
PRAGUE – 2013-2016 Strategic Plan Development II
Wednesday, June --, 2012 – 09:00 to 11:00
ICANN - Prague, Czech Republic

Carole Cornell:

This morning, we're going to talk about the Strategic Plan, the 2013 to 2016 Strategic Plan Development and Larisa Gurnick is going to be with us this morning. She is the consultant that ICANN has hired to help us with the development process. We have sent out in advance this time, an advance package of material, which we will be discussing and it can be found online as well as we have a handout here if you would like it, and we also have put up the agenda for today and you can follow that online as well. With that said thank you very much for your participation today and I'll turn it over to Larisa.

Larisa Gurnick:

Good morning, thanks for joining us and let's get right into the agenda. So as Carole suggested today we're going to be talking about the strategic plan and this being the cross-constituency group to provide feedback to the ICANN team on the development process for the strategic plan.

So we'll be talking about significant trends and strategic priorities. We'll be talking about some ideas for linking the strategic plan and the operating plan and the budget and the process for measuring progress that has been quite important. And then finally we'll have an opportunity wrap up and hear of any other issues and feedback from the community.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

So all right so just to reiterate the purpose for this is to provide an update as to where ICANN is in the strategic planning process and to really get feedback from different constituencies and communities on your perspective as to what would be important from a strategic point of view for ICANN. And this is the first of two sessions that we'll be having. Today's session is focused on two the strategic pillars of the four which you'll see in the handouts on page 8, if you want to follow along. Today we're talking about two of the pillars, competition consumer trust and consumer choice and cooperation including IANA.

The link that's included in here that's also available in the materials will show you the time line that has been published so far and you can find that in your materials as well on page 4. And that provided you with an outline of where we are in the process right now. The next step will be the formation of the cross-community strategic planning Working Group which is something that we are trying as a new strategy to create better feedback and dialogue with the community, and that will take place in the next month or so and then we're getting ready to post the first version of the 2013-16 plan, the framework and the issues and that draft will be posted in August with the opportunity for community to provide additional feedback in addition to the two meetings that are being held in Prague and then we'll provide draft two after the meeting in Toronto. So you can see more details of the timeline and this is a pretty typical approach to our strategic planning at ICANN.

Since the idea of the cross-community strategic planning Working Group is a new one and with the few of you that are participating, we would love to hear your thoughts as to whether this concept of a Working Group to create more of an open dialogue and an opportunity

to share ideas in a cross constituency type of format whether that's something that is of interest and whether you would be interested in participating in a Working Group such as this. Any feedback for me on that right now?

Mark Partridge:

My name is Mark Partridge and I'm with the Intellectual Property constituency. So I think it's a great idea to have cross constituency feedback to break down the silos and get more interaction and communication between the different groups. And I think a Working Group to work on strategic planning is a good thing to do to get ideas that flow from a Working Group can be more than just the tried and true ones but brainstorming can generate some interesting new perspectives, so I encourage you to do that.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you.

Branislav Andjelic:

My name is Branislav Andjelic. I'm with the CC community and I agree with colleague, it's a very good idea I think. My own issue with it is that I feel it's kind of coming late in the game. If I looked at the schedule how fast can you form this Working Group, and how fast can it start working really. It needs time first of all to go back to the community and see what are the issues that a community is interested in discussing in this kind of Working Group and then you've got to organize it, has to have meetings and stuff like that. So looking at your timeline, I'm not sure we're going to make it, but I think it's a good idea.

Carlton Samuels: My name is Carlton Samuels. I'm the Vice Chair for the ALAC and I'm representing the ALAC here. We would endorse this approach. We believe that perhaps the best plan under these circumstances ought to be crowd sourced. And we have a concern however with the calendaring of this as our colleague from the CC community pointed out it's going to be a very tight timeline because we have to go back to the edges to get our input. When I say edge we have the At-Large community, we have the ALSs and the RALOs in the far regions and we have to get back to them, so our conversation has a long tail on it. And this is aggressive but regardless of that challenge we endorse this approach.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you.

Male: So three out of three community members agree that it's a good idea. There is two challenges one is the calendar, so I think we could identify as a calendar issue but then maybe sort of put our blinders on and go ahead with a rational way of forming a community and if it's ready for this time that's good, and if it's not, we're still doing the right thing. It sounds like the right thing and I think Carlton, one of our challenges I think with the ALAC and the GAC more than other constituency or stakeholder groups is going to be who, I think of the GAC they all tend to go together and don't appoint representatives generally and the same with ALAC, I can imagine there will be quite a bit of eagerness to

participate in the session, so that's part of your work will be to try to make that small, because I think this group will be effective to the extent it's nimble but also does represent the views of the stakeholder group or advisory committee or whatever that is.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you very much for that feedback so we will definitely continue working through the process to come up with the best way to get the group structured, identified, clear objectives – good morning, Leonid. We also got some feedback from the ccNSO group regarding the structure of this group and possible overlap with some of the other Working Groups that are dedicated to strategic planning type issues, so all this feedback will be considered as we go forward with the idea that a Working Group, a cross-constituency Working Group is supported by the community.

