on strategic issues and what's important to the organization and community as we develop the strategic plan, as

well as to the community's input also on the concepts of the working group that we introduced over the last couple of weeks.

If you'd like to follow along with the timeline, it's in your materials on page 4 and before we go any further with the discussion of the strategic plan update, I just wanted to say that the feedback that we've received already from the other sessions and folks in other groups is that the timeline may be a little ambitious. So as you look at the due dates and the plan as we proposed it in its draft format, we already know that the timeline is ambitious for a number of reasons.

First of all we recognize that August is a challenging month and that would be perhaps impossible to expect to get a whole lot of feedback in that timeframe. Also we now have to consider the fact that we have a new CEO onboard and Fadi will not be joining until sometime in the fall is my understanding. So there's a question as to how much time this timeline may allow for him to produce his input.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr. I just want to be clear. Do you want to take questions during or save til then end?

Larisa Gurnick:

During. I hope to make this as interactive as possible.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

In that case I'd very much like to make an intervention. If that assumption is the case then we are being misled in the community by the plan of having Akram act as a fully fledged CEO, so there should be

no influence. Akram is acting in full capacity. If we have to wait for the next guy to come up and start dotting the i's and crossing the t's, then something is wrong with the messages we're being given and then that takes us down an entirely different pathway.

Carole Cornell: Thank you, Cheryl. That's really good input and we will and have been consulting Akram through this process so we will make sure he gets invited more fully.

Xavier Calvez: And, Cheryl, for what I can say, I think both are true. What I mean by that is I think we all expect and that's been said and that's the intent for real tangible leadership and decision-making that Akram is the CEO from the day after tomorrow to whenever Fadi comes in. And I don't think there's any will from anyone to delay anything. I would say the strategic planning is the obvious subject on which it makes most sense to have some kind of input from Fadi because actually we're looking at the period where he's going to be CEO.

So I think there's a logic there, right? If we would tell you we're intending to not ask Fadi about his opinion, you would say, "That doesn't sound right," so I guess it's a combination of both. But I agree with your point on the fact that we should probably not delay the process in relation to Fadi's... I think the comment that was made validly was we still need to insure that we have a chance to have Fadi's input into the process and that that may impact the term that we have there. So subtle difference that we didn't make, but you made your point.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Xavier, that's fine, but as you know we can live and die by subtleties so let's make sure we get it right.

Xavier Calvez: I completely agree. Thank you for bringing it up.

Carole Cornell: Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn Cade. I have a timeline question as well. I'm just noting that in October there's a suggestion to meet with the SO/ACs to collect feedback in Toronto. We don't seem to have fully convinced everyone inside the ICANN staff that Tuesdays are sacrosanct. But I think you had the experience of learning that people come after you with clubs and knives when you try to schedule anything on Tuesday. [laughing]

Carole Cornell: For the record I did learn that.

Marilyn Cade: We're all sorry we were so mean. But just to point out that in order to have the leadership available to provide comments, that it's really important to do it on the Saturday or Sunday or afterward. And if you do it during the session, there are certain sessions that will draw

everyone and people literally, they will not give them up in order to come and participate in this.

So you might ask... there is now a Chairs Group list that includes all of the Chairs across the constituencies and the SGs, as well as the Chair of the ASO, etc., SSAC. So you might ask, Carole, to just post a message maybe to ask for some ideas once you know how much time you want.

Carole Cornell: Thank you, Marilyn. I've noted that. Yes, please?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. It's Olivier here. With regards to actually scheduling the meetings during the week, it might be worth setting those times early in advance before we actually build our own calendars because all of the sessions this time around, I was conflicted; I was Chairing. So it was very difficult to even keep track of it. Thank you.

Carole Cornell: Very good.

Xavier Calvez: Sorry. Just from a - and this is Xavier Calvez – just from a logistical standpoint we have a tendency sometimes in the staff to schedule the meetings only when we know what the content is because we've worked on it and so on. And I'm not saying that's the case for this team; I know it's the case for me and we need to change that because even if we are not entirely sure what the content is going to be of the session,

I'm pretty sure we can put a session on the strategy planning, no matter what.

So that may be letting us work to do it earlier and then we'll iron out the content and I'm going to try to do something similar for finance just because otherwise we create a much lower attendance capacity because people are already conflicted eight weeks in advance. So anyway, just a general comment.

Larisa Gurnick:

Great. Thank you for all that feedback. I think that this will be very helpful to schedule sessions that will insure that we can get the greatest possible participation.

Alright, a couple of other comments that have been made in the last session regarding the timeline also is some questions about the outcomes of the IANA contract, as well as some upcoming events at the end of the year – the meetings in Dubai, both in December, as well as May 2013.

So I just wanted to acknowledge that we've received that feedback and at this point ask this group in terms of your feedback to us on the idea of establishing a cross-constituency strategic planning working group, and the interest in participation in such a group, as well as the role that you might see for yourself for that group.

Marilyn Cade:

Marilyn Cade. I Chair the Business Constituency which is one of three constituencies and one of the stakeholder groups. The chart that I

shared with you I think would be probably a helpful maybe annex to the strategic plan in terms of thinking about the one that shows the full breakdown of the organization that includes... sort of helps people to understand that we have two advisory groups. I'm looking at Olivier so he can correct me if I get this wrong.

We have two advisory... no, sorry, we have three advisory groups, that need to be reflected in one way, but one of the advisory groups – the GAC – is not represented here. So talking with them about how this will affect them, I think is going to be really a priority for you guys to reach out to them.

The message that I'd like to send is in order for this to be effective and to work is the representation needs to come from the constituency and stakeholder level in the GNSO with whatever the Council decides to provide in terms of a liaison or some other representation. But the overall input will have to come from the constituencies in the SGs.

So I just wanted to be sure you and I touched on that, that probably changes perhaps the number of people that you had in mind. So I wanted to speak in support of the idea of having the working group, but noting that the participants in it are going to have to come in a somewhat representative basis from as low an organizational structure as the constituencies.

Patrik Fältström:

Patrik Fältström. I think first of all, with top level design, I think that it's important that ICANN try to help just like it seems to be the case that all of us agree to. The problem with the working group has to do with

getting participation. And the question is also what the goal of the working group is because I think if I look at people that actually do work in this are to prepare for the IG meeting – for example me which is part of the Swedish delegation to the meeting in Dubai – I have absolutely no time whatsoever to participate in this working group.

And I think the same for each one of the individuals working with this is that they will probably only work in one place which might be for me, on behalf of the Swedish government. Others will work in whatever working group ISOC is going to do; some other from business will probably work or spend most time in ICC and similar societies have their organizations.

So I think the problem with creating a working group now that we've come closer is that you will only get participants which do not participate in other places which means that they participate because they want to learn something, not give something as input. So I think just think about the charter for the working group and what the goal is.

And having it as a way of distributing information and discussing and sharing, I think that's fine. But we need to think about the architecture so it doesn't just end up being yet another working group that some people just have to go to because we have enough meetings anyways.

Marilyn Cade:

I should probably raise a question to everyone in the room. I had been one of the people who proposed that we create a budget working group, for instance. I'm not sure that's exactly the name of it, Xavier, but...

Xavier Calvez: It is not.

Marilyn Cade: [laughing] But of course... and the name of it is?

