

ICANN72 | Virtual Annual General Meeting – ccNSO: Strategic and Operational Planning Standing Committee  
Session ICANN72  
Tuesday, October 26, 2021 – 12:30 to 14:00 PDT

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Hi, everyone, and welcome to the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Standing Committee and the ICANN Org Planning Team session at ICANN72. My name is Kim. And along with Susie and Claudia, we will be your remote participation managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During the session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. I will read the questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session.

If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. And when called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly and at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note that this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcript, click on the closed caption button on the Zoom toolbar.

---

***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.***

And with that, I'll hand the floor over to Giovanni Seppia, chair of the SOPC.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Kim. Thanks a lot for the introduction. So we have an extremely interesting session ahead of us. This is a session that follows two sessions that took place in July with the ICANN Planning Team about the ICANN Prioritization Exercise which ICANN has started and is part of the ICANN Operating Plan.

Tonight we are going to focus on four elements of this prioritization framework. And also, we are going to have a presentation by Becky from the ICANN Planning Team, and Victoria. They will introduce us to the four design elements that are subject to discussion for today's workshop.

I'd like to invite everybody, especially the SOPC members, to be as proactive as they've been during the July sessions. There will be polls during the session to test the temperature of the room, and also facilitate the discussion and brainstorming on the four elements. And the ICANN Planning Team will take into account our input. And so during the polls and after the polls, we will have a discussion to understand if any of us has some experience in those areas and if we'd like to share these experiences and our expertise on the different subjects on the different four design elements with ICANN Planning.

So, Becky and the ICANN Planning Team will also explain the project next steps and the timeline. This light sector that they're going to go

through has been made available already on the webpage of this session together with a briefing document that I hope some of you have read and should serve as a sort of starting point for today's session.

That said, I'd like to leave the floor to Becky and Victoria for the introduction and overview. Again, please be ready to answer to the polls that will come up regularly during the presentation. Thank you so much, Becky, and it's really nice that you have the SOPC today involved in this exercise. I know very well how much you'd like to interact with all of us. We hope that we can provide valuable input for you and for also all the team and this exercise. Thank you so much.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much, Giovanni. I appreciate the invitation today. I'm here with my colleagues from the ICANN Org and ICANN Org Planning department. This is Becky Nash. We really appreciate this session. And as Giovanni indicated, we have a pretty full agenda, which includes polling and quite a lot of opportunities for discussion. So we're really looking forward to our session today. So I'm going to cover an introduction and overview to the Planning Prioritization Framework Project. So if I could have the next slide, please.

A project consists of elements that are part of the planning at ICANN, which is one of the 15 operating initiatives included in ICANN's Operating Plan for both FY21 and FY22. So a component of this operating initiative is to deliver a draft prioritization framework as an

improvement of ICANN's overall planning process. As we know, prioritization continues to be critical in supporting the needs and demands of ICANN's global community and the large volume and complexity of implementation work resulting from policy and community-led review work contributes to the need for ICANN to prioritize as part of the planning process.

So who's running this project? Well, it's in collaboration with the community, Board, and Org. And it is the ICANN Planning department that is leading this operating Initiative and the delivery of the draft prioritization framework. And the deliverable will be a draft prioritization framework to be used during the annual planning process. We'll speak a little bit more about that in the next couple of slides. So next slide, please.

We've presented an overview of the steps and timeline for ICANN's strategic and operational planning process. We just like to highlight that these are the key major steps for the typical annual process, which does result in over 18 months worth of work in collaboration with the community Org and Board. So what we're suggesting as part of this prioritization framework is actually to add a new step in the annual planning process in order to prioritize together.

So if we look at these major timeline bubbles on this slide, we see that we start each calendar year in the January-March timeframe with a key step that involves the community called the Strategic Outlook Trends Identification. Then we progress into the analysis of the current year trends along with the operating and financial planning.

So in the April and July timeframe, before the development in detail of the draft operating plans, we're suggesting a new step around the May and June timeframe where the community can participate with Board and Org on prioritizing all of the work that we have to do together to include in the draft operating plans. And the key step there would be a prioritization process that is efficient and streamlined that then provides to the Org as input direction on prioritization. The Org would receive this prioritization list of activities as input into the drafting of the operating plans and details. That, as you can see, takes place during the July through November. And then in the late November-December, the actual ICANN draft plans are published for public comment so that the community can comment on the activities that are in both the five-year operating plan and the one-year Operating Plan and Budget.

At the bottom of the slide here, after the draft plans are published for public comment, we move into the public comment period where we receive all of the comments from the community and staff prepares a staff report on public comments. And then we move into the February through May timeframe, which is where there are any revisions to be made to the plan, we propose those and then we move into the proposed for adoption steps with the ICANN Board Finance Committee and the ICANN Board, which for the last several years has taken place in the May timeframe. And after that, of course we have the Empowered Community period. So again, this Planning Prioritization Framework Project, we're suggesting a new step in the annual planning cycle, along with a very collaborative process

together and including the draft plans that are published for public comment. If we move to the next slide, please.

Our project overview. We've just highlighted where we are today, where at ICANN72 we launched this project with a public webinar at the end of FY21 or in April 2021. We've since then have been doing several consultations, such as this type of webinar, where we just discuss inputs into a framework. Again, this is in collaboration with the community. So during the June through October timeframe, we've been holding consultations to discuss the scope of work. And then for ICANN72, we've had during Prep Week a public webinar, and then again today we're very happy to be here as invited by the ccNSO SOPC for today's session.

Following ICANN72, our target is to publish a version one narrative or briefing paper outlining both the results of all of the consultation or input that we've received, along with a proposed process for a planning prioritization step as part of the annual planning process. We are going to publish that as a resource document, not within the actual draft operating plans for FY23 but just as a resource document since this is something that we plan to include as part of the operating planning process in future cycles.