So in addition to the work that's been going on with the community and the SOs and ACs, ICANN management also has had a number of planning sessions, we've been going through that process in the month of May and June going through each pillar and considering some of the same issues that we will be presenting and talking to you today. And as I already mentioned the plan is to have the framework and issues for the 2013 through 16 strategic plan to be posted in August for public comment.

Marilyn Cade:

I'm sorry, may I ask a question here, my apologies for being late. My name is Marilyn Cade.

Larisa Gurnick: Good morning, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Good morning, I think it would be great if you could post it in August, but I would note that you shouldn't count August as part of the number of days because of the fact that particularly in Europe there are very extended weeks of vacation and family holidays. But I was just also going to make a point that I do think perhaps at the end of this week and talk a little bit about the challenges that are existing right now in terms of the amount of time it will take and perhaps interim engagements it might take to get the communities to respond, don't you think?

Male: Yes.

Larisa Gurnick: Marilyn thank you very much for that feedback, we did consider the fact that August is a month of holidays and vacations so the idea was to get it posted and make it available and then to open it up for public comment and really expect that the bulk of the feedback and the next steps would take place through the month of September and getting ready for the next phase of the process in time for the meeting in Toronto which is in October.

But I would say that maybe at this point, it would be helpful to hear from you folks as to what kind of a timeline and what kind of a process

would work for the Working Group as we continue the formulation of how to make it work so not to digress in that direction for too too long but if maybe quickly you could run through your ideas of what kind of a timeframe each one of you would need in order to connect with your constituencies and to be able to address questions and issues would be really helpful.

Marilyn Cade:

It's Marilyn Cade speaking again. Perhaps I might just clarify that I'm glad that Kurt is here because of this particular comment I'm going to make. The Business Constituency which I Chair and I personally have been a very strong supporter of the importance of these kinds of sessions, but our workload is so overwhelming right now that there are some very critical, essential other meetings that are taking up some of the elected leadership that you would need I think to be able to give you the depth of response that you need.

I think we can give some high level ideas, and then perhaps even take them back and plan to come back to you but for instance for my community which sits inside of a – the Business Constituency is part of the GNSO. That SO does not have a Chair. Our policy council has a Chair and we have seven other Chairs, so each of us will need to work within our smaller groups in order to have a GNSO perspective. Any timeline that the CCs can meet I think and probably we could meet, because their community I think is fairly complex as well, right?

Male:

Well CCs already have a very active strategic planning group and we have been very heavily involved in these issues and made a number of recommendations to ICANN in the past. So for us I think that the issues have been fairly clear, I cannot speak for the Working Group leadership, but I suppose that for us it would be easier to participate because we already have positions pretty clearly worked out.

I'd like to use this opportunity to go back to the timeline; I have other issues with timeline if I may. As Marilyn said, August is a dead month and I see that your public consultation is – public comment period is planned for August only. I don't believe you're going to get much public comments during the August. I also think that risk assessment contained in the recent dissipated events with significant impact is somehow timid, it's not – the two events that can have very significant impact on the strategic plan, one is the IANA contract, you are assuming it will be extended, might not. So I wish it is and the likelihood that it is extended is very high, but it should be planned for contingencies if it is not.

Also the final resolution in Dubai will significant impact strategic operations of ICANN, and the result may be national legislations or international agreements and a lot of countries also are waiting for Dubai to see whether they will pass internet laws locally, some countries have it, some don't. So I think these two events are kind of after some significant dates in the planning calendar and they will have significant impact on the content of the strategy itself.

So I think that needs to be worked into the process very carefully, risks need to be assessed and of course if you judge the risk as very, very

minor, then we can continue with this timeline, but if you judge that the risk is somewhat greater, then I think this is too ambitious timeline in that respect, because these two issues, I think this is all we're talking about. Last few days I think we get – you know, so this is very important issue, we don't know what's going to happen in Dubai, and what impact it will be particularly on the unity of the root. Thank you.

Carlton Samuels:

Thank you. Carlton Samuels for the record, speaking for the ALAC, well at the At-Large we're in the position where we could respond in good order because we do have standing Working Groups that are dealing with the strategic plan, the Chair of that is Tijani Ben Jemaa and he's not here today.

And we also have future challenges Working Group that has been looking at two focusing on the two major pillars which is competition consumer trust and consumer choice, and the one in ALC internet governance ecosystem, so we do have something on the boil for that, and the real challenge for us is going out to the edge and coming back to the center, that's the challenge for us and that is where the compressed timeline kind butt up against our interests and our aspirations to make meaningful input into this process. So you need to be aware of that.

Some of the major points of intersection from the At-Large in this strategic planning process we already have begun work on them, and they're in the process now of gathering input from the edge. And so we might be able to probably shorten some of the response time in a couple of instances for example the future challenges, we just had a

meeting this morning where we were talking about some these exact issues. So it's where betwixt and between as it were.

We know we want to say something very particular in two of the pillars within the strategic plan. We have been very careful to ensure that what we say reflect the views of the At-Large in general and in order to do that we have a long tail that we have to go out to the edges and come back. So just bear that in mind as our process, it would impact on how soon we can have – let us say input that we are absolutely sure reflect the views of our entire community. Thank you.