Xavier Calvez: There is no name of it other than trying to work on budget improvements.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, so... but that group I had envisioned as having to be representative and fairly senior. I had also envisioned the strategic plan as being composed of individuals who are willing to be representative both from their group and into their group – that it has to be two-way communication rather than a very large sort of fluid people coming in and out.

But the reason I mention this point now is that working group does not replace the need for broader public consultation. So anything that the working group were to provide would still have to have the benefit of a full review, etc.

Carole Cornell: Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. It's Olivier for the transcript if there is any. With regards to the WCIT issues, I differ in my view a little bit from Patrik. Yes, we all wear different hats; we all consult at various levels. I consult with the British government on one side and the other side also with ISOC.

But I like cross-pollination and I think we're all – I gather for the most of us standing on the same side of the boundary or whatever you say – so I do like the cross-pollination effect in being able to have individuals that work on various groups that deal with the issue and are able to basically be the bridge and share the information so that we all sing to the same tune.

Carole Cornell: Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr and there is a record because it's recording so I guess it's not a transcript record but it's close. We're well trained to say, "For the transcript record," all the time because we actually work in three languages simultaneously as a matter of normalcy.

I just wanted to pick up on something that I thought Olivier may have got to but didn't. I'll discuss that with you later, sir. He as Chair of the ALAC should have suggested that he make sure you know what the particular flowchart is for his layers of community because we've got that defined in now the accepted report from ALAC Improvements.

So there is a defined flowchart with days, links of times, duration and everything else. It's literally off the shelf and it would be useful I think if, Carole, you got the update and shared it because it'll give you some work back stuff. And it's very much a matter of being able to have one or two people sitting at the table but representing the voices of many others in a proper way.

Marilyn Cade:

I'm sorry to have to do this, but I have to ask a... it's Marilyn. I have to ask a clarification. When I brought forward the information about the Dubai meetings and the meeting in May, it was only as an example of the kinds of risks we need to take into account, not that we were going to spend time talking specifically about that in the strategic plan.

I think one of the points Patrik was making was between now and Dubai, he has 37 seconds on his calendar left. And so I'll take this moment to say one of the things I suggested on Wednesday's meeting was that we might be able to convene on site in Toronto but probably had no time for a lot of intercessional work leading up to it and I think that would be consistent with Patrik.

Patrik Fältström:

Patrik Fältström. Let me just say for the record that I absolutely support and agree with what Olivier said so that is absolutely the ultimate goal. I was just talking about how to implement that in an as most effective way as possible. If we continue to take the Dubai, the WCIT and the WTPF meeting as examples, we have to think about when doing these kind of things – I think there are three overarching goals.

One has to do with the cross-pollination that Olivier is talking about. How can a working group, a cross-constituency working group in ICANN help with cross-pollination between ICANN and other [iStore] organizations for example. That's one thing.

The second thing has to do with how can the working group influence whoever is actually making the final decisions at these various meetings which specifically WCIT is actually governance, okay. The third thing has to do with how can we inform the community on what's going on so they're not scared or so they indirectly can influence whoever is making the decisions. So I'm just talking about the need to create a plan to work as effectively as possible.

Larisa Gurnick:

Yes thank you and I would respond to that that we understand that we need to spend a bit more time on designing the architecture, as well as doing the proper research to make sure that the representation on this working group and the way it's structured and the charter addresses all these very important issues that you raise as well as a few others that have been mentioned which is the possible overlap with some other working groups. So that just speaks to the need to put some more effort and time into doing the research and designing the architecture appropriately.

Okay, so moving on from the working group idea, I wanted to report that the ICANN Management Team has had a number of planning sessions as well so the information that's presented here is some of the product of those sessions in which we had addressed the various external and internal developments and issues of possible strategic

importance in assessing the environment that ICANN is operating in right now.

And based on the current timeframe, the strategic plan framework and issues would be posted in August but obviously with the feedback we're getting from all these meetings, we will take a look on whether it makes sense to refine the timeline. Any questions at this point?

Carole Cornell:

This is Carole. One of the questions that came out on the Tuesday session is do we want to do an in-depth full longer process to come up with a strategic plan and if so, we may want to do a very light dusting and then do a long in-depth plan to allow for us to keep staying within the pattern of getting an approval and then getting an operating plan that has a supported structure and then get a more full development of an updated strategic plan. I'd like to hear people's reaction to that because that's one of the ideas that was brought up earlier this week.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr for the record. I'm always willing to give a knee-jerk reaction as long as everybody knows I reserve the right to change my mind when I think about it later. My gut didn't coil back in horror at all. It got my eyebrow to raise and me think, "Hm." So yeah, I mean usually if I don't like something I usually know pretty well straight away. I've still got my eyebrow raised, but depending on what that does to the critical points of community intervention and getting that material out, could be well worth while pondering. Thank you.

Patrik Fältström:

One thing that I think has been good this time and has to do with, for example, this meeting which has a specific topic which is sort of you have sort of two different kinds of discussions. One is the overall architecture of the strategic plan and see how things fit together and what the process is to map the strategic plan to sort of the budget and how ICANN operates which is more a (inaudible) issue.

And then you have the actual contemplate discussions of very specific issues. And the reason why I'm here is not so much about the overall architecture because that's not really what I'm skilled in – I trust other people in the room. So the only thing I'll comment on is actually from SSAC that there are some specific issues and specific line items where we question the wording.

So I think those two kinds of discussions are probably too different and you need to have both as sort of topic content based discussions to make sure that the wording end up being correct. The other one is overall architecture and different people might be interested in either/or.

Carole Cornell:

Good point. Thank you.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl here. A little and often approach or defined parallels so you can carve it up into different directions cause you could do that two ways.

Patrik Fältström: Yeah, I think these two things can more or less be done independently because I think for example, there is actually two lines in this one I have a question on regarding the Board-controlled protocol. And I don't really know how many people in here actually are interested or care what [actually learning] is. On the other hand it must be correct.

Carole Cornell: Chris?

Chris Chaplow: Yes, thank you. Chris Chaplow. I think in an ideal world – this is quite where we were – we wouldn't even start the budget framework until the strategic plan was actually completed and approved by the Board. But I just don't think that's possible. I think we've got a serious look at some sort of overlap mechanism where we would draft a strategic plan and then overlapping with the framework and then building in some sort of feedback loop or some check loop just to make sure that that feedbacks into the framework plan – that we haven't missed anything or something's gone astray. I think we need to take a look at that mechanism this year.

Xavier Calvez: This is Xavier Calvez. I completely agree with you that that's what we've done this year, this past year, right, because the strategy plan was effectively approved much later. I think we still need to try to respect the logic, I would say, if we can and try to schedule things in such a fashion that we do on the structural basis manage to complete the

strategic plan before we formulate the strategy direction that is laid out in the budget, right – that would be the logic.

I think there is a wider question that we will have to address as it relates to that specific overlapping timing aspect which is how do we structure our overall planning process. And by overall planning process I'm defining it as being strategic planning, inclusive of budget process. And that is a much more fundamental re-design or starting from scratch potentially – I don't yet know – but fundamental re-design of the entire timing which I think is something we need to think through, if not try to achieve.

So I think that's probably the next step of our thinking. Incrementally we need to try to plow through the progresses and the refinements that we're talking about and we may have. I think it's Plan B but quite high likely Plan B will be the reality that the overlap will have to happen and then if that's the case, we need to insure that there is still consistency at the end that there was at the beginning. But the next thought is a different structure and timeline of the entire planning process in my views.