The next key step in January and February 2022 or early next calendar year is we will be running a pilot, and the pilot is going to permit us together with the community to have a very hands-on validation of the process. Following the pilot, we will expect to hear more input and adjust the framework as needed based on any feedback we receive

from both the pilot and the proposed process. So then in the May-June 2022, we expect to be able to move into implementation at that time for the first year of a planning prioritization framework step in the annual operating plan. Next slide, please.

At this time, we're actually going to move into a discussion about the framework design elements. I will invite my colleague Victoria Yang to take the microphone. Thank you.

VICTORIA YANG:

Thank you very much, Becky. Hello, everyone. This is Victoria Yang speaking from ICANN Work Planning Team. As Becky introduced, the series of consultation we have to date with the community is to hear your feedback about the element that will make up the prioritization framework. This element will help to provide guidance of what to prioritize, when to prioritize, who will do the prioritization, and how will participants do it, etc. These elements are listed here on the slides as scope, frequency, participants, techniques, etc. So today we are going to cover four of the six elements. As Giovanni introduced earlier, for each element, the team will present the most relevant options for each element. And then we will pause and have discussions and feedbacks from all of you. And with that, can we move into the first element scope on the next slides?

So when it comes to prioritization, the very first question everyone asks is "What are we prioritizing?" And for the purpose of the initial draft framework, we are suggesting focus on all the Board-approved

implementation work. And this covers a broad range, including implementation of review recommendations, implementation of PDP, implementation of advice and CCWG recommendations. We are also recommending to include projects that are large scale and cross-functional in nature, such as ITI and the NSP for Compliance and contracted parties.

One thing we want to point out, as we did get some confusion and discussions in the past consultation, is the examples given on this slide is really just for illustration purpose. We are trying to focus on getting and hear your feedback on the type of work rather than the details of the work under each type. For instance, are we talking about only the EPDP 2 versus the rest of the other PDPs? The answer is no. We are just giving an example here. But the implementation of policies will be one type that we are suggesting to be included in the draft framework.

The main objective is to hear feedback and exchange ideas in this session. So with that, we do want to open up the floor with, first of all, let's participate in the poll questions just to understand where everyone's stand by on the proposed scope. So, Kim, if we can post the questions.

So as Giovanni earlier introduced, the purpose of the poll is really to get a temperature check of the room to understand where in general the community stand by with the proposal scope. And with that, we can open up for discussion. Okay. I will pass the floor to Giovanni.



**GIOVANNI SEPPIA:** Thank you. Thank you so much, Victoria. So we can see a clear yes for the support of the scope of the activities that you just went through in the slide. As you rightfully said, Victoria, it's a sort of non-exhaustive list of elements to be prioritized. So that is a list of examples. Before I start the discussion on this point, I'd like to remember all attendees of today's session that they can ask questions on the chat. And we have three nice staff members—Claudia, Kim, and Susie—who are going to read out the questions that may come up in the chat.

So that said, let's start the discussion on this element. Also, if there is anything during the presentation that Becky and Victoria, they have given so far, if there is any element that you'd like to have further clarified, please feel free to speak up and intervene. I'll be happy to give you the floor. So you can raise your hand in the chat and also speak up freely. This is really up to you. I understand that it's brand new exercise. I see already David from Verisign with hand up. So, David, please. That's really an icebreaker. Thank you. Please take the floor.

**DAVID MCAULEY:** Thank you, Giovanni. Sorry, I was a little bit late. Thank you, Becky and Victoria. So I have a question, Becky and Victoria. Maybe it's a two-part question. The first part is where would government engagement get in on these in the scope if it does? I attended a meeting between the Board—and I think it was the CSG yesterday—where government

engagement was quite a topic. As an example—I was trying to give an example—let’s say ICANN asks questions of European DPAs or counsel or whatever, European Commission, and they get an answer back that causes a discrete work project, where would that fit in? Would it be within the scope?

The second question I have is more tactical. Victoria uses the term illustrative examples. When will you be asking or when will you be filling out what the scope will be for the pilot? Will we have an opportunity to sort of suggest topics that would fit in the scope in the pilot? Thanks very much. Thanks for your presentation.

VICTORIA YANG:

Thank you, David. These are two very good questions. I will attempt to answer, and my team here are welcome to complete my answer as needed. So the first question is about government engagement. So in the operating plan, for great level of transparency, we actually have 33 functional activities in the operating plan where we describe each function’s primary purpose and the activities that they conduct. So government engagement is part of the ongoing operation. At least for now, for the initial draft of prioritization, it’s not included in the scope to be prioritized, as we know that there are a lot of activities that we all do—community, Org, and Board. Again, because this is new and this is a new step that we are introducing for the draft and for the initial pilots, we are suggesting only Board-approved implementation work which are listed here. Will ongoing operation be prioritized in the future? It might be. As we evolve, as we become more agile and



mature in doing this exercise in the future, ongoing operation can be considered as candidates to be prioritized. I hope that answered your question. My team are welcome to add on.