Leonid Todorov:

Leonid Todorov SOP Working Group the ccNSO. Well first of all I do appreciate the importance of this session but I'm sort of a little bit upset with the turn out, and it's not that accidental because I've just conferred with a veteran of the ICANN meetings and realized that it had actually been a long, long time ago when such a session was around at the ICANN meeting, and that's probably why people are either unaware or ignorant of this, although it's basically the origin and at the heart of the ICANN'S operation, it's the spine of the operations.

So I think that it's important for us to somehow boost I would say attention or attract the attention to drive this session into the limelight so that there will be more stakeholders in this room, and we could just not totally exchange our reviews in the very narrow and intimate company, but also have a greater input, that's number one.

Number two I mean in terms of timelines you may be interested to know that our group, we emphasized the importance of the ICANN's

kind of observing of the timelines themselves I mean to be very precise, I mean coming up exactly at the time as it's stated in the papers, so that we could have greater predictability and could plan our business schedules, we're not that busy as Marilyn's and her colleagues, but still our business schedule so that to come up with a certain input as well.

And also I would just echo what was just been told, this is very important to have that blend, if IANA is not approved, I mean at the contract is not extended, if the Dubai meeting has far reaching consequences. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: I just need to – it's Marilyn, I'm just going to expand, do you know what we're referring to when we talk about the Dubai Conference? Okay –

Larisa Gurnick: Go ahead, Marilyn, please.

Marilyn Cade: Let me describe this maybe a little more broadly, we are using the code word the Dubai Conference to reference four weeks, two separate meetings held in Dubai at the end of the year, but in reality there will also then be a similar risky meeting in May of 2013, so it is within this budget cycle that budget cycle as well. So I think it's important for us to think of this as a series of events which offer external threats in places where key decisions could be made that may affect national legislation or create perhaps parallel initiatives that would just drain energy and

availability of people that would then be drawn away to play defense to solve another problem.

We can talk about it more off line, but I just want to be sure we're looking at it as this series, there's these two meetings back to back in Dubai, and then there's this week, this four-day meeting in May of 2013.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you for that clarification. Kurt?

Kurt Pritz:

Thanks, so starting with Marilyn's first comment and its progeny a couple thoughts come to mind. One is I recognize the heavy workload, but then we want to grow this, right? And this is really important, so it seems like each constituency or stakeholder group should, like the ccNSO has done create this strategic planning arm of that or something like that, so we should start educating the different stakeholder groups about the want to staff this, and then the comments about timing and going about the formation of this group the right way made me think that this is the longer term process, that you know for those that have a compulsive need for another version of a strategic plan this year, you know we can update the existing strategic plan to reflect what's changed, but with this initiative and with Fadi coming on board, he'll want a say in how the strategic plan process is run.

And so maybe we can engage with him and then also engage with some community members and him to develop this you know, develop this committee and how it would run, how it would interact with the CEO, and I know, as you know Akram had some vision about this too which is

one of the reasons why we're sitting in this room. So I would recommend taking the comments about calendar very seriously and almost make a two-track process; one is you know tweak the strategic plan if we think we need to or tell people we're not going to do that this year and then take time over a period of months, get the input of the interim CEO and the soon to be CEO and get them together with the community to talk about how to form this for the kind of a long-term planning tool, decide how it's going to run.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you Kurt, I think it has become to me quite apparent in the last couple of days from the feedback from the different groups that there is all these questions and uncertainties and really important developments that require that we rethink the timeline and the process and given that it's all in draft form, this is precisely the kind of feedback I think we were hoping to get to make it a productive process.

Based on some previous discussions with the ccNSO Working Group and the work of ICANN management, we had identified what we call overarching priorities so this is issues and ideas that go even above the four pillars, something that crosses over the whole operation of ICANN and the community and they're listed here so given that we're getting some really terrific feedback, I'd like to go over these priorities and hear from the community as to your thoughts and what other priorities, what I would call overarching priorities you would like to add to this list.

And the list being chief operational excellence, preserve multi-stakeholder model because that is in fact what differentiates ICANN from all the other entities out there, and fulfill ICANN's limited mission

in doing its work. So let me ask you again if there is some additional thoughts that you have on these priorities.

Male:

My name is [Mishinger] Internet Foundation. I am a bit well from external world to ICANN but what I can see, well ICANN is quite busy with internal processes with the contract of IANA, with Dubai and all this kind of stuff, but it seems that the rest of internet and technology behind it is [on another planet] for ICANN. Facebook is on another planet, and Google is on another planet, galaxy maybe. ICANN does not look at the market as such.

The market isn't developing so maybe in four years' time nobody needs to name names anymore. Look at what Facebook is doing now, they are saying well guys you don't need email addresses based on domain names, all of what you need is Facebook name so in five years' time, it can be another planet that everybody is moving to another planet and there is no business anymore for ICANN and for TLDs.

We were talking to our colleagues TLDs year around, and they do recognize that but I do not see that here in the strategic meeting that you're looking at the market, what's around here in the world, not only the internal process this is my comment, thanks.