Larisa Gurnick:

So that's a good segue into this next point. One of the objectives for the strategic planning process this time around is that linkage and also we are looking at how to leverage the operating plan and budget and some of the detail activities, budget allocations and really building from the ground up of the project and the work that goes on at ICANN.

So we're looking at how to leverage that into the strategic planning story, if you will, in terms of creating metrics and being able to report out as to the progress and the accomplishments that are being achieved on the various work that goes on. So toward the end of our discussion today we will talk more specifically about some ideas for how to get that accomplished based on the draft operating plan and budget that has been put out.

Okay, getting into some of the content – specific sections of our discussion – this is for the DNS Stability and Security pillar. These are some of the significant trends that have been discussed and identified in the brainstorming sessions so far and we wanted to share this information with you, as well as get feedback from you as to what you see as significant trends and how you think they would impact ICANN's strategy.

Male: Sorry, I can't see that far. Is it the same thing as the page 9?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, it is indeed page 9. Patrik.

Patrik Fältström: So here is one of the two things that I am asked from SSAC to come here and discuss. There's one item that is removed from last year which is the source address validation on the edge or the SSAC No. 4 document that is removed and we in SSAC ask ourselves what the conclusion is

why that is removed. Is it that that is not a problem anymore or... because we don't agree with that.

Carole Cornell: This is not a full list is the answer, and it should be added back in.

Patrik Fältström: Thank you very much.

Carole Cornell: Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I'm thinking that perhaps item 8 may need to be slightly more... well, let me say this differently. There's nothing in the DNS Stability and Security that would to me fully encompass the concept of awareness raising about the DNS Stability and Security and the impact of ICANN on the larger ecosystem of providers like ISPs.

So maybe we could think about this, say and when we focus on law enforcement I think nTLD operators, I think we might be missing the wider awareness in capacity building that may be needed at some of the points in the ecosystem.

Carole Cornell: Good feedback. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. It's Olivier for the record. I have trouble getting my head around these sections because I see that there's a mix of technical matters, non-technical matters, legislation and they're not ordered in any way. So you've got one line that speaks about the DNS filtering but it's actually DNS filtering and blocking legislation; it's not technical DNS filtering; it's the legislation itself. And then you've got another one which basically talks about Border Gateway protocol security protocol development which is a technical matter.

So if we could order these into technical, non-technical in different fields – and I don't know how many fields there are, but – that would probably make it easier for people to be able to see the subjects in a sort of more structured way.

Carole Cornell: Thank you. Good feedback. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I really want to support that maybe for us to think about in another way and that is we have the issue as well of when is policy development? What are the implications? Is it are we developing... what we sponsor we developing. Are we developing information briefs; are we developing awareness and activation campaigns for the community to be aware of? What is it we're doing? Are we developing policy out of this?

So if this is supposed to be just advance and trends, then maybe Olivier, there could just be sort of a listing of everything and then moving it into categories so that we can begin to think about the implications as we go

into the operational plan. But if this is just trying to capture sort of... yeah.

But the one thing I would say is not on here – which I think has just as big an implication for us really as the gTLD expansion – is again what I call the changing face of the internet, the significant change in the distribution of users and the characteristics of users.

Larisa Gurnick:

Yeah, just as matter of clarification, these lists represent events, activities, trends that have transpired since the last year at which time this process would have taken place or are anticipated to happen in the near term that would have significant impact on strategy. So this is really part of the scan – the environmental scan – to better understanding of the environment that the organization operates in.

Male:

I think what we are asking for is a little bit more also explanation on what each one of these are and I think let me give another example of how these can be divided. I support what Olivier said that there are different kind of events or happenings. I think for each one of them you could also say who is triggering this event and for example, if I take the source address validation that was in last year that we asked from SSAC to be added, it is problems due to non-implementation.

So that is an example even of things that happen because people are not doing it, while other things are issues just because someone is doing it. And sometimes I read these things as... for example, the change of users, the change of focus geographically. Because when these were

found, I think there are more thoughts behind it that are now thrown away and we should add that back again. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Absolutely. Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. It's Olivier. Just on a parallel basis and perhaps even on a longer term, you might wish to ogle a report by the DSSA Working Group which is developing a methodology for analyzing risks to the DNS Stability and Security. That of course you would say is completely out of the same scope as this.

However, the methodology itself is one which has been worked on quite carefully by the working group and might be applicable to other types of analysis when one looks at threats or significant events and the severity of events and implications... and consequences, should I say, of each one of these events.

It's an interesting methodology. It's taken two years so far I think, or a year and a half, for one piece of paper. No, there's more than that. There's more than that, but it's something which ICANN might be able to make use of. I don't think it's ready yet – maybe next year or the year after – and might be able to apply it to its own processes so as not to have to reinvent the wheel as well because yes, I agree.

There is a geographical dimension; there's a time dimension; there's a severity and there's a severity of consequences dimension as well. And of course, mitigation comes into it as well. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: Great. Thank you.

Male: I just want to say I'm not sure I agree with Olivier about the separation into technical and non-technical. There's a lot of stuff here that from the strategic planning level is going to be hard to make that separation. I mean DNSSEC – is it outreach... you know parts of it will be purely technical; parts of it will be outreach – that sort of thing. From the strategic planning level I'm not sure how much separating that is useful.

And on a general strategic planning for Security and Risk Management stuff, yes, certainly the DSSA stuff looks really good and useful cause the Board also has the Risk Management Framework Working Group that hopefully will be working in that area and there's quite a lot of recommendations about strategic planning of Risk Management in the strict Security Stability and Resiliency Review Team report that came out about a week ago – I was part of that team.

Larisa Gurnick: Yes, I believe that as we go further in the presentation we start moving into what does this mean from a strategic perspective. I believe that the reports and the work that you're referencing has already been mentioned and will be incorporated here. Are there any...

So before we move on DNS Stability and Security I guess to wrap up the comments that I'm hearing is that perhaps some way to at order or at least organize these elements in a way that would be easier to

comprehend the idea of who is triggering these events; a little more depth and discussion behind what's behind the bullet point as opposed to just including the bullet point, so those items have been noted.

Moving onto the same idea – significant trends – this time we're looking at the healthy internet governance ecosystem and you can find these in the handouts on page 10. I'll give you a moment to take a quick look at that list. Yes please, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you. It's Olivier for the record. I would tend to agree with removing governance from the whole Healthy Internet Governance Ecosystem. The ecosystem is not only governance, it's everything else. It's commerce, it's users, it's everybody, so certainly making everything healthy is a good thing forward.

Larisa Gurnick:

I'm sorry. Can you just clarify removing governance from the title?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Consider removing governance from the pillar name Healthy Internet Governance Ecosystem. Governance is a field of study; it's not an ecosystem. I don't think it's an ecosystem; I think the internet is an ecosystem but internet governance cannot be an ecosystem. Where does it produce anything? Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick: This topic has generated quite a lot of discussion and you'll see a lot of it in the subsequent slides but I think at this point we've taken apart just about every single word and have come up with some ideas that I would like to share with you to get some additional feedback.

What you bring up now is yet another twist. We've discussed healthy – the definition of healthy. I think the only word that we've kept intact and that's a good thing, is the internet.

Oliver Crépin-Leblond: It's Olivier again. Scrap my previous comment from... [laughing] Scrap it from your head so we don'

Kurt Pritz: This is Kurt. While it's important, actually that word is in here because I think it was an SOP meeting of the ccNSO – we inserted it, so it was healthy internet. It was a healthy internet ecosystem and we put governance in.