For the second question on the pilot, that's a good question, too. So we are going to run a pilot in January and February just to validate whether or not all the feedback and the framework that we'll put together by end of the year works, and how can we improve further so that we can officially implement that prioritization framework in May and June timeline when it come to Fiscal Year '24 planning process. So for the pilot, we are going to take us a portion of what you see here under implementation project. We covered four. There's implementation on PDPs and review recommendations CCWG and advice. As you know that in Fiscal Year '22, about a Cross-Community Working Group on Work Stream 2 recommendations is already being prioritized and it will continue to be prioritized in Fiscal Year '23. So for the pilot purpose, we will be using the implementation on review recommendations. As you know that we just finished one round or one cycle of reviews, there is a backlog of recommendations needs to be implemented. So we think it's a good reason and good timing to take review recommendations as pilot for us to validate the framework. I see that my colleague Becky's hand is up. Feel free to please jump in. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you. I will just quickly make a comment on that before, of course, Irina has her hand up. We did note on this particular slide that

our ongoing Org operations are not expected to be prioritized during this step in the planning process. Again, ongoing Org operations, what we call in our operating plan are actually functional activities. And they're really split into these five service groups in our operating plan of which some of them are support services like our accounting department, our global human resources, etc. The purpose of the prioritization framework is really to focus on large projects. And currently in scope are many of the work that is Board-approved already and ready for implementation. So we just wanted to highlight that. We do not anticipate that a prioritization step would be needed for ongoing Org operations or smaller projects that are within the functional teams. And those items are really what we encourage community members to provide public comments on during the publication for public comment of the draft operating plans and budgets. That's normally where we would see comments as it relates to functional activities like accounting, like global human resources and/or GE or government engagement and other types of functional activities. So thank you very much.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you. Thank you, Becky. I'm going to give the floor to you Irina. I'd like to also to invite ICANN Planning to be a bit shorter in the responses. I know it's first attempt. So thanks a lot, Irina, the floor is yours.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Giovanni. I just wonder whether these multiple recommendations when they come from a review team or either from working group, if they are in some way already prioritized. Or if not, is that theoretically possible? I understand that there are a lot of elements that influence prioritizations, including availability of resources, etc., but at least in terms of importance, among like 15 recommendations coming from the review team, is it realistic to have understanding that this is most important and this is less important? And would this help the process itself?

VICTORIA YANG: Thank you, Irina. This is a very good question. And the short answer is definitely it will help. As we move into some other elements such as techniques, we might touch up on that. So that comes to the question of how do we do prioritization? What are the criterias and techniques that we use? So for instance, some of the elements that we have been thinking about is the prioritization ranked by the review team. Of course, that is helpful. As we know that as part of the review improvement, the review team are asked to assign prioritization for the recommendations. So that's definitely a very valuable and helpful input for us when we consider putting all the review together to this overarching prioritization.

Another element that we have been discussing is the aging of the recommendations. Take CCT versus SSR as example that some recommendation that is waiting for implementation approved before the most recent one. So, should timing an aging be considered as one

criteria? Definitely. So, those are all criteria that we have been thinking and discussing, which will be covered later on in the other elements.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you so much, Victoria. Again, thank you, Irina. Very good question. One last rounder for especially SOPC members, if there is any SOPC member who may like to add anything, which means if you have any expertise, if you also agree on the fact that implementation projects should be the focus area for this exercise at least in the beginning, please take the floor. Anybody else from the SOPC may share his view before we wrap up this part relating to the scope of the project? Anybody? No? All lazy or sleepy or too early? Okay. I think that the takeaway is that there is a sort of agreement. And I've seen in the chat, there was a discussion between David of Verisign and Xavier about the possibility in the future to include other areas. So that said, if there is nobody from the SOPC who likes to take the floor at this stage, let's move to the frequency. Thank you.

VICTORIA YANG:

All right, perfect. Great. So the next element is frequency. The key question here is when should we conduct the prioritization exercise? As of now, since the scale of prioritization is new, meaning, we are doing a prioritization across the ecosystem and we are proposing this to be an embedded step within the annual planning process, as Becky covered earlier using the overarching annual planning overview. So we are suggesting to conduct this exercise once a year for now for the

draft framework, and that will be during the May-June timeline before ICANN Org developed the draft Operating Plan and Budget.

So the advantage and the good thing out of this proposed frequency is that the community has the opportunity to, one, participate in the prioritization which the result of it will be in the draft plan. And then, two, participate at the end during the public comment process of the draft plan. We think this is reasonable, especially to kick us off start. We are proposing this to be once a year for now.

With that, similar to the scope element, we want to hear your feedback. Let's run a poll. And then with that, we can open up the floor. Thank you, Kim. Okay, Giovanni, we have the poll results, the floor is yours. Thanks.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Victoria. Thanks to those who have participated in the poll. Again, the majority is in favor of this prioritization exercise to take place once a year as part of the annual planning process. Becky, at the very beginning has shown where this will fit in the planning agenda. We also understand because we had several talks in preparation of today's workshop that it's going to be already challenging to accommodate this exercise once a year. Therefore, we all agree that once a year is the preferred choice both for the community and for ICANN Org.

At the same time, I'd like to understand if there is anybody—if you can, Kim, please put back the outcome of the poll, if that's possible.

Because I understand there was a majority of yes, but there were also some no. I like to understand those who have said no, if you have any specific view why you believe that it should be more than once a year, the frequency of the prioritization exercise. Anybody who has said no or has no opinion, if you like to share your doubts or, again, if you'd like to share your concern why should it be more than once a year, please speak up. Unless you press no because it was a mistake, which I hope it was not the case. Anybody who likes to speak up? Those who have expressed the no or no opinion, is there anything we can do to help you understand the frequency aspect? Okay. It looks like those who have said no, they might be shy tonight or today. I have Xavier. Please, the floor is yours.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. Very quickly, in addition to that annual frequency, which I think makes sense to a lot of people, I think the question is should it happen more often in—could there be circumstances that after the annual phase of prioritization has occurred in the annual plan, would there be circumstances, new events that happen that maybe were potentially anticipated but not really known or simply not known that could influence what the priorities are or new information pertaining to some things that were maybe prioritized but, for some reason, now should be put on hold because the factor, external, for example, would have affected the ability to progress on that one topic that had been prioritized, and therefore it cannot be a priority anymore, and therefore there could be a change.