Marilyn Cade:

Thank you for that comment, Marilyn Cade. So I think we have to rewrite all three of those, because the understanding, the comprehension of what people will take away from such short phrases, I think will convey not enough information. So that would be my first

point. An overarching priority in a strategic plan of achieving operational excellence, I come from previously a company that designed, created and delivered five nines over liability.

The rest of the world followed that in excellence. And I do think we want ICANN to achieve and excel in the area of operational performance, but I think we need to find a way of stating it so that it is a little more visionary. So the topic is right, I think, the category is right, but let's think about how we relay that.

Secondly, preserving the multi-stakeholder model, I think sometimes people try to pack the word multi-stakeholder more times into our paragraphs; I think we want to – the serving the multi-stakeholder model doesn't convey the intent of what we're trying to do. We're trying to build the kind of broad, diverse, geographically distributed participation that is needed to support our delivering our mission and the multi-stakeholder model is how we plan to do it. So multi-stakeholder it's a code word.

Carlton Samuels:

Can I jump in?

Marilyn Cade:

Let me just finish the third one. We can't continue to say fulfill ICANN's limited mission. I helped write the text when ICANN was created that said that ICANN has a limited, but critical technically oriented coordination role. The world has changed I really think that's right, but the internet has also changed in its involvement in our daily lives and in our corporate lives, and in the dependency that corporations,

individuals, NGOs and others have on the function that it provides in terms of connectivity and access to the worldwide web and to other resources such as Facebook or Twitter.

But I doubt very much myself that the worldwide web is going away just because other solutions evolved. We need to figure out how we say that we are going to continue to fulfill our mission in managing and coordinating the unique indicators but we've got to stop calling it a limited mission. Because I think by saying that, we think we're reassuring people who used to be concerned about ICANN's existence but they got over that during the WICIT. So sorry for my long – I didn't have wording, but I think it's got to be a little richer.

And then I think we need a fourth priority which is a little bit more about vision. I may have to go read Fadi's speech, because I found a lot of vision in it actually, but I think we need to figure out the – there needs to be something, and there I think we need to be able to say that we are going to play our role in the larger internet ecosystem, and I'm not sure how we say that, but I think it's an important point to get across. Thanks.

Carlton Samuels:

This is Carlton Samuels again for the record. I want to pick up on the thought that Marilyn had about the multi-stakeholder model. One of the challenges that we've had especially in the At-Large is trying to explain to people what that means. And I would very much prefer to see that we embrace the idea that the model is [out short]. And we're saying that there is a set of outcomes that we're after. And we need to

define those outcomes and this model that we are embracing is a means to achieve those outcomes. It's very important to say that.

It's like again the confusion when we talk about the public interest and you have one, I have one, everybody and their brother have one. And it creates noise in the channel when we use these labels and we don't have a way of bringing it out and defining it. That's the first thing.

I violently agree with Marilyn about this business of the limited interest, ICANN's limited mission. Believe it or not to most of the world, it's a kind of a half enough out kind of thing. It's like testing the waters you know, put your toe in and see if it's warm enough, that's what you project. And I really think we should like Marilyn suggested stop talking about that, let's define what it is that we are constructed to do, let us define very clearly why we think it's important to be done and let us agree on the way we go about doing it. That's what we need to have very, very clear. So I fully support Marilyn's position on this one with the limited – I think we should stop talking about that, we need to change that.

And I am not so sure that it's like you Marilyn Cade, we're trying to find, when we say an overarching – these overarching, these big ideas, there's a set of things that we know is going on, and our friend over there speak about what's happening the marketplace in terms of the technology changes that might impact what we do in the domain name system. And we talk about things, like the perception and we need something to define and put all of that together and that's not here. I agree with you, it's not here. We need something else.

Mark Partridge:

It's Mark Partridge. I support a lot of what's been said, but I'll just go through the three and make a few comments. First of all, in operational excellence, obviously that's important, that's like mom and apple pie, you have to do what you're doing well. It needs to capture more than that. It needs to capture not only that things are being done well, but that we're perceived as doing things well. And currently at least in the world I live in, that's not the case unfortunately. And so there's a lot of work to be done there, and it's not just about doing a good job, but it's making sure that people know that a good job is being done.

On the multi-stakeholder model, I guess when we come to these meetings, we have a sense of what all that means, but the rest of the world talks about multi-stakeholder models in a very different way. A lot of the people at the table, Congress is a multi-stakeholder model, et cetera. It's not the same thing, and so maybe that phrase is not conveying to the rest of the world of what we need has already been mentioned.

My perspective is as somebody who works as a lawyer within the business community in the United States, so I speak with that perspective, and I come here as a representative of the American intellectual property law association. In our world the importance of the multi-stakeholder model is that it is private control of the internet space. And I think that's something that I hope this would convey that perhaps separates what the multi-stakeholder model means here from what some of the other uses in the outside of this community mean.

And finally I agree with the idea with fulfilling ICANN's limited mission, limited sounds so small, so timid and like we're afraid to really do the

whole job, we're just going to do a little bit of it. So you know can we change that to fulfill ICANN's specific mission and have it mean that we're focused on something in particular and special, rather than having a limited narrow view.