Larisa Gurnick: We'll have a discussion about those words in a couple of minutes and so if we could defer that. But is there any feedback on the content itself – on the types of events that are mentioned here. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: So did I understand that what is in here is a compilation of items that staff had distilled from interactions with the community on some kind of ongoing informal basis? Is that what this is?

Larisa Gurnick: Yes. This is a compilation of discussions, brainstorming sessions much like this one with staff representing their analysis, their knowledge, as well as interaction with the community.

Marilyn Cade: But the community has not... this is not the community's list yet. That's what I just wanted to understand.

Carole Cornell: We had some interaction with the community, not a full interaction. I think that's important to note.

Marilyn Cade: Some or selective?

Carole Cornell: We've had one or two brainstorm sessions where we collected some input.

Male: I think we made open invitations and like the SOP took us up on it and a couple other groups.

Marilyn Cade: I don't even know who the SOP is.

Male: The ccNSOs, the Strategic and Operating Planning Group.

Marilyn Cade: Okay, that's like three or four people. So that's... I would use the word selective. I'm not being critical; I just want to make a comment about this. So if I could now make my substantive comment now that I understand where this came from.

I think the composition of ICANN's community is changing because I think broadening... it's changing and it's changing not just because of new gTLDs. I have the feeling that for the past three years 99% of the air in the room is new gTLDs. We gotta get past that. We're putting the organization at serious risk. Even if it's important to a large number of people, ICANN does far more than new gTLDs. So that is going to be my umbrella statement and it is going to be my mantra and I guess I'm going to say it 14 more times this morning. But it really is important to understand.

So when we talk about education of the community on new gTLDs, I think we need to support the community's understanding of all of the [NIC] indicators and their relevance. So that would be gTLDs; it would also be IP addresses; that would also be AS numbers; that would be the whole... and I think that may be a better way to look at it for a strategic plan that goes out this far.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you.

Paul McGrady: This is Paul McGrady. On the issue of the composition of ICANN community broadening as the new gTLD rollout is happening – I think that it's important to consider where those new people will be best able to engage the community and I think it's important for us to consider changes to structure if that's necessary instead of trying to fit the new people into the old square pegs at the same time not throwing the baby out with the bath water.

Also I just think that in order for the new people to be participating in a meaningful way, they're going to be looking to the community that's already hear for guidance in how to do that in the best way. And that goes to education and I think it also goes to structure.

Carole Cornell: Thank you. Cheryl?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr and it's a pity Kurt just escaped, so I trust he will be having the following statement and clarification made very clear to him when he returns or I'll trip him up in a corridor and do it again. Getting back to your thing of selective, I can't think of a more selective dive into the community than the ccNSO's SOP. I just think it's really important as someone who spends a considerable amount of her time serving on a ccNSO Council which acts in the best interest of the ccNSO membership – which is some 134 I believe at this stage ccTLD operators – in other words a proportion of the ccTLD community – that the SOP is a valued and important and essential tool that acts in its own right, on remit that we understand, speaks in no way on behalf of either

the membership of or the Council, but whose material is an ongoing work, particularly in the analysis of the operational plan of ICANN is valued input which we then use to create, discuss and perhaps endorse as consensus policy.

And if I'm not making that clear enough, I'm here til Sunday when I fly out at 1:00 and I don't care what time of day. Let me make it clear – the SOP does not speak for the ccTLD community, nor for the ccNSO Council. They are valued contributors and they always make that rider. So whoever thought changing a word as important as adding the word governance back into a title of a pillar was any indication of what community thought was a good idea even narrowly fixed on the ccNSO community is so wrong I can't begin to tell you how. Deep breath. Thank you.

Carole Cornell: Thank you, Cheryl.

Marilyn Cade: May I? I'd like to go back to Paul's comment for just a minute and think about how that could be incorporated because I think it is over the period of this strategic plan that we will be assessing the impact of these changes on structures from the GNSO – I'm looking at Cheryl cause I'm going to say something... [chuckles] You always pay attention. From the GNSO... what we're talking about in the constituencies and everywhere really with the Board, etc. is are the implications of the change at the sub-level constituencies GNSO and all of ICANN.

And I think, Paul, that's what your pointing us to is to be sure we are reflecting in the strategic plan so it might be something like... maybe it's a new topic. Bu the point is we need to capture that we may be looking at structural changes in... now I'm going to look at Rob. Rob, am I getting this right? It would be structural changes at the... in the sub-organizations of the... I wouldn't expect the SSAC to change necess... well actually it might, Patrik, you may have lots of new business techie CSOs wanting to come. Anyway the concept is impact on the structural supporting organizations or some phrase like that I think.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you. We will take a look at the wording of what the impact is. But I think we all agree that the event is the changing nature of the stakeholders, the broadening and the changing. Chris?

Chris Chaplow:

Yes, I think most of us agreed just by the show of hands yesterday at the public meeting globalization is important for ICANN and I'm not sure that's captured in here. I've just done a word count; there's only in the IANA core operations including IANA .5 is the only mention of the word globalizations, so I think it might need to be reinforced somewhere else. Thanks.

Larisa Gurnick:

Yes, the globalization I think technically in the way that we've organized the strategic pillar, strategic focus areas, it actually lives specifically in a different pillar. But like so many other important overriding elements, it

does come across different pillars as well, so it's certainly... there is traces of it or large components of it than virtually every pillar.

Carole Cornell: Right. Right now we're only talking about two of the four pillars. I think that's good to remember when we're looking at this. And we were going to do it all but we thought we were going to run out of time to try to do all four pillars in one discussion.

Larisa Gurnick: But let me continue with that for just a moment. Maybe, Chris, you'd like to clarify in terms of the impact – whether it's in this pillar or another pillar – your thought on globalization.

Chris Chaplow: I'm not sure to be honest. I just sort of picked up that... it was hardly mentioned anyway and it's not in the summary and I think the word should be in the summary – healthy governance ecosystem perhaps - in that pillar. But I think it should at least find its way through onto here.

Larisa Gurnick: Yes and I think, Chris, you are looking at the handout that's on page 8 of the handouts and that is an excerpt – the summary if you will – from the previous strategic plan – 2012-2015 – so that is one of the inputs into our strategic planning of the process that we're involved in right now. And we haven't really tackled the format or the content of the summary yet and of course, we will, as the strategic planning process evolves.

And we already know that perhaps there will be some changes in the way this information is presented so that we don't run the same sort of challenge that we do in other places which is these bullet points being rather brief and not giving adequate explanations as to what's really behind it. So certainly we would welcome any feedback and ideas on what would be a meaningful to summarize the entirety of the strategic planning effort into a single page.

But I just wanted to clarify that what you're looking at here is not this year's effort; it's 2012-2015 and clearly we will update it as well as look for better ways to express this information as we go forward.

Chris Chaplow: Yes, thanks. No, that's fine. It's just... well, that's the point of this meeting isn't it, yeah?

Larisa Gurnick: Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: So I'm going to not quote, but perhaps paraphrase something I thought I heard our new CEO say on Monday. I think he said something like the following. Being a global entity is different from... is more than offices and staff; it's a way of thinking. And one of the things that happened yesterday which disturbed me greatly – as everyone in the room could tell – is that the Chair of the Board considered cancelling the discussion on globalization.