I can imagine a lot of different events that could affect any one of the projects that would have been the subject of prioritization and vice versa, you could have a project deprioritized as per the analysis that is affected by events that shouldn't make it then a bigger priority. A year is both short and long. A lot can happen over a year. How do we take into account events that then change or should change potentially the order of priority? I think that's the big question that is not necessarily addressed with an annual frequency only. I'll leave it as a question at the moment.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Xavier. Can I ask you as you brought it up, if you believe that ICANN Planning would be able to accommodate more than one consultation if there is a change or a major change in the scenario in the landscape in which ICANN is operating? Do you think there is going to be the chance to accommodate more than one consultation? Anybody from ICANN Planning? I'm asking if there is going to be a major change in the landscape. This is something that Xavier was referring to. Do you think that currently there is a preference for this prioritization exercise to run once? But if there is a big change in the landscape where ICANN is operating, do you think that there will be the possibility to accommodate a second prioritization consultation, a second prioritization exercise during the planning process?

BECKY NASH:

Giovanni, this is Becky Nash. Just to highlight, once a planning prioritization framework is in place, we do see opportunities to leverage the mechanisms or the process that does get set up. But we do want to highlight what intervals in steady state, we don't know yet what would make sense on a scheduled basis. There was discussion of should it be twice a year, which would give a more up to date or help us work ahead. I think for the standardized process, that will be determined with collaboration from the community members as to how easy it is to actually facilitate and work together definitely once a year. So should there be a major change in the priorities for ICANN, for instance, that's something that comes out of the planning process for the strategic outlook trends as well where it is considered by the Board should the strategic plan change and thus have changes in the operating plan. So we do see other mechanisms and I think that we can keep an open mind on what would make sense to do what we would call as a forecast and a forecasting process. So that is definitely something that we would contemplate. But I think first, from our standpoint, we want to look at getting this mechanism and a working process in place. And then from there, we can analyze and hopefully leverage throughout many of our activities even up front before there's work that gets done or planned for, which is all part of planning. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you. I see Victoria.

VICTORIA YANG:

I was just going to say basically what Becky mentioned, because it sounds like the major change can be a trend. Don't forget the prioritization we are suggesting here is embedded step in the overarching planning process, which started with the strategic outlook exercise. A major change can be a trend, which then we'll go through the motion of impact assessment and as a result, if it's such a priority, it might result in a decision that triggers activities in operating plan as a result can be prioritized. There are other mechanisms in the overarching planning process that keep us balanced and checked on all aspects. Prioritization is not the only opportunity for us to do this type of exercise.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you so much, Victoria. Thank you also to Xavier, who has made a very nice comment in the chat. Any SOPC member would like to add anything on the frequency? Any experience you may have within your ccTLD about the frequency of similar exercise that you may have conducted again within your ccTLD? Okay. No?

I can tell you that EURid.eu perspective, we do run the prioritization exercise at management level once a year. So once a year we have made a priority list for certain kinds of projects that we would like to move forward. Again, this is happening once a year and it usually happens before the preparation of the budget for the following year. So that helps the budget process and the strategic planning. This is the experience that we have at EURid.

Okay. I would suggest we move to—since there is no other SOPC member or no other attendee who likes to take the floor and express any specific view or ask Becky and the Planning Team to clarify any element of this section, let's move to the next one, which is about participants who should be involved in the process. Thank you, Becky. And thank you, Victoria.

VICTORIA YANG:

Great. Thank you. So the next element participants, as Giovanni basically highlighted, the key question is who will do the prioritization and be involved in the process? On this slide, we first want to share that the high level roles and responsibilities of the participants, for sure, Org, Community, and Board, all play a role in this process. In any case, at a high level, as we indicated on the slides that ICANN Planning Team will be facilitating the prioritization workshops with participants joining May and June timeline as the proposed frequency. Then the participants will be using the tools and techniques which we'll cover in the next element to be determined as part of the framework to conduct this prioritization exercise and provide recommendations of what to prioritize for the next planning cycle. Then ICANN Planning Team will share the results of the prioritization consultation. And also the results will be incorporated into the draft Operating Plan and Budget for further input by the community during the public comment process.

So now, considering the structure of the participation, we have three options here for the community to discuss. The first one is

consultation with AC and SO, followed by community webinars. This approach is very similar to the strategic outlook program that we carry out annually, where ICANN Org Planning Team will hold several sessions with different AC and SO using the same approach and the framework to collect trends. And then from there, we conduct the analysis, impact assessment, etc.

For instance, this first structure proposed here will be Planning Team during May and June timeline have different consultation workshops with AC and SO. Then joining the workshop, we'll be using the techniques and the scope that determined to conduct the exercise and drive results from there. Then we'll consolidate the consultations and feedbacks from AC and SO and share it with the community. That's one option.

Then the second option will be to form a group that has representatives from different AC and SO. And then this group will be tasked to do the prioritization each year based on the other elements of the framework that is proposed. This can be very similar to the ATRT3, one of the recommendations from ATR3 regarding prioritization.

Then the last one will be just have two public comments during the annual planning process. Whereas the first public comment, we'll be focusing on prioritization, and from the public comments, we derive the result of what to be prioritized. Then we go and develop the draft plan and put out another public comment for the draft plan. That's the third approach.

We want to hear from the community. Which structure of participants do you think that makes sense or is feasible to carry out? Thank you very much, Kim, for having the poll. This is a single choice question. With that, we can open up the floor. Thank you. All right, Giovanni, the floor is yours. We have the poll result now.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Victoria. You have presented the three options for the structure of participation. We may also like to hear if there is any member of the SOPC or any attendee who may have a different view on another option for structure of participation, which we may have not thought about but could be fourth or even fifth option for the structure of participation.