Branislav Andjelic:

Branislav again. I would say that the second item, the multi-stakeholder model, I see that as the only possible vehicle and consensus building within it for preventing fermentation of the internet. And I would say that our principal mission today might not be at the time when Marilyn was writing the mission, but today I think our principal mission is prevention of the fragmentation of the internet. And as the colleague said there is a new world out there, there are Facebooks and social networks and similar technologies and business models that are coming. I would like to perceive them in two ways.

One way is yes they're a threat, they're a threat equally as not renewal of IANA contract or WICIT in Dubai, so in one way they're a threat and we have to look at them as a threat. But on the other hand, perhaps they are a new constituency that we haven't included in our multi-stakeholder model. The crowd that is on the Facebook is very specific, and none of speak for them, they look at the world differently and perhaps we need to think of those people as one of the stakeholders and try to engage them in this dialogue. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade:

Can I just ask a question. I'm on Facebook, so I think I'm not totally alien.

[background conversation]

Marilyn Cade:

No, no. Oh, sorry youth, could I ask a question here though because how much more we have to go through, I know we're running out of time. I guess what I take away from this is we all ideas about the overarching priorities. I don't feel like we have actually done a good job right now of – nor do we have enough diversity in the room to give you the robust enough feedback, but we I guess to your senses, we want a lot of tweaking.

Larisa Gurnick:

Yes, Marilyn and everybody else, I thank you for the comments and I guess my response would be based on the kind of feedback we're getting, I think it certainly would be my recommendation with the ICANN team of folks working on this project that we think about some specific issues that have been raised and really come back with some thoughts and ideas, how we might continue the process given change in leadership, given some of the risks that we're all aware of.

And given the type of feedback that obviously is out there that the community has to offer and really it will be a task to make sure that we can have these conversations in a more robust and – in a way that includes more community so that it can be substantive just as this is but include a more diverse group of people.

So certainly based on this indication I think rather than spending the time to go through the details of the rest of the slides, it would probably be good to continue – to hear any other comments on these high level issues and feedback that we might take back and come back with a plan for how to continue developing the strategic plan in a substantive way that would benefit everybody.

Keith Drazek:

My name is Keith Drazek I'm with Verisign and also the Registry Stakeholder Group Alternate Chair. Just sorry to backtrack just a little bit but on the discussion about the limited mission and the consideration of moving away from that language; it seems to me that by changing, that the term "limited mission" seems to have been in the lexicon around the ICANN organization and community for quite a while, and I think that removing that will draw attention and the people will notice, and say, well wait a minute if it's no longer a limited mission, then what is it.

And it would be incumbent upon us in this process to I think define that, which raises the question, well, what are peoples' perspective on what that mission actually is. And it seems that it may raise I don't know concerns from the community or some – it may create some issues or problems by simply removing it and not defining what the mission is. So I think it's something that's – go ahead Marilyn, sorry.

Marilyn Cade:

We have a mission. So tell me what – I'm confused, the mission is the first thing in the Bylaws.

Keith Drazek: So I guess rather than saying fulfill ICANN's limited mission you simply restate what's in the Bylaws there.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry, before you came in I said that these three phrases were too short-handed, but we do have a mission and the mission is very – I think it's very narrowly – so we could say you know fulfill ICANN's mission as defined in the Bylaws.

Keith Drazek: So I think that makes sense and I apologize I didn't hear your lead-in, so that makes sense to me now. Thank you.

Marilyn Cade: Actually I like that idea because that means that points people to the official mission. And we don't – but it's really tightly defined I think. So you and I can look at it separately, but I think that might take care of that particular one.

Larisa Gurnick: Kurt would you like to go next?

Kurt Pritz: Thanks, right when Marilyn made her first comment I went to the fact that we kind of manage ourselves and work to PowerPoint slides. And so we're trying, you did a very good job of taking really complex topics

and getting them down to three words and what we're hearing is especially if we're going to do serious planning, we should get away from that.

And so as we establish this Working Group, you know it's with the idea that it's going to do some pretty hard work and the work's going to be done through briefing papers and that analysis of papers that fully explain that this stuff is, and I just off PowerPoint slides; so as part of your planning, we might think about training ourselves up to get used to reading papers again inside of slides.

Marilyn Cade:

It's Marilyn again, and I'm sorry I was late. I missed your timeline for populating the group, et cetera, so I'll just catch with you later, if I can Carole but Keith may want to do that as well since...

Carole Cornell:

I would like to say that we put out the timeline for public comment and it is out there, and we've had very limited response so far, and it is open through July 30th to allow people to weigh in and given some more substantive, besides this. And we will take all of this back, we think it's been very good feedback, but we will take any additional comments that people have in the public comment timeline to help maybe justify changing or revising it if we feel that it's necessary.

As Kurt said, there's maybe two tracks we should approach.

Kurt Pritz: Right, we've already decided to I think well to the extent we can just sit here and decide to make some substantial change in that, make it a longer term process.

Larisa Gurnick: Absolutely, so all this feedback will be considered and then we'll come back with a plan for what makes sense. I do want to cover another point that's part of the strategic planning story, if you will, and this is based on the feedback that we've heard from certain community members; is about the importance as part of our process of creating linkage between the strategic plan and the operating plan and budget.

And we have some ideas for how that can happen and also for how to use the process that's already in place for the operating plan and budget that includes accountabilities and metrics that are a pretty detailed activity level. But the idea would be that it would help build up the process and the reporting and the planning at the smallest perhaps somewhat tactical level.

But it would help everybody understand how the strategic objectives and the projects and initiatives that stem from them filter all the way down into operating plan and budget, what the dollars are decked against those projects as well as how ICANN as a team goes through to measure whether those objectives and key deliverables are being met, and the outcomes.

So that's kind of a nebulous and somewhat theoretical comment, once again that's been capsulized into a very brief PowerPoint lingo, but it would helpful to get your feedback as to what the community's

thoughts are about that process, and I might ask you very quickly to take a look at – in the handouts, page 17, we also have a slide on this point that I’m just going to jump to.

And the idea here is that the Articles of Incorporation, the Bylaws, Affirmation of Commitments those are all the Charter documents of ICANNs that really define the core mission, word for word and in great specificity. And it’s that that drives the strategic plan of which currently we have strategic focus areas also referred to as pillars, and then underneath that for each pillar, we have strategic objectives and then moving down the process we also have an operating plan and budget which is available – approved now? Or up for approval?

Carole Cornell:

I don’t know if it’s actually...

Larisa Gurnick:

But that’s a document that has been prepared and I know it’s posted. And that document has the purview of just one year as opposed to the three-year planning cycle that we have from a strategic planning perspective, but in that document there is priorities that are not to be confused with the overarching priorities but specific activities, organizational activities and key activities that make them up and from there, we have a way to allocate or report out on the allocation of budget that represents the organizational activities which also will help understand how much dollars are decked against each of the pillars. And will help the process of defining, not just definition of success, but by success we mean the key deliverables from which metrics can be

established. So that's kind of a conceptual presentation of some of the ideas that we've been discussing at ICANN and I would very much welcome some feedback on these thoughts.

Male:

I have a question, rather than feedback. (Inaudible) speaking for the record. Are you suggesting to put in the strategic plan a mandate for the operating plan and budget to have methodology for prioritizing objectives within the operating plan and mandate to have specific metrics in the budget? Because we don't have either right now.

Larisa Gurnick:

Not so much a mandate as a way of using the work that has already been done for the operating plan and budget to come up with definitions that we can as a starting point use to build up the process of key activities that can be measured and reported out with specific metrics. Those key activities rolling into bigger scale projects which then roll into support strategic ideas and objectives and of course those have phases and project steps that take us way beyond the one year operating timeframe.

So I wouldn't use the word "mandate" per se, it's just a process or a way to use as a starting point because this is a rather involved exercise to get to the point of being able to report out and be held accountable and measure the success and accomplishments against goals. So this idea is to use the framework and the infrastructure that's already there as part of the operating plan that breaks the vast number of activities that

ICANN is involved in into these smaller more measurable pieces that can roll out to a strategic idea.

Male:

So excuse me, the strategic plan will not say that the operating plan and budget must have measures that will be used to measure to what extent the strategic plan has been fulfilled in a certain year. If we have a strategic objective that is three or four years long which is further detailed in the operating plan, annual operating plan, after the second year, we'd like to know to what extent in both quantity and quality that goal in the strategic plan has been fulfilled by the operating plan, so you're not planning to institute some kind of mechanism that would kind of require that kind of metrics that will report – I don't have a better word but report back to the strategic plan so that we can see how well our strategy is being fulfilled.

Larisa Gurnick:

What you just described, that is the idea, that is what everybody is asking for and that would be the goal, the how to that would be accomplished, I would defer to a team of people to figure out how to mandate it or include it or incorporate but certainly the objective would be exactly what you described is to create some way of being able to really tell the strategic story of how the goals and objectives of the organization are being accomplished and if there has been delays or unforeseen circumstances then what they were and how they impacted the outcomes.

Carole Cornell: Other comment, sure.

Mark Partridge: Okay, so this is Mark Partridge. I think the process you've identified here in the plan is very positive, it's a good way to create and implement a strategic plan that you have the plan tied to specific budget items and amounts to be spent and then you identify that you've going to have metrics to not just did we spend the money, but did we achieve the goals in a measurable way and what you measure tends to get done, so that's positive.

What's implied in a very small way by the circular arrows is that this keeps going round and round. But I think that it would be good to emphasize what you're going to do with those results once you get to that point where you run the budget through the year, you've got your metrics then what's the process for taking that information and turning it into something, okay, we learned this lesson now next year, we're going to change our ways, we're going to do something different.

And of course the last thing is this to me suggests the need for having a budget created very early so the budget does actually work as a guide to what's being done, so that's another challenge.

Larisa Gurnick: Thank you, Leonid?

Leonid Todorov: Well first of all just getting back to the background, thanks very much for taking into consideration what the ccNSO SOP group actually has

been long proposing, that is the metrics and the benchmarking, I mean we're really happy that it was indeed taken into consideration and included into these very cute how to say that, scheme or what it is.