I would like to support the idea that globalization – whatever that means – and I think it means also a different way of thinking and an expectation that we stop using colloquialisms so that phrases like “walk the walk,” “talk the talk,” you know... my point is just I think we need to look at all of this and say to ourselves if we are a global entity, then how is that reflected in each of these areas?

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you. Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you. It's Olivier for the record. Just a quick housekeeping thing. I have to go unfortunately. I'm Chairing the ALAC Executive Committee meeting and unfortunately we couldn't move it back because our staff is being sent out, hauled out, shipped out as soon as... so not even an hour was doable. So let's hope we don't have the same problem next time. Thank you. So I'll leave you in the capable hands of Cheryl Langdon-Orr in the meantime.

Larisa Gurnick: Chris, was that just a good-bye or...?

Chris Chaplow: It was good-bye.

Larisa Gurnick: Okay. I saw his hand go up; I just wasn't sure. Moving into an update and an open discussion here regarding what does all of that mean for

strategy. In the DNS Security and Stability there was certainly some discussion but there was reference specifically to the review team that's working on the final report and recommendations under the AOC and that mentioned that the final report will address a number of topics and issues that ought to be considered as part of the strategic planning process. So it's unfortunate that Olivier just walked out of the room.

But I think this was what the reference was to earlier that as we consider this area, that we look at some of these other bodies of work and how they might apply to the strategic planning process. So I would love to hear comments on that.

David Cake:

Yeah, actually I think Olivier was running the DSSI which has a much more specific role. Yes, this report – the SSR Review Team – that was actually finalized last week and delivered during this week so that's definitely now available for an input to the strategic planning process and it does have a lot of recommendations on strategic planning.

It's a bit confusing. There's a number of sort of different activities and reports going on at the moment. The SSR report... a lot of the report is concentrated at the strategic planning level and how ICANN deals with security issues within its both strategic planning and its sort of ongoing operations and a lot of it is at the sort of management level rather than the much more specific... we don't get into the specific details that SSAC or something do cause our role was to review the role of SSAC amongst other things.

And of course the DSSA work which is risk assessment-focused and what will come out of the Board risk management working group is also... that's sort of ongoing work towards it rather than... As far as strategic planning goes, the final report is definitely there; it has a lot to say about strategic planning. I think it will be very useful.

Larisa Gurnick:

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade:

On the timing issue, David, if I might, so we have the final report – it's out for public comment. The timing, just to go back...

David Cake:

No, it's been through public comment.

Marilyn Cade:

It's been through public... So...

David Cake:

It's the final final.

Marilyn Cade:

So what's happened...

David Cake: Well, it wasn't... of course we don't generally release... the whole thing about not releasing documents within two days and we delivered it to the Board a week ago, so I think it is...

Marilyn Cade: So you're expecting it to be...

David Cake: Expecting it to be... yeah, out in the next cycle, but it's definitely... be available very soon and so we gave our final delivery, stuff this week so it's done and dusted and should be out very soon. And if anyone wants a copy, of course. It has barely changed since the version put out for public comment, so I could probably get you an absolute final final version but I'd say it differs very little from that one.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you. Any other thoughts on how we should approach the strategy component of the DNS Stability and Security pillar? Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry I skipped past this. This is Marilyn. I need to take us back to page 10 to discuss a word. On Wednesday I suggested that we remove the word limited and I'm looking at the bylaws. I confess to having been the person who inserted that word many years ago. Okay, I had a little help – Mike Roberts and Larry Landweber and Becky Burr – a few other people.

But I think in today's environment we have a mission statement which is in and of itself narrow and short. I would prefer, rather than our using the word limited – which I think puts us in a situation of debating what limited means – that maybe we could say fulfilling ICANN's mission as defined in its bylaws. And then people could be pointed to the actual short paragraph.

The debate about ICANN's mission is going to heat up and become for the next two years, we're going to go back to the intensive debates we've been having about it. So if that could be considered, I would feel more comfortable about that.

Larisa Gurnick:

Yes, we made a note of that based on the discussion on Wednesday, so the suggestion is to remove that word. Probably the cleanest way to do that is to refer back to the original mission rather than trying to describe it in this document which I think is what your point is.

Marilyn Cade:

While I have the microphone, I should point out on point 13 – today ICANN's approach is to be subtle and collaborate with others such as ISOC and the business community and others. This is proposing that we change that and that ICANN's voice be more prominent.

I'm wondering if what we want is... what is it we're trying to say? We're trying to say we want to see the ICANN logo in a lot of additional places? I mean in terms of image, Carole, we want to see ICANN speakers; we want to see... Right now if the SSAC does something or RIRs do something or ccNSO does something or the business community

does something and ICANN is part of that, then we are advancing the ICANN image and using the community to really advance and build support. And very often the community is the best spokesperson.

Or are we saying that we feel the need to see more ICANN executive speeches or we want both or we want something I want which is ICANN actively participating in all of the national and regional IGFs. Just the range of things – I don't mean we need to list them here but I'm trying to understand what being more prominent and consistently present at external fora might mean. I think you'd find strong support from everyone for it.

Carole Cornell:

Mandy?

Mandy Carver:

I just wanted to ask is maybe the issue with the way that's phrased – the actual voice as opposed to prominent and consistently engaged – so ICANN... rather than saying ICANN's voice because again as you indicate, raises an issue of is that executive leadership presence voice as a reflection of the organization – is it ICANN's community. So is it more that what we'd be looking at is something like increasing number and growing blah-blah-blah, an emerging need for ICANN's support of participation, ICANN community engagement to be more prominent and consistently present or...

So maybe the word is... because I think you're identifying that there are in fact increasing venues where you would – I don't want to put words in your mouth, but you've just indicated you would want to see more

consistent and visible engagement, participation. Anyway, I'll stop, but is the question its voice...

Marilyn Cade:

Let me give you an example because we've given this advice to the Board and several others have as well I think. That is that ICANN need to partner with the parts of the community that are actively engaging in these other fora, take advantage of them as a voice and advance ICANN's identity more positively.

Now that's the message we've been giving them for this other... that I think is one thing but there is also the issue of advancing the visibility of ICANN and what it is which will need to be done through executive speeches and as well as supported by collateral, etc. This just did not to me quite capture what I thought the broad intent was.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you for clarifying it and just to respond back to you based on the discussions that we had that resulted in this one blurb, it was the first comment that you made. It was the fact that ICANN is not a member of all those forums and wouldn't be necessarily participating in all of the discussions but would need a way to partner with other community members to make sure that its mission and its work would be better understood and its points represented.

Marilyn Cade:

It's Marilyn. Let me be clear about my understanding of the strategic plan. We don't just play defense which is what many people are trying

to do when we focus only on the Dubai conference. The strategic plan direction is to try to help us deal not with just risk and threats, but with our responsibilities and our opportunities.

And so being a member of one particular organization – that should not be the focus of this. That should be one... it shouldn't be limited to that, right? Okay.

Larisa Gurnick:

Right.

Paul McGrady:

This is Paul McGrady. Can I give a practical example? So last fall INTA had its internet law conference and it was on the eve of all the excitement of April. And Steve Crocker came to give a talk and encouraged the community to encourage the businesses behind those brands to consider DNSSEC and to learn about it and to promote it and INTA is actively looking into how best to communicate that message back to its membership. It's not a trademark issue, but it's a conduit in the community.