At present, we can see that the majority is in favor of having consultations by SO/ACs, and then community public webinars, followed by the forming of a group committee as a formalized structure with, I guess, different representatives from the different constituencies. Again, this is quite important because at some point, there will be no different views, and therefore, part of conflict in what those who are supposed to participate in this exercise, they may express, again, different views. So it's really relevant to understand and to have agreement on the kind of participation that we will envision for this exercise.

I see there is a comment of Becky in the chat. This is something that indeed we have spoken about. As a matter of fact, a separate public

comment as Becky is writing in the chat would result in additional time in the annual planning process. So it's really an extra layer. So please speak up. It would be interesting to listen and know your view. I see David and then Pierre. David, the floor is yours.

DAVID MCAULEY:

Thank you, Giovanni. I think I had the same question that Becky posted about: what is the impact of this on time? Assume that you do go with number one because, at least in this group, there's more support for that consultations with SOs and ACs. So my question Becky, would be how do you envision that? Consultation with the leadership of SOs and ACs where they have to do their own background work and get it done somehow and you only consult with them, or do you see it as a wide open consultation with not just leadership but all members of SOs and ACs? I recall that the effort from the community was two months long. Do you believe that this will work in that timeframe, if I've got it correct? Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Giovanni, may I respond?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Please. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you. Thank you very much for your question. A couple of points is that actually part of our project is to solicit input and feedback on how to design this process. So the questions that you're posing are very valid as it relates to the participation of consultation. We have heard a few types of input just from other sessions, including the two that we've held with the ccNSO SOPC. So one of them is we do have a principle similar to much of ICANN's work and the multistakeholder model where we really want to keep this process very open and transparent. So consultations with SOs and ACs, followed by community public webinars for the inclusiveness and global representation. But your point of, "What does that mean—is it just consulting with the leadership or chairs?" we do see that in most cases, the SOs and ACs will ask for interested parties or volunteers to participate in a process. That is also an option that we've heard. But we would like to hear from community members like yourselves as to what type of consultation with the SOs and ACs, how would it be described as just membership or something that is consensus driven within the SO and AC. That's where number one and number two are a little bit different, where participation in a formalized structure, which is also something that we did here in the ATRT3 Recommendation 5, where the question there also was there's been some discussion and input about is it at the leadership level and the whole membership level, or is someone working in their capacity after they've been offered as the interested party to work on it? Then as we put in the chat, we have heard potentially some hybrid or maybe using number two or number one, along with number three. So this is open for



discussion and we value your feedback. Sorry for the lengthy answer. I'll be quiet now.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Becky. Barbara, you're next.

BARBARA POVSE: Sorry. I think Pierre was first but since I started—

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: I'm the chair. Then yes, I decided ladies first.

BARBARA POVSE: Thanks. Maybe I just wanted to clear because I voted for the second option, and this is obviously the least preferred. Why I do that? I thought that this second option would make these opinions convert faster. Why? Because I think that second option means that we would need to make our decision in AC and SOs before. And then in the group, that would actually make the final decision, there will be a participant from each AC and SO which has the most of the knowledge and expertise and would already have all the input from their community. That's why I thought that while I preferred this option towards the one that all the SO and ACs give their opinion and then you need to somehow combine this. Because this smaller group would need to make a final decision, and I find it better for the whole

community. I just wanted to explain why I voted differently. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks a lot, Barbara. I'm now giving the floor to Pierre. Pierre, as a friend gentleman, I know that you have understood why I give the floor to Barbara. So Pierre, the floor is yours. Thank you.

PIERRE BONIS: I was just afraid that Barbara said everything I wanted to say. By the way, I voted for the first option. A very simple question, is there a recommendation by the SOPC? Because in that kind of matters, some people are working much more than me and others on these questions. And I would have liked to have an opinion from you, Giovanni, or from members of the SOPC before being asked to answer that. I answered first, because it seems normal that the SO and ACs are the first to be asked in the way ICANN works. But maybe you have good reason to say that this is the second or third option that is better and your advice is expected on that.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Pierre. I think that this is quite a tricky poll. I would like at the end of this discussion to open it again to see if there's been a change. Currently, we have 71% for option number one and 29% for option number two. But after we have brainstormed about those elements, we may have a different outcome at the end.

What's my opinion? My opinion is that this is going to be quite challenging for ICANN Planning when it comes to participation to have something that makes all the constituencies, all the participants happy. It's really important also to understand up front that each constituency, each participant may come with a different view on what priorities are, and therefore, at some point might be difficult to find an agreement, but rather to have a compromise in terms of the outcome of any possible participation in this exercise.

Again, my overall opinion on the prioritization exercise is that it's a laudable effort by ICANN Planning Team. At the same time, there will be more challenge to accommodate the needs and expectations of all the parties and the views of all the parties participating in the exercise. It's a big challenge overall. So, independently from the four elements that we are addressing in today's workshop. That's my personal view.

That said, I see Xavier's hand up. Xavier, please.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Thank you. A couple of comments. Weighing in on the participants is obviously requiring also to understand and to be able to design what the role of these participants would be and what is the authority that they have, whether it's an entire SO or it's a set of representatives from that. So imagine number two here that the group, the formalized structure, let's assume that there is a defined number of participants by SO and AC, what is the authority that these individuals that represent an SO or AC have in the group? And what authority do they

get from their original organization? If, let's say, Giovanni and Pierre are delegated by the ccNSO to participate to this group, what mandate does the ccNSO give to Giovanni and Pierre to decide during their participation in the cross-community groups? That's a challenging question. And as we collect input, what we will probably need to do is offer scenarios of both types of participation, mode of participation in the sense of a meeting or a session, etc. And also what roles would be granted to those who participate as a combination of something that can potentially make sense and be reacted upon.