Anyway I will try to respond to your question, sir. I believe that it will be up to that cross-constituency group first of all to assess those results and outputs and just assess those metrics and come up with a certain recommendations for the Board, the ICANN management and I think that if that cross-constituency group has I would say a broader mandate than just the ccNSO SOP group, I think that those recommendations will be really meaningful and will be seriously taken by the – into consideration by the Board.

So we might sense or see in some foreseeable future some very credible mechanism of that bottom up cooperation or I would say collaboration which would ensure some I would say timely and strict following the [box] properly if you will. Thank you.

Larisa Gurnick:

I appreciate the comment, thank you. To wrap this up, I think we've heard a lot of really helpful feedback and with the next steps of figuring out how to effectively put the Working Group to work for this process. I'd like to just close with any other comments that you might have on ways that ICANN can do a better job in communicating, measuring first but also communicating that story and that progress.

I have some specific questions here if there is any additional thoughts on measuring, reporting out in a way that information is relevant given everybody's busy schedules and workloads, how to present this

information in such a way that it would be of value to the community, so that it would set up for a productive and open dialogue that can then be plugged into the whole strategic planning process. Marilyn, good.

Marilyn Cade:

I'm going to add – this is Marilyn Cade, I'm going to add a possible area rather than respond to what you just said. But I think, whoops – I think the gentleman is gone. In order to, if I take us all back to page 3 for just a moment. I know people like to use bullet points so there's no prioritization conveyed by the order of the numbers, but look at the first bullet. Significant trends impacting ICANN strategy from the community's perspective. I think we talked about some of the trends I would say there is a trend to re-examine increasing the role of government oversight, and those meetings we referred to were an example of that.

But I think the gentleman who spoke was referencing another thing that I think we need to have information on in order to develop a strategic plan and that is what I call the changing face of the internet. Now that is all publicly available data, but the rapid growth in internet use and users, the different kinds of applications and demands that are being made on the internet, driven not only by changes in the worldwide web, but in other things, the rapid growth of risk and threats, et cetera. Those are all trends and things that we need to know about, if they're out in our ecosystem, in order to be able to develop a strategic plan.

And one of the things that I have been very interested in is why we, as ICANN, don't count more, why we don't do – why we don't gather statistics on important things that are driven by our activities or that our

activities affect; and then also, track at a high level, there's not a huge amount of work to do because the data is all publicly available or participate from certain resources.

So that we're reflecting in our strategic plan the sense that we know what is going on, we know our place in the landscape, and this is what we're doing, and this is how we're affecting the landscape. So metrics about our performance are all really, really good, but I think for a strategic plan we're missing some of that conveying the awareness of the external environment. And I'm not sure how we would – so that's not reflected yet.

But then to tie this to how would we measure the progress toward our strategic objectives, I think we're going to have to be careful that it's not only numbers that we count. And so to give an example counting the number of fellows who come is a good thing but that's not measuring the impact of the fellowship program.

Keith Drazek:

Thank you, Keith Drazek again. I agree with everything that Marilyn just said, let's get that out of the way. One maybe sort of a tactical solution for addressing the measuring and communicating progress is the concept of having sort of a dashboard perhaps on the ICANN website that indicates progress visually, progress against the metrics that have been identified.

And you know sort of the image that I have is a color-coded, a timeline with various steps along the way of a process that's been identified, metrics, measurements, however and it may be very different on each

line item or each topic or each instance that we're tracking and that we're trying to measure. But basically a visual representation that shows and indicates where we have met certain objectives as a community, as an organization and visually be able to identify where we are falling behind, or where there are instances that would require some additional focus or resources or attention.

And again this is just thinking out loud talking about ways of communicating what we're measuring and identifying where we need to augment or repurpose the resources of the organization and the community as a whole. So just a thought.

Carole Cornell:

Thanks Keith. I would like to say I hope we're starting to do more of that. There is a dashboard, it used to be on the top left of our front page, and it's actually moved to inside one of the trees down below and so it is still available, but maybe it's not – to your point as visible and/or seen, so people can see some of the progress made.

The other point that you make is doing a better job of visually showing strategic objectives and how they're progressing along a timeline, it's interesting, we've had a couple of dialogues this week, and that's one of the common threads that we've come away with that we need to do a better job of that, and we actually have started talking amongst ourselves how we might do that better.

It does mean that we have clearly agreed upon strategic elements that from all levels management community and all of those that we can show those and identify them over time. So I think that is something we

are doing but I agree we need to do a little bit more, but there is a dashboard that does show progress for 9, 10, 11 and we're working on 12 already, but we're not showing them in maybe the right format to help make that message, so thank you.

Keith Drazek:

So thanks for letting me know and I'll certainly go and take a look at that. You know I think that one of the benefits of having this, whether it's a visual representation that shows sort of at a high level the progress of attaining certain goals and accomplishing the metrics that have been identified is the idea that you might be able to then click on that particular item and then it brings up more detail. But to have a fairly high level view that then there's additional supporting information I think would be very valuable.