And it also had the side benefit of... Dr. Crocker was very well received and people had a much better essentially emotional connection with ICANN, especially because so many of them hear about ICANN, but don't really participate. And something like that – where we have a leadership meeting for INTA coming up this fall – I happen to be the Co-Chair of that event – every year there's an annual meeting and a leadership meeting and I think there's a sense, as Marilyn mentioned, of maybe playing defense rather than offense.

Instead of waiting for an invitation from organizations like that, having the executive team reach out. They'll be very welcome in any event like that to give an update. That's just one example of one community that might have some influence and if, for example, if the Dubai meeting is of great important and we think it is, why not educate that community and what that means for them if things don't go well.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you. Good example. Okay, so the next area is a healthy internet governance ecosystem and the gist of the conversations has centered on the fact that perhaps there is a better way to express what the essence of this pillar is all about. And as I mentioned earlier, we've discussed a variety of ways to perhaps clarify this including robust, vibrant or balance being used in place of healthy.

Also considering removing the word governance from the pillar which I think that was Olivier's recommendation. And in addition to looking at the specific words and the meaning of those words, which is quite important, also the idea of developing a clear definition of what this pillar is all about.

So the discussion has centered around that. We have not yet developed this clear definition but the work has begun to start framing that to clarify what the purpose and the focus of this pillar is all about.

Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade:

So I think everyone in the room knows that it took a world summit, a U.N. summit to debate the definition on what internet governance

means. So that's a heads of state agreement – let's be careful we don't try to edit it in any way. Being a little facetious.

ICANN is part of a larger ecosystem so one of the things I think we have to be careful about – during an earlier period of time some of the documents from ICANN referred to the ICANN ecosystem. ICANN could be a sub-ecosystem if we're thinking of the internet ecosystem, right? But I think that's one thing I would just caution us about, about being too ICANN-centric when we use the word ecosystem because the rest of the world mostly thinks about it a little bit differently.

We are however at ICANN providing governance of our part of the unique... That is what we're doing. And if you look at the definition of internet governance, you note that it can be codes of conduct; it can be standards; it can be laws; it can be rules. ICANN acts as a surrogate for other forms of a regulatory or governmental model.

So we provide regulation through contracts. We don't call it regulation; I think we ought to be careful not to. But we govern through contracts and through voluntary agreements. I'm not sure if... because there is a need for ICANN to both drive and support the actual internet governance system that is broader than ICANN, ICANN needs to strongly support the IGF for instance and to strengthen its role and enhance it.

So part of what I'm trying to struggle with here is that I do think in our strategic plan it should be part of our strategic plan that we are contributing and strengthening the internet governance ecosystem. And that would include to me strengthening and improving, just as an example, how we enforce contracts. It would also involve

strengthening, participating in areas where codes of conduct are being developed that are relevant to us, etc.

Carole Cornell: Mandy?

Mandy Carver: Forgive me because I don't remember now who made this suggestion. Is one of the issues here both the title of the pillar but the mixing within the pillar of some things that are internal to the - if you want to call it the ICANN micro-climate versus the broader internet ecosystem. So some of these items...

There was a request to perhaps organize things more between what is technical in policy and this is trying to talk about... you've got everything from RAA which is internal to ICANN if you will and internet governance which is something that ICANN might be participating in in the broader internet ecosystem.

So is the pillar trying to do too much and therefore is a simpler title better or are we talking about reorganizing within this because you've raised two important points.

Marilyn Cade: To respond – it's Marilyn – I wouldn't necessarily remove governance from the title and I guess I should have started with that. I think ICANN needs to contribute strongly as a leader in building and supporting a... I don't have a problem with healthy, but whatever adjective ends up

being there – but you have to think about how whatever adjective you use translates. So what does it mean in Chinese?

So I should say... so let me say one thing about that. I think we need to keep the term internet governance and that is why I said that it is after all agreed to by heads of state. The word governance in Chinese means government. In Arabic, it has a different meaning than we think of it. However, it is a term that is agreed by heads of state so it's negotiated text in the U.N. at a heads of state conference. So those governments have accepted a different definition than their language actually gives them and that's an important thing to kind of understand.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you. That's a really important clarification and healthy has produced a lot of question as to what's really meant by healthy. So the context and the syntax of each word is really important. That's why there are some suggestions as you see here – robust, vibrant, balanced – that were recommended. Mandy?

Mandy Carver:

I have a feeling there's going to be a lot more discussion about it because what I'm looking at is how you break out the 13 different things. And some things very much are internal within ICANN's structural issues and some things are very much external – what ICANN as an entity is participating in and yes, governance is in that particular setting is negotiated text. So I guess the other question is what is the impact of removing a word in a label of a pillar over other kinds of

things? Is that the right place for that word or is that concept – should it be better filled out in some of the subsets?

So I'm going back to those things that are internal – structural versus the activities that ICANN as an entity would be supporting and actively working in that's within that pillar. You understand what I...?

Marilyn Cade:

Sorry, it's Marilyn again. There was a point when there were senior executive changes at ICANN when the new Communications Team made the magical decision with no consultation to go from capital I to little i. We weren't sure they were going to make it out of the country alive and they had no idea that they were now no longer totally supporting the single authoritative route that they were copying the economists.

The community was aghast. [chuckling] So changing a letter created a great deal of excitement in the community. Removing a pillar or changing a title would... okay

[break in audio]

Mandy Carver:

...governance being put into the title of the pillar has created one set of responses around this table earlier in the morning and the concept of perhaps changing it. Right, but there was a discussion earlier about how did it get there. All I'm trying to figure out is... I mean I don't think anybody is questioning the importance of the concept, but it seems to be – and I'm going to get out of this because it's not my role – but it

seems like there have been some very specific concerns raised about its placement as well as its... Okay, that's fine. Thank you.

Xavier Calvez:

Quick either question or comment. This is Xavier. The "healthy," if it's not clear being replaced by "vibrant" is not going to be more clear. What I mean by that is if it's not clear for a number of people, I'm not sure "vibrant" is going to be clear for more people because this is an objective that's conveying an image rather than a technical description.

And I'm not saying we should not be using that but I don't know the history of how we described the pillars before, so it may have already been rolled out what I'm going to say. Would it be useful to, without voiding, to use a description the way it is there? Has it been thought in the past to have a few lines that describe, maybe in a slightly more technical manner or conceptual manner but descriptive of the actual content, the title of the pillars? Maybe two or three lines that just are associated with the title but give more of a description of what the title is without necessarily listing all the activities that fall under that pillar?

I don't know – maybe it's a good way to address what we mean by "healthy" and what we mean by "governance" in a few lines that are carefully crafted, that are regularly associated with the title so that the words are translated into the concepts in a three or four-line... practical suggestion.

Larisa Gurnick:

Yes, and that's exactly the discussion that we've had. There was a recommendation that in addition to whatever words we end up with,

what's really important is a clear definition of what the pillar is and that would be something that we would develop.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr:

Cheryl Langdon-Orr here. If I can just take you back to page 8 for a moment because the title of this pillar has actually stuck in my craw for some time since it was suddenly just from the gods somehow given to us and I remember the moment well, as Marilyn does.

If you look at the titles which are descriptors of these focus areas or foundations or whatever you want to call them – we're calling them pillars – that's fine – says – listen to the words - DNS Stability and Security - clear and you know what you're going to get underneath it. Corporations including IANA - clear and you know what you're getting. And then we got this aspirational half-sentence called "a healthy internet governance ecosystem."