I think we also need to keep in mind that the output of the prioritization phase that we're talking about is not ICANN is going to do this and this and that, and in that order, in that timing. What the output is going to be, the prioritized list of project, which is the same list of project that the group started with, but instead they will be presented from top to bottom in the order of priority that the community has determined should be. It is not to say, "You're going to do these three things and those five things. You're going to do this first and you're going to do that next and you're going to do this that way." It is not the plan that we're asking the community to define. It's simply to say, "We think this is more important and this is less important." Then it becomes an input to Org to decide what the operating plan that Org can propose should be using that order of priority. And it's really important because at the end of the day, how can the community keep Org and the Board accountable for what ICANN does if the Community is actually the party who decides what happens? Because if that's the case and someone then after the fact said, "Org,

why did you do this?” “Well, not my problem. It’s the community who decided.” That cannot work. The community can only provide input, the Org takes the responsibility and the Board is accountable for the decisions that are being made.

Last comment, some groups suggested that all three elements or structure of participation should be happening, that there should be a consultation of the SOs and ACs that maybe happens after a group, as proven number two, has worked together, discussed together, and proposed to the SOs and ACs an order of priority for their review and, third, that a public comment for the entire community for the public to be able to comment on would be happening. So all three would be happening. I just want to offer that idea, not because I’m saying that’s what needs to happen. But you can see that these three different approaches can be complementary. I’ll stop here. I see Roelof’s hand up.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Xavier. And indeed we have Roelof’s hand up. Roelof, I hope you’re not driving. You reached your destination. Is it correct?

ROELOF MEIJER: That’s not correct, Giovanni. So let me first check, can you hear me?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: We can.

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay. I'm a bit confused by Xavier's intervention because I assumed that the output of this process to be a recommendation on the secrets to priorities of projects that were already identified and that the Board will take a decision. Maybe I should stop here first. Is that correct? The output of the prioritization process is a recommendation to the Board, the Board will ultimately take a decision or the Org will.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Giovanni, can I jump in quickly?

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Please.

ROELOF MEIJER: Very quickly. It's just yes or no?

XAVIER CALVEZ: No.

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Roelof, second question.

ROELOF MEIJER: So my second question is, well, my confusion is related to Xavier's remark considering the mandate of the structure that is mentioned under option two. I don't think that that is a question that is unique to option two. I think it's applicable to option one as well. If this process should come up with a decision on prioritization, then also in the first option, somehow we have to make sure that the SOs and ACs are represented in one way or another with a mandate on behalf of their own constituency. Otherwise, it won't work. I have to say that I put my answer was option one. And after Barbara's intervention, I thought, well, this is option one is going to be too complex, too time-consuming. It's better to have an internal process in every SO and AC first and have a form or structure where each of them is represented, and then they will do the final step. It's probably more effective, and it probably has the highest chance of usable or workable outcome. I'll stop here. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Roelof. Please keep driving safely. I don't know if, very quickly, Xavier or Becky would like to say anything.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Quickly. I agree with Roelof's that probably both the first and the second option require that we are very clear in determining what is the role that whether a representative for the entire structure organization has in what is the authority that is given to that input. But

I think it really is maybe one question above that. What I mean by that is we can look at it, I guess, in two different ways to simplify it. Either this phase produces the input to the Org—and hopefully I’m re clarifying for Roelof his question. The way we’re thinking about this at the moment, but this is why we’re talking, is that the community exercise of prioritization would become an input to the Org into the planning process, not a recommendation to the Board yet. Why? Because a list of priorities is not a plan. The Board can only approve a plan. The Board is not going to make a decision on saying, “Okay, thank you. You’re giving me this list of priorities, but what am I, me, Board, going to do with it?” because the only organization who can say what will effectively happen is the Org, because the Org is the one who manages the resources and who receives the workload. So that’s why the input of the prioritization is currently designed or we’re thinking to design it so that it is an input collected by Org at the time of developing the plans. If you think about it this way, we’re trying to place this phase of prioritization in the June-July timeframe. Once completed an order of priority, Org takes that as input to say, “Okay, now we know what the community priorities are. We’re going to try to incorporate as much as we can of those projects being prioritized into the operating plan.” We close the loop then by drafting the operating plan, and then submitting it for public comment to say, “You told us this was important. We took everything we could from that list, put it in the plan, and here is the plan that comes back with it.” Community provides input through public comment on everything in the plan, including what of the priorities have been reflected and how, and then



the Board makes a decision at the end after that step to be able to say, “Based on the community input, we adopt or not the plan.” And of course, then there’s the Empowered Community afterwards that can reject the plan or not. So that’s the current “thinking” of the process instead.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Okay. Thank you so much, Xavier. I wonder what would happen if you don’t say quickly. So that said, I see no other hands up. But at the same time, I like to ask Kim to rerun this poll to see if there’s been any change in the minds of the attendees. Let’s see. So before it was 71% for number one and 29% for number two. Now we have number two catching up with 47% against 53% for option number one. Nobody likes a separate public comment. That’s a clear indication, a clear takeaway.

That said, I’d like to move very immediately to the last element under discussion, which is about the techniques, because that is also one of the most complex elements of tonight’s discussion. So, Victoria, thank you.

VICTORIA YANG:

Thank you, Giovanni. I’m actually going to pass this back to Becky. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much, Giovanni. Yes, I'm going to cover the remaining slides at this time. Again, this is Becky Nash from the ICANN Org Planning department. So the last design element that we have for discussion today is the techniques. So part of the process for prioritization is that we are suggesting the use of prioritization techniques which help with collaborative decision-making.