I think though that having and to your point about having to have the metrics identified and agreed to, I think that having that visual representation, or you know the dashboard would attract more people to the discussion of establishing those metrics. You know it may basically just bring more people into the discussion.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you, good feedback.

Mark Partridge:

This is Mark Partridge. I'd like to underscore something that Marilyn got to which is the need – these things internally are important, yes. But there's a need to recognize the importance of external communication

and that doesn't seem to be captured as much in these statements here or in the statement that Marilyn highlighted in the report, and so I'd urge you to add that to part of this, because that really is an important strategic consideration going forward in our environment now is the reaction of the external world to what's going on here.

Larisa Gurnick:

Yes, thank you, so definitely a take-away is Marilyn's suggestion of some statistical and other data points to really frame what the environment looks like and just to add to that comment as the ICANN team went through the process of getting ready for the strategic planning exercise considering the external environment in addition to what's happening internally was very much a part of that process, and there have been robust discussions and conversations and certainly what you're seeing here is just a slice of the process, and not the process in its entirety, but the comment about perhaps bringing that story into what we share publicly as part of the strategic plan, because that hasn't been included before, has been duly noted.

Leonid Todorov:

Leonid Todorov, well basically I agree with Marilyn and the others. I would just caution against creating of that business intelligence unit, if you will, because they tend to serve the [parent]. And we all are aware of where they could lead us, I mean take that year 2008 crisis, you know.

Well, speaking of communication. I believe that a certain part of the world is missing, still missing on the ICANN's map, and this is critical, I

mean I speak – I dare speak for a group of countries that are effectively cut off because of objective reasons from communication with ICANN more or less. For example Middle Asian countries, the former Soviet Republic simulation and the only chance for them to stay connected with ICANN is of course Russian translations on the ICANN’s website, which I’m sorry to say are far from being perfect. And this is critical given particularly, I mean a low penetration rate in those republics and you know if their circle of internet users. Now, that’s the only channel and I guess some attention should be paid to that.

And finally I would also caution against somewhat excessive use of US dollar equivalent of success because it might seem inappropriate in a situation when everybody realizes that he deals or is a part of the community of nonprofit organization.

Larisa Gurnick:

Thank you for your comment Leonid. Just to let you know we already discussed some of the concerns that you have shared earlier in the week, and we will pass that information, you know the people here are working on a strategic plan, we will share that information with the communications team and the translation team and make sure that they get with you to see about your concerns for those groups can be addressed.

Carole Cornell:

Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry and it's Marilyn Cade. When you said earlier that what we're seeing is a sliver of the work, I feel compelled to make the following statement.

The community is ICANN and if there are deeper materials that are not being shared with the full community they need to be prepared as an addendum and published. Thanks.

Larisa Gurnick: Noted, we were just doing some internal brainstorming and we did a SWAT analysis to tell you. And we have shared some of the SWAT analysis but that's where that direction came from for clarification. And just to clarify even further, what I really intended to say is that the PowerPoint presentation was just a very high level representation, the other document that's been attached was intentionally attached because it goes deeper and allows for more depth for those that have the time to read through the material. So certainly, that was the nature of my comment that the PowerPoint presentation is very level and doesn't include a lot of the detail.

Are there any other thoughts on the information that's been shared, any comments on the timeline the Working Group, any other feedback for us?

Alain Berranger: Actually this is going to be more to excuse myself for being late at this session. I wanted to attend completely; it was impossible – Alain Berranger from the NPOC constituency. And I do want to understand the strategic planning process better than I do right now, and I

wondering if you could give me a tip or two where I could catch up on the bigger picture to start with and share with my constituency colleagues if at all possible.

Larisa Gurnick:

Sure, first of all I want to make sure that you have the document and that is certainly a way to begin to understand the process that is where we are at this particular moment; in addition to that document there is the published 2012 through 2015 plan that will give you an idea of before we started the current process, what the plan looked like and then certainly myself and Carole we're available to answer any questions off line and give you any additional information, we'd be happy to do that.

Any other thoughts? Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade:

I was just wondering if we could confirm that those of us who came late, there is a number of us could have maybe 10 minutes of you time after this closes with Carole to catch us up on the first part that we missed if that would be okay?

Larisa Gurnick:

Absolutely, why don't we move right into that now and those that have heard it and would like to move on to other business that would be fine, and then we'll address any of your questions.

Marilyn Cade: That way were not – I feel really badly about coming in so late, but then others came in later so now I’m feeling like really good and they’re feeling bad.

Larisa Gurnick: We’re very happy you were here and we appreciate the participation.

Carole Cornell: What I’d like to say is we did not go through the two pillars in great detail, we decided that it was better to get the high level picture done, and so if you have been listening online or have come in since we started the program, we did not spend a lot of detailed time on the two pillars that we have.

We did put in the package the two pillars, and of course we would love any feedback you have and if there’s – you can certainly put that in with the timeline comments that are out public right now for public comment. So there’s other avenues to get that feedback. But if we spent a lot of time just focusing on those, we didn’t think we would accomplish the bigger picture. So we changed our agenda.

Well, thank you very much, this concludes the official portion of the session and we really appreciate your participation.

[End of Transcript]