I mean, I've choked on that for a long time. If you want to parse it slightly differently then perhaps we could take "a"s out and I don't really care about the descriptors. But what we're talking about is internet governance and internet ecosystem. And it just really struck out at me as not a really well-constructed title.

Now I'm happy to review how the title should be constructed. I hear what Marilyn's saying but when you look at what's under the current chart, very little of it has to do with what you and I would think of, Marilyn, as internet governance. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick:

Please.

John Berard:

This is John Berard, member of the BC. This is my first foray into one of these meetings – purely serendipity. My flight’s not til this afternoon and I thought, “Well, it seems important so I should take a look at it.” I share Cheryl’s confusion. Hers is a far more studied confusion because she’s been participating; mine is a more casual, first glance confusion.

A strategic plan designed to set direction, right – I certainly understand each of the words – a healthy internet governance ecosystem. But they also occur in context. And at ICANN - whether here, there or anywhere - the phrase “internet governance” means how do we fit in and how do we make sure that we continue to fit in – in terms of helping govern the internet. Because we are aware that there are external forces that might have some desire to change the way that ICANN operates the mandate that it has.

And so it necessarily strikes a defensive chord because the other three are aligned against progressive, active forward-thinking activities; this one seems to be more protective. So maybe that’s one of the reasons why it sticks out.

And internet governance ecosystem – whoever thought of that in my mind was thinking about the fact that no one can do it alone and the best way for ICANN to protect its mandate within the internet governance arena is to approach it as if internet governance is an ecosystem where each organization has a specific role and therefore promoting ICANN’s role is a key to keeping it healthy... I don’t – healthy depends upon if you’re a man or a woman; you’re 25; you’re 60. Health is a relative phrase, right?

But it just strikes me that the context of these things are important that as a strategic plan, are we still building the strategic plan against the business objective of one world/one internet – I don't know that. And then what are the tactical considerations that support the strategic imperatives? So just my thinking, casually falling in here because I had the time to. I apologize for intruding, but just some thoughts.

Larisa Gurnick:

I think very good feedback. Thank you for that comment. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade:

Let me go back to what I said earlier and try to be a little bit clearer. ICANN is one of the entities that does internet governance. When you read the definition of internet governance, that is talking about us as well as regulators, as well as governments who make national laws.

So when I look at what's here... I'm trying to think about this again. I'm sorry Patrik is gone but we're one of the deliverers of what... we're one of the internet governance entities, but we are in a larger group of structures that working together are governing the internet. There's no single government or regulator at the internet; it's comprised of technical bodies, other organizations and ICANN.

The strategic plan I think is trying to give us some direction on what we should be doing, both internally to fulfill our governance functions, as well as working with others to insure that there is an internet governance ecosystem and that it is functioning well.

So I don't know how we say that, but I think to me that's the important two messages that we need to be giving. We know we are doing internet governance. We are providing governance of the unique indicators – that's our job and we do it in certain ways, contracts, etc. But externally, since we believe in this model, we're also supporting and driving the survival and excellence of the model. I don't know what the heading is.

Paul McGrady:

This is Paul McGrady. Is it as simple as switching out "healthy" for "singular?" It's not? Well, in the sense of not the singular governance but the singular route. As long as we are healthy... How is it different then?

Male:

Just my general concept. I definitely looking at it take Cheryl's point about it's a very different kind of language. If we are to have a descriptor at all, "healthy" seems as good... "Healthy" actually does seem as good to me as any of the suggested alternatives, but I do think we don't need it. And when we don't say core opera... including that, we don't have to say we have to do them well; we don't say we'd like more security and stability. We can just say internet governance. It's just a general heading. We don't need to put sort of aspirational stuff in there

I definitely think it needs Marilyn's point about the phrase "internet governance" is very well understood; we have a well-understood international definition of what that means from the old working group

on internet governance. I'd be happy to just change that whole heading to just "Internet Governance" really.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you.

Male: Just a point. The bit about I think what ecosystem there is saying is intending to reach out, put that idea, make it clear that we are not doing it alone and reaching out. I think that is actually in the understood definition of internet governance, that it has roles for governments and so on. It's all in there.

John Berard: I'm sorry to ask my question again because I'm just supposed to be here listening today instead of using my microphone. But the other three say something though, even in their simplicity, right, it's stable; it's secure; there's competition; there's trust; people have choices; it's operational in the sense that it actually works. How do we... Is there a way to define what governance means in terms of the outputs of governance which is why I asked the question about singular.

Is our primary goal to make sure that the internet doesn't fracture so that we have five of them? Or is our primary goal for governance something else? If it's something else, is there a way to say what that goal is because I don't know that... I mean governance in and of itself – there's bad governments and there's good governments. Governance is

not an outcome. What's the outcome of good governance and is there a way to say that?

And I'm sorry for getting into the new ship but I'm curious about how this fourth pillar, just looks different from the other three. If I were given this as a multiple choice test and I didn't have access to the question and I saw these three, it's the one that doesn't fit in so I would pick it because it's the distracter that doesn't fit.

Male:

Can I just... just a point of information. So the agreed upon definition that Marilyn and I have been talking about from our working group on Internet Governance is internet governance is the development and application by governments, the private sector and civil society in their respective roles of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures and programs that shaped the evolution and use of the internet. That is what is understood when we say internet governance. Anyone who cares enough to scrutinize the language at that level probably will understand that is the accepted definition being referred to. I don't think many people will, but should they do it, that's what it is.

Larisa Gurnick:

That was very helpful. Thank you. Xavier, I know you had your hand up a while ago. No?

Carole Cornell:

I want you to know that since we have done this strategic plan, that particular pillar has gotten... that heading on that particular pillar has come up many times and we will try to address it to everyone's satisfaction since it has come up repeatedly.

Larisa Gurnick:

And just to wrap up the discussion on healthy internet governance ecosystem, it's really... what we want to do is make sure that the title is not a distraction. So however we do it – whether it's through the label that's the title or the next couple of lines that become the official definition. I think that what we want to do here is to make sure that the substantive work that fits under this pillar and the outcome of the strategy and the direction and the projects that stem from there are clear and that people understand why they're there and what we're trying to accomplish – that's why this discussion is so important.

To wrap this up - I know we're practically out of time – I wanted to take us in the direction of linkage between the strategic plan and the operating plan and budget, not so much from a timing perspective which we already know that there is some work that needs to be done, but this is more conceptual to show how it all ties together.

So a rather simplistic graphic but it's here to indicate that first and foremost we start with a charter; documents to article of incorporation; bylaws; affirmation of commitments and that obviously flows into the strategic plan. That is what drives and defines the four pillars and the various strategic objectives that fall under the four pillars.

But then we move into the link to the operating plan and budget and using the current draft FY 2013 as a current example, there's priorities. I believe it's 13 priorities that have been articulated in that document that can all be linked to one and in some cases perhaps more of the four pillars. And under each one of those priorities there's organizational activities which then break down even finer into key activities and that's because the operating plan and budget is rather tactical, not so much strategic but by connecting the dots between the smallest unit of measure, if you will – the key activities, we can create that linkage.

And the objective here would be to be able to associate some budget dollars with each of the four pillars. When I say definition of success, really what that means is key measures, key deliverables being able to identify what those key deliverables are by activity, by project and then finally to have metrics associated with each one of those key activities - which in the current version of the operating plan and budget, the structure and the detail is all there for us to be able to start at the key activities and work our way back up to the strategic plan level and to begin to report metrics and key deliverables which would then begin to address how well are we doing in terms of meeting our strategic objectives.

So I would love to hear feedback on this idea of creating linkage by building up from the mechanism that's already there in the Operating Plan and Budget. Chris?

Chris Chaplow:

Thanks for that chart. It's very interesting. On the operating plan and budget, I've just cross-checked and you've got it in the FY 13 Priorities. I

always have trouble with the linkage on that from the Strategic Plan. I mean maybe it's me. It doesn't seem to fit together. Maybe that's me.

I've just actually be interested in a comment perhaps from Xavier as to whether he has trouble bringing from the Strategic Plan into that or what the process is or where we are with this – how we can improve it.

Xavier Calvez:

There's the short version and the long version of the answer to that question. The short version is I do; the long version is that I think the basic issue that we need to be able to resolve - and that's not a small process to get to the resolution - is that what we are currently calling a Strategic Plan is formalized in a one-page document with four pillars and a bunch of things in it. But that's a one-page text.

And it seems that I am digressing from the answer to your question but I'm going to come back to it. For me the words "Strategic Plan" relate to a comprehensive analysis that starts from strategic objectives... Let me rephrase – a mission that is defined in strategic objectives. To achieve those strategic objectives you have action plans that are usually multi-year - because a strategic plan is usually multi-year – into which these action plans then are sliced into annual increment assuming that they are multi-year and that the annual increment of those action plans for the next year becomes the basis to the budget, to developing the budget.

That logic that I just described is where we need to work in the future so that we can effectively have each of the steps laid out which, if we do it correctly, would show the very logical linkage between these elements

that we're talking about. Today we're lacking in... We have the strategic mission; we have the budget, but we're missing the formalization of some of the steps in between.

And when I say formalization, I should really say the process to formulate it because formalization is just the rendering but it's actually the getting there that's more important. It's less the destination than walking the path, right?

When I was talking earlier about the fact that we need to re-think, re-engineer our whole strategic plan and it's going to take time, that's what I had in mind. So yes, I personally am struggling with the linkage. We know we all are basically, so then the question is how incrementally the next three months basically do we manage to try to make it a little bit more clear without having yet re-engineered completely the strategic planning process.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you for that clarification and certainly what we would like to do in the interim is to be able to address questions as to how are we doing on meeting the strategic objectives, given that there's still a lot of work to be done in creating this ultimate ideal linkage. So this would be an interim step, a beginning, to connect the dots between these two activities and bodies of work.

Xavier Calvez:

And so to just conclude and be practical about it, I suppose that we will be using - to Chris' point earlier - at least a draft of the updated strategic plan before it's approved for the purpose of identifying the

fiscal year '14 priorities or a different version of what that concept was. And one way or the other we're going to have to maybe a reversal that linkage from the process of saying what do we think we need to focus our attention in '14 when we look at...

Because the Strategy Plan is so high level that we will need to find a way to formulate what our focus needs to be in '14 by looking at the strategic planning, by looking at what we think we have on our plate in 2014 and try to make sure we formalize the link between what is in the strategic plan with that and insure that, yes, it all makes sense, it all fits together.

What I'm suggesting is the logic would be strategy planning, action plans and then as part of the action plans, this is what we're going to do in '14. I'm kind of suggesting because we don't have the formulation of that, to say what do we all think we need to do in '14 and insure that everything fits very well and explicitly in the strategy plan's descriptions that we have so that we can say, "Okay, this activity – this is what it fits in."

And the activity, the task under that label "healthy internet governance," for example, is we need to do this; it's an action because we talked about sentences when we described the strategy plan. The sentence has a verb in it and right now we don't have the verb; we have ideas. This is the subject, it's not what we are doing about it.

And that's what the next step I think needs to be in our strategic planning, is that's the subject, now what do we do about it? And then how do we do it. And then what does it mean for the budget. That's those steps that we do.

So I think there's a way for us to formalize a little bit better the priorities. It may be a very simple table that lets the strategic objectives put in front of them the priorities for the year and try to lay out in front of that a number of projects or activities that we carry on during the year. At least it tries to give substance to that formalization short of having yet had the construction of the entire plan as for those phases.

Larisa Gurnick:

And because we are living in the real world where work goes on, there will be an interim step. I would like to suggest some sort of interim step to resolve the ongoing activities and the ongoing work and projects that need to be tied to a strategic objective that happened perhaps or was started a couple of periods ago. So the transition may be a little bit...

It may require some finessing so that we can connect the dots between these two concepts but certainly as new strategic objectives are identified, that linkage that Xavier is talking about, the big strategic idea and what does it mean, how many years will it take, how will it break down into discreet actions and projects that will I would think become much clearer as new objectives are added to the strategic plan. Chris, I think you had a question?

Chris Chaplow:

Yes. Thank you. Chris Chaplow. Maybe it's a naïve question but I'll ask it anyway. Could the ICANN priorities be better sitting in the strategic plan rather than in the budget and operating plan?

Xavier Calvez:

Yes if our strategy plan would include a formulation of the strategic objectives as an action plan that's then sliced in annual increments. So maybe we can still try to say this is the strategic objective and this is next year's focus of that strategic objective. But that's... when we look at what the strategic objectives look like right now, just formulating next year's action on it is not going to be a piece of cake. And honestly, formulating the next step to that requires that you know where you want to go.

I understand your point and I think it's completely logical once we have laid out the entire process correctly. Right now we're trying to hatch the process with formulating that priority because we were all missing that linkage, right? That's the only reason why we have those fiscal priorities right now is because, okay, so now that's what we need to do so what do we do this year, right? So I think we need to try to formulate that better but I agree conceptually with you. I think in practice where we fit it is not necessarily changing the concept.

Larisa Gurnick:

Not to overuse and abuse the word "linkage" but I think the point that you make is exactly what will connect the two documents – the strategic plan will leave off with the priorities and the operating plan and budget will start with that and drive it down into more detail.

Okay, well, we pretty much are at the end of the session. We didn't get to a whole lot of discussion on the metrics but hopefully the division between the linkage of the two documents has given you some idea of the direction that we're suggesting to put some dimension around the metrics.

So thank you very much for participation. Certainly if anybody has any additional questions or comments, I would welcome those but I want to be respectful of everyone's time and schedule. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade:

It's Marilyn Cade. I think we need to go back for just a minute to the question of forming a group, whatever the group is, and what the characteristics would be, what its responsible... I'm not saying we solve it; I'm just saying thinking about forming a group. It is going to be very difficult between now and Toronto to do much inter-sessional work, right?

There's going to be... you'll publish the plan, you'll publish the document. For Toronto you want us to come in prepared to have an interactive session of some time to discuss that? Would that be the goal?

Larisa Gurnick:

What I'd like to say is at this point I'd like to take all the feedback and all the concerns about the timing, all the recommendations as to how we form such a working group and work with Carole and Kurt and Akram to come back with a plan as to what we would like to accomplish in the timeframe between now and Toronto and then how we want to proceed with the working group. I think that's probably the best way that I can answer your question at the moment.

Xavier Calvez:

And I suspect the issue relative to that – I agree this is what we need to do – I think the issue is that we manage to issue that within a timeframe that doesn't eat up half of the three months in between. I was not trying to put pressure more on the staff but we just need to make sure we can do that.

[End of Transcript]