So on this slide, we're providing the fact that the Planning department researched 11 different prioritization techniques. But during our research, we considered that there were four techniques that really were recommended as potential prioritization techniques. We do want to highlight that similar to all of the other design elements of this prioritization framework, we could also anticipate that perhaps a hybrid or using a combination of techniques could be considered.

So Org evaluated the four first ones listed there with the check mark, given the fact that they appeared to fit best for a multistakeholder model and a public benefit nonprofit. And we evaluated these in the terms of general pros and cons and determining if they seem to be applicable to ICANN's context or operating environment.

So if we go to the next slide, we have a summary here of the pros and cons of the four techniques that were highlighted on the first slide. So the first one is the hierarchy of purpose and a short description of it is that this particular technique examines the purpose, priorities, projects, people, and performance—so it's all Ps—and it clarifies what's most important in providing clear direction to inform decision-making, especially when there are multiple priorities.

---

So why did Org indicate that it could suit ICANN's multistakeholder model? It's just that this technique that is in our research in its original form and language appears to be appropriate for a mission driven organization such as ICANN.

So the pros are that using a technique like this could create a clear hierarchy when embedded across the ecosystem can provide consistent and clear guidance for all decision-making on what to prioritize.

So the con is that it emphasizes top-down decision-making. So again, this particular technique that we researched that's available is emphasizing that prioritization may take place at a higher level such as a management team or a CEO of an organization.

So, the next one that we researched was transparent choice project prioritization. This one has a more in-depth approach based on stakeholder approved criteria and weighting. So it does appear to suit ICANN as a mission driven organization and it could be used in combination with other techniques. And again, that's a key that we want to keep stressing is that techniques are ways to facilitate decision-making and they can be directional.

So this is the pro for transparent choice project prioritization is that it's a comprehensive technique or model, transparent and systematic approach to prioritization. It does require criteria and weighting be set up. So that does have to be agreed upon and that means collaborative

---

participation to have a scale or an agreed upon weighting set of criterias.

So this technique, the one con or against it maybe that it's overly complex and time-consuming to work through and agree upon criteria with stakeholders, assign weighting, and seek stakeholder input and approval on all of the setup. Some feedback that we've received is definitely to keep the prioritization techniques that are one element in the process to keep that very simple and swift. Not to be overly complicated because the point is to have the dialogue and come together to prioritize.

Another technique that we researched is Team Gantt. It's a simple five-step process based on assessing business impact, which again, that language is from the original technique that's available online. It could be changed to organizational impact, importance, urgency, and bandwidth.

So, some features of this particular technique may be useful to consider as a hybrid for a framework for prioritization, and the reason is that bandwidth—a pro is that this is simple, easy to follow based on urgency and importance, again to be defined as a value, but it does consider bandwidth constraints, which at the time in the planning process that we are prioritizing, we may not know all of the impact of bandwidth and constraints at that point, because that is really what is evaluated in the development of detailed plans that then have resources and constraints analyzed, which would be later in the planning process.

So a con for this particular one is that the criteria may be unclear, meaning, what is urgent to one group or important to another group. Again, we have to use this in a directional manner and it could be criticized for having too much room for interpretation and subjectivity.

The last highlighted technique that we have listed here is the risk cost value effort. So this is a matrix approach which is best used when an organization needs to prioritize a series of issues and decide on which ones that really help achieve the strategic and operational goals. So it does have a slightly different context. But this is one technique that has highlighted that the outcome of the process of using a decision-making technique should be just used as a guideline and not a definitive answer. So that's a key description of this particular type of tool.

So why it may suit ICANN is that the four criteria of this risk cost value effort may be a bit limiting criteria such as relevance to the mission and values or dependency. It does have criteria that we would need to tailor. And again, our view would be that we would develop a technique and make it work for the ICANN model.

A pro is that it's simple, easy to understand, it does call for collective stakeholder clarification and articulation for definitions. And it is stated to be stakeholder-centric.

A con, just quickly, would be that it doesn't allow for additional criteria beyond this matrix. It does assume the stakeholder consensus on the ranking and placement of projects against these criteria and

does not provide guidance on how to address conflicting rankings as well.

So this is a short summary of four possible or potential techniques. I hope this has been helpful. So I think at this time, if we move to the next slide, we again are suggesting that there would be a poll. I don't know if—oh, the poll is already up. So we would just ask that everybody take part in this poll.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Okay. Thank you, Becky. Again, that was probably the most challenging part with all these techniques. And thanks a lot for having investigated so many techniques and having presented the four best techniques. So the outcome of the poll is quite clear. So there is an agreement on the recommendation of using a set of prioritization techniques as they are presented. So the majority is in favor of this approach.

Before I open the floor for discussion, there is also a very interesting comment made at some point in the chat by Irina. It's a comment relating to the fact that probably at the time there's going to be a pilot of this exercise. We will be able to have a better understanding of what works and what doesn't. And so, indeed, I believe that the pilot would be a very important milestone in this exercise.

There was also a question from Jordan in the chat. I don't know if, Jordan, you would like to have it read or if you'd like to speak up? Yes, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER: Thank you. If I could just briefly speak. I think Xavier has just answered in the chat. But the question was, are we talking about a process that will only affect 5% of ICANN's work or 20%? Just trying to get a sense of the magnitude here.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Jordan. Anybody from ICANN Planning who would like to respond to Jordan's question?

BART BOSWINKEL: Xavier has his hand up, Giovanni.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Okay. Thank you. Xavier, I couldn't see it. Thank you. Xavier, please.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. I put a comment in the chat for Jordan's question before he spoke up. That is important. I think it's really difficult to answer that question because each project may require different resources. But if I use a different approach that Göran and I have been talking about for the past five years, a lot of the organization's work is ongoing. I know the pandemic is a bit special, but organizing meeting is an ongoing activity. It's not suggested to be prioritized here. Issuing payroll is another one, etc., etc. So if you look at it, the IANA functions are not subject to project prioritization or competition inputs on the

resources. So, my views and Göran has used that as a concept. Often in the past, it's probably 80 to 90% of the organization's resources are ongoing. Now, David was asking the question earlier—sorry, therefore, maybe 10 to 20% of the resources or the organization are the subject of this exercise of prioritization because that's the maybe reasonable, very high level and a rough evaluation of the implementation work bandwidth that the organization puts you're in, you're out on the implementation type of work. So it is to Jordan's point, a small fraction of the Org's resources that small one. Everything is relative. That is, which bandwidth can be used for different aspects or different projects that are those being prioritized or deprioritized? I hope that's helpful. But I know it's a challenging question to answer.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thanks a lot, Xavier. Going back to the techniques. Is there anybody from the SOPC who likes to take the floor and eventually share the experience you may have with any of the techniques, if you have heard about those techniques, and if you have tested any of those techniques? Anybody? No technique oriented in the SOPC? It doesn't seem to be the case.

So again, I think that the four techniques are, again, of quite importance for us because, again, one or a set of them will be used in this prioritization exercise. The session is drawing soon to close. We have a few minutes left. Again, I'm having just one more question to the SOPC members. If there's anybody would like to take the floor and ask any question on the techniques or any other point that we have



discussed so far, please raise your hand now. Nobody? The SOPC has become extremely shy. So we have to—okay, Irina, thank you so much. Irina, please, the floor is yours.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you, Giovanni. My point is just, at this moment, all this process looks like a very complicated and time-consuming one. Please try to make it as simple as possible. Because from what I see, I can hardly imagine how I really will be able to go through that without spending enormous amount of time. And this is probably my biggest concern. Thank you.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you, Irina. I see Xavier.

XAVIER CALVEZ:

Irina, you're pointing out to one of the few principles that we spelled out for this needs to be met, which is simplicity and efficiency. And so among the principles that we've listed, we said it needs to be simple so that the largest possible group of the community can participate and obviously understand the outcome. So simplicity is absolutely needed. Efficiency is probably combined with simplicity. If we had something simple, it's probably a little bit easier to use as well. Because we need to be efficient. We need to not spend another 15 months in prioritizing. Otherwise, it's never going to be working. This is why we've given ourselves a little bit of a constraint for saying

prioritization needs to happen within two months. There's not a lot that can happen within two months. Certainly not a public comment, 10 webinars, 15 consultations of SOs and ACs, etc. So we're going to need to find something that is simple, clear, and distinct, "quick" and fits within that timeframe so that we can use it efficiently. It's not going to be easy, obviously, to your point. But we're very conscious of the points that you're making. This is simply putting the bar really high in trying to find the solution that combines all those features of simplicity, effectiveness, and a short timeframe. But we agree with you that that's what needs to be done.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thank you, Xavier. Irina?

IRINA DANELIA: I'm really happy to hear that. And I understand that it's extremely challenging task for you. Thank you for that.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA: Thanks, a lot, Irina. And again, thanks for bringing up this point, which the SOPC has lighted during several comments on ICANN strategic and operating plan exercises. Xavier, do you have your hand up? It is all done? Okay, all done.

That said, I'm going to give the floor back to Becky for wrapping up and speaking about the next steps. Please, Becky, the floor is yours.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you very much, Giovanni. If we could go to the next slide, I will just quickly highlight the overall timeline. Next slide, please.

For this project, we've been consulting and—sorry, one slide prior. Just to highlight that the overall timeline is that a proposed draft framework as a resource document will be published early December, along with all of the input that we've received.

The next key step is a hands-on pilot. Again, our original design elements as listed earlier in this presentation and in a separate presentation presented at Prep Week by ICANN Org Planning has more discussion about the pilot, also about systems and tools. And we would like to highlight that this is an iterative process where feedback will be welcomed and received all throughout the process. We do want to hear feedback for collaboration and making this an efficient and process that's effective for all ICANN ecosystem.

And then the final point is that we will move into a list of prioritized activities from the pilot. And we'll have lessons learned in the March timeframe, and then also move into the first implementation in the FY24 planning cycle in the May and June. With that, I'll just turn it back to Giovanni. So thank you very much.

GIOVANNI SEPPIA:

Thank you so much, Becky. And thank you also to all your team, the ICANN Planning Team, Victoria, Xavier, and all the others who have

---

made this session possible today. It was extremely interesting and it was extremely interesting to know a bit more and to participate in the discussion about four elements of the ICANN prioritization project. So we will continue to stay in touch and contribute. I think that what I've heard, there were really good comments that we provided. Not the last one, but also all the comments that were provided since the beginning. There are going to be more chances, as you have highlighted, to contribute. But an important element that I've seen now in the chat is that together we will make it, and we'll make sure that it's going to be a simple and accessible project to involve as many of us as possible.

So thanks, everybody. Thanks for the great session. Thanks again to the Secretariat, to Bart, Kim. I had written somewhere the other names which are Claudia, Kim, Susie, and Joke for facilitating the meeting. And all ICANN staff, thanks a lot. We, SOPC, remain available to provide further input at any time. So thanks a lot. Have a nice day. Good night. Bye-bye.

KIMBERLY CARLSON: Thank you, everyone. Bye-bye.

STEPHEN DEERHAKE: Bye all. Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**