
ICANN74 | Policy Forum – ccNSO: Strategic and Operational Planning Standing Committee
Thursday, June 16, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 AMS

CLAUDIA RUIZ: Hello, and welcome to the ccNSO Strategic and Operational Planning Standing Committee session. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I along with Bart Boswinkel are the remote participation managers for this session.

Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat.

If you would like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak and should leave their Zoom microphones disconnected.

For the benefit of other participants, please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace. You may access all available features for this session in the Zoom toolbar. Thank you all very much. I will now hand the floor over to Andreas Musielak. Thank you.

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.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Good morning, everyone. A very warm welcome. I would like to start with minor changes which happened in the leadership of the SOPC. Irina and me were appointed as chair and vice chair in January 2020. So I took over the leadership of Giovanni. So I would like to take this opportunity and thanks to Giovanni once again for his great and excellent work he did in the past. We can really say and make a long story very short. Giovanni has created an excellent basis so Irina and I can take over easily from that point. But in Germany we say, “Du ruhst du rostest,” which means if you rest, you rust. So our goal, as new leader team, chair and vice chair of the SOPC, is to increase participation and prepare the SOPC for the challenges of the future. So the goal of today’s session is to review the scope and the goals of the SOPC. At that point, I will turn it over to Jordan, and we can go to slide number two, please. Jordan, you are there?

JORDAN CARTER: Yes, I am. Can you hear me okay in the room? Good morning, everyone. I’m so very sorry not to be with you, thanks to the COVID. I think my brief for this session is to give you a just a very quick outline on the changes of the Triage Committee. So I’ll try and be about two minutes. And if there are any questions, please do ask them.

The focus of the committee has shifted a little bit in the last year or so because we found we weren't doing enough prioritization of the work of the ccNSO itself. And so a new role for the committee has been to assess and advise on the prioritization of ccNSO work items that come through. Not just the routine request from ICANN, which has been the committee's historic role, but also to take a look at the standing work plan and to develop a methodology for how we should prioritize the overall work of the ccNSO. To do that, we realized we needed a bit of a clearer strategy for what the ccNSO was there to do. So we've worked with the Council to establish the purpose and goals of the ccNSO, which will not come as a surprise, it's to evolve the global policy framework for the ccNSO to be a great platform for ccTLDs to learn and develop with each other and to support ICANN's broader remit within its mission.

So with that, we've come to so far as the preparation of between '22 to '24 annual plan. After that's adopted by the Council later today, we'll be working on prioritization of the key discretionary activities within it. There's no point in us trying to prioritize things that the Bylaws require us to do, whether we need to fill the function of the ccNSO. But it's the other work, the things we have choices about that we'll be doing that.

The methodology that we've been using is a little bit different that ICANN has been testing out. We've been looking at impact and effort as the two axes, if you like, of approach to prioritizing

things. Impact what difference will it make for ccTLD's efforts, how much work is required to get the job done. This will help us prioritize things that may make the biggest difference for the smallest amount of work. This is all reflected in the updated terms of reference that were signed off earlier this year.

So I think it sits alongside the SOPC as a separate group focused on managing that work plan will be adopting a quarterly reporting framework to let people know what has happened on the plan where things are running on track, if anything's running behind. I'd welcome any questions or discussion or any additions for any of the Triage Committee members who are on the call today. Thanks.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you very much, Jordan. Definitely, we have two committees focused dealing with planning at the ccNSO. The Triage Committee deals with internal planning. And Jordan just described and mentioned the strategic priorities of the ccNSO which have been discussed by Triage Committee, while SOPC focuses on the external issues like planning at ICANN level but also fulfills its mandate as a part of one of SOPC's strategic priorities.

So, SOPC was created back in 2008 during ICANN meeting in Cairo. At that time, its name was Strategic and Operational Planning Working Group. So it ranks its activities for all the 14

years having a lot of skilled members in the past and in current. And in 2017, this working group was transformed into committee. So it's like long-standing and operating everyday operating body. Its charter was last reviewed in 2020. There were actually minor changes aiming to increase members' participation and involvement in the committee activities. With this background introduction, I return it back to Andreas to talk about the future.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Exactly. As I mentioned in the beginning, I think the important part is that we SOPC group has the mandate to submit the rejection action. Next slide. Next slide, please, Joke. Sorry for that.

So bear that in mind that we have this mandate. From that, I think we should also consider what is the future challenge for us as ccNSO and ICANN in general. We see a reason to discuss the work and scope of the SOPC for the future now because some KPIs and parameters changed in the past. In the beginning, if we look in the 2010 figures, you can still see the budget documents were 35 pages, the budget in total was low, and that changed. If we look in the forecast for 2023, we can see up to 300 pages and total budget of \$170 million, which means you see there is a change towards a very high number and we discussed if we should change the focus. Next slide, please.

So have a look on the current charter. The main reason, so that's only in one extract out of it, is to really increase the participation of ccTLD managers. It's open for all. You don't have to be part of the ccNSO, and we want to have a clear focus on the strategic approach, as you can see. So the charter is available on the website so you can see the details over there. Next slide, please.

So what is the future value of the SOPC for the ccTLDs? Our idea is to change the quality and input of our work. So there are three main points is the SOPC ccTLD community comments are taken into account. Basically, this was the outcome of several sessions we had with the SOPC from January until May of this year. So we had four or five sessions. We had two to three sessions with Irina and the secretariat to prepare that. And the outcome was this three bullet points, SOPC ccTLD community comments, are taken into account, SOPC as watchdog of the process, and efficient and consistent drafting method and with timelines for the community to react. We think it's very important not only to stay in the ccTLD community, in the ccNSO community, but also discuss this with other parties within this community. So that is our idea. Next slide.

Okay. So the question is now—so we prepared some polls where we can see if you would support our proposal. And at this point, I hand over to Irina.

IRINA DANIELIA: Thank you, Andreas. But before we go to polling, may I ask we get one slide back? Because I want to ask if there are any questions or comments so far. What you see in front of you is a mission statement for SOPC. And during the upcoming poll, we will ask you your opinion regarding it. But at the moment, any questions or comment?

BART BOSWINKEL: There is a hand, and it's Adam Eisner from CIRA. Adam, go ahead.

ADAM EISNER: Good morning. Adam Eisner from CIRA and excited new member of the SOPC, I suppose. As somebody new, maybe just a quick question. Is this going to be a verbatim statement as opposed to sort of the groundwork for a finalized statement? Just because it feels like the spirit is there but there might be some additional work in how we actually craft it, given how concise the initial one was. And then a couple of words like honest, I suppose, or watchdog where maybe accountability is the theme, but perhaps we might do a bit of work in tightening it. Thanks.

IRINA DANIELIA: I'll try. Well, this looks most like an aspirational thing. It has not converted in the final text of SOPC charter or whatever. That's

actually a more emotional kind of vision statement but not definitely that text to be finalized and approved.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: We want to see really what the community wants from us to do in the future. We think it's important to probably change the focus a little bit, always to keep in mind that we have this mandate for petition. That is always I think the layer above, and then we should look what is the focus and the scope of the SOPC. Any other questions, Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: If you can put your hand down, Adam, that would be nice.

IRINA DANELIA: If not, may I ask for the first poll to be displayed? So you may use your Zoom to check the mark and give you like maybe 40 seconds to all participants.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: We need to limit the time for the poll.

BART BOSWINKEL: May I just quickly ... 86% of the people have expressed their support, 5% is not sure, and the same two people or 10% has no opinion. So in principle, there is no objection to the statement.

Strong support. One or two are not sure, and one or two have no opinion. Thanks.

IRINA DANIELIA: Thank you very much, Bart. So, I wonder if maybe there is anyone who is not sure or has no opinion wants to elaborate on at least what might help him or her to make the opinion? Or is there anybody who wishes just to comment?

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Okay, then next slide. So, the whole exercise about to see if we need to limit the SOPC focus. So we could see from 2010 to the current budget the number of KPIs, the number of pages increase very much. Since I'm with the SOPC from 2016, I could see that this is overwhelming. So we have to split for information. We have to split the groups in subgroups to have the chance to really go through this all the 300 pages. So our suggestion is to limit the SOPC focus. The alternative approach would be SOPC should comment only on operational initiatives relevant for the ccTLDs. Next slide, please.

Here you can see a number of operating initiatives. The ranking is very rough. However, this would be an example of how we would went through the initiatives with the focus of the high ranked. I don't want to go through the whole list, but however, to give you an idea how we approach the budget and strategic

planning of ICANN. Setting priorities, go for that, and then with a clear focus on topics for the ccNSO. Next slide, please. We come to the polling again, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA:

So with that, before we start the second poll, again, we are like looking at the options of keep things like we used to do before trying to cover everything, or to limit our scope and focus and be more focused on ccNSO and ccTLD-related issues. On the slide, before there was just an example of a very rough prioritization exercise that we did in the SOPC a few months ago. I wonder if there are any comments or questions so far regarding that before we start the poll. I see no hands up, nothing in the chat. Then please may I ask to start the poll? And while you are making your choice, this is definitely the input that will help us to move forward and really seeking to understand what the community wants from us as a committee.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

If there will be questions now because you have five options and one option is not clear, please raise your hand.

BART BOSWINKEL:

Just for the record again, as you can see, this is a bit of a mixed bag. So 36% is focusing only on ccTLD relevant strategic initiatives, 50% is ICANN strategic and operational planning and

budget, so a broader scope. And a minority is “All ICANN planning activities,” so that would include something like reserve fund and other things which are not directly related but on which the SOPC has commented in the past. There is no “No opinion” and there is no “Not sure”. Back to you.

IRINA DANIELIA: Excellent results, actually. Having no “No opinion,” I guess it’s an achievement. But with that, I would love somebody who made one or second or third choice to elaborate a little bit of that. I first see Xavier’s hand up. Please.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Thank you. This is just a question about the second and third option. What’s in your mind is included in all ICANN planning initiatives that is not included in the strategic and operational planning and budget?

IRINA DANIELIA: Very good question, actually. Maybe here by ICANN strategic plan and budget, we understood exactly the document which we received close to the end of the year. While, at least in my memory, since I am a member of SOPC, we provided our comments not only on this particular document but also on IANA plans and budget and on reserve fund proposal. There was a recent prioritization exercise arranged by ICANN. So all we

understand as ICANN planning initiatives. Did I answer? Okay. I see a hand from Pierre. Pierre, please.

PIERRE BONIS:

Thank you, Irina. Just to maybe elaborate on the option ICANN strategic and operational planning and budget, option two. I was wondering the amount of operational and planning that we would have to follow if we were just focusing on ccTLD. So I don't have a clear view. By the way, thank you to our colleagues who are very much involved in SOPC. If just focusing on ccTLD would not empty the exercise for us, because from my point of view, I don't see a lot of strategic and planning operations linked to cc. So that was the reason why I was more conservative and I hope that we would still work on all the strategic and operational plan. And at the end of the day, I think it's almost impossible to look at a priority if you don't look at the others. It's another way to say that we cannot ask for prioritization of something that is of concerns for ccns if we don't know and don't give our views on the other priority. It's almost impossible.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Okay, Pierre. This is executive discussion we had within the SOPC group. This is clear to stay very clear focused on ccTLD relevant topics, all have the broader look into the strategic and operational planning figures. You could see the poll was exactly—the majority is in favor to keep this focus on that. We

don't want to make results for the moment but I think my personal opinion is that could be really the base. And from that, we go down and focus on ccTLD relevant topics. Because clearly, we know the budget is important. We need to have a solid ICANN to handle the challenges of the future. If you only look on our ccTLD relevant topics, it can be difficult. So the focus must be something in between. But they wanted to know and we were very frank and said keep the question very open and have a discussion afterwards. We can see the majority is in favor to have still the ICANN strategic and operational planning and the focus of the SOPC. Irina, do you want to add something?

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Andreas. I wonder if there is anybody who made first choice “Only ccTLD-relevant strategic initiatives” wants to speak and to explain their choice? Is there anybody? I see Mary Uduma has her hand up. Yes, Mary?

MARY UDUMA: Hello. Good morning from where I am. I hope you can hear me.

IRINA DANELIA: Yes, we do hear you.

MARY UDUMA: Okay. I made the first choice because I considered that ccNSO would have been part of the prioritization and would have made submission to ICANN where the planning process is in place. If those strategic initiatives from the ccNSO is now keyed into the ICANN strategic plan and ICANN planning initiatives, then the stand for me, I think, is very, very fundamental that we'll look at those strategic initiatives that have been submitted to ICANN. So that's why I chose the first one since it is no more question of top-down, it's bottom-up from the ccNSO to ICANN, ICANN Org will not collate and send back to us. So that's why I chose the first one. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: To summarize, for you, it's fundamental to have this look on the ccTLD-related topics. And I think this is important. I think what we missed to mention is that in the past years, you could see that the approach with Xavier and his team is really on a major level. That was why we asked this question. We should probably tell that beforehand. But we could really see this change that the figures, the numbers are somehow transparent so that the focus on ccTLD-relevant topics can be a part. But I think it needs to be both. Any more questions? Or we go to the next slide?

IRINA DANIELIA: I see a comment from Roelof in the chat. I would say the difference is strategic planning versus very detailed operational

planning. I wonder, Roelof, if you would like to add a little bit more on this? Okay. If not, with that, let's move further.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: So basically, all what we discussed brings us to a dilemma. If we look into the charter, we are obliged to be transparent and include most of you in the whole process. So we had a dilemma to have, from our point of view, timelines and efforts versus consultation and transparency. So this is the next poll we have to understand. Next slide, please.

What you are in favor for? Any questions about these four options? We basically have the challenge that we can't consult in the way we would like to inform the community. That is really an issue if we have these timelines, which is also difficult for us at the SOPC if we build subgroups and consolidate the data and finalize the documents. So this is really a challenge. So if you have a question, raise it now. Otherwise, we start the poll.

IRINA DANELIA: Please start the poll. While you are submitting your questions, I would probably elaborate a little bit more on our concerns. From one side, SOPC has quite a strong mandate to deal on behalf of the whole ccTLD community. From the other side, we want to be sure that we still have your trust that enable us to fulfill this mandate and that we are doing enough to inform you

and to make the community be sure that we take enough good care of the interests of this community. Therefore, we wonder whether we should engage more, whether we should keep doing what we did before, or whether we should probably do something quite differently. That's the question.

MARY UDUMA: Excuse me, please. I couldn't vote because you closed it too early.

BART BOSWINKEL: The poll is closed, let me capture the results. So 40% voted in favor of the first option, consult with the ccTLDs first before submitting comments. 50% opted for the second option, submit comments first and alert the community. And 10% has no opinion. Back to you.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you very much, Bart. May I ask somebody who chose the first option to elaborate on that and maybe give some idea how this might work? I see Pablo waving his hand. Please, Pablo.

PABLO RODRÍGUEZ FELICIANO: Thank you, Irina. And thank you all for all the work that you guys have been putting in favor of the SOPC Committee. Regarding this first question, it only makes sense to me that if

we are going to make an informed decision, we should consult it first, discuss it if we agree, then we submit it. But, in my opinion, if someone were to submit—for those that opted for the second option, who would make that decision? Who would make the decision to make a comment? And then we'll discuss it. That doesn't seem to be something that I feel comfortable with. Thank you.

IRINA DANELIA:

Thank you very much, Pablo. I see comment saying that the poll was opened and closed too quickly, so apologies for that. We will try to make next poll a little bit longer. But meanwhile, if you have no time to submit your position in the poll, may I suggest you type it in the chat? Or if you're willing to speak now, please raise your hand. I see Jordan. Please, Jordan.

JORDAN CARTER:

Sorry, I missed the poll. It didn't appear. Maybe because I was pulling up the chat thing. I would have voted for the second one, to submit comments first. I think in terms of ICANN finds staff that cc is going to make a different point of view. Then as long as the SOPC shares its alert before the deadline, people can make their own comments if they've got a different point of view. I don't think we should bog the SOPC down with having to engage in a whole separate consultation process with the ccTLD community. Thanks. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: I think it's important to know that we can see in the SOPC group that we have experts from different areas—finance, even legal—so we have a good exercise to really review things like that. Are there any more questions?

ADAM EISNER: The one thing that caught me was the word proactive. While I actually think I lean more to what Chris and Jordan were saying, it felt to me like it wasn't particularly proactive if we were consulting post submission as opposed to pre submission. So I felt a little caught between the two, I suppose. But with that word not included, I suppose, my choice might have been different.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: We will see how we can work in that direction. To have received a 50/50 percent response, we'll see how we can manage both sides. So we're still a little bit in a dilemma. Bart?

BART BOSWINKEL: May I just make one observation? I think that's pretty relevant. If you look at the timelines involved in consultation and also the timeline involved in submitting comments, if you would do a consultation first with the ccTLDs before submitting comments,

effectively, you squeeze the timelines for the SOPC itself because there is always a hard deadline. And that's, again, Bylaw driven deadline. So that's something to take into account as well. Thanks.

IRINA DANELIA: I see [Annebeth].

[ANNEBETH LANGE]: Thank you. Thank you for all the work you're doing. It's really heavy work, I know. Isn't that the whole point with choosing working groups to do this work for us? We are giving them a mandate and that goes for all working groups we are establishing that we have to trust those. Forget the mandate and hope that they will do the best. So I think it's no point in going back and consult the ccTLDs, and then afterwards give you their commitment or their comments to the rest. Also, as we have been talking about here, the timeline, it wouldn't allow it. That's one of the big problems we have. So I vote for having we're giving the trust to the people we choose to do that work, and that's it. Thanks.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you very much, [Annebeth].

BART BOSWINKEL: Roelof has his hand up. And Mary has her hand up. Roelof first.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you, Bart. Can you hear me?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, we do.

ROELOF MEIJER: Okay. I just want to say that I completely agree with what [Annebeth] just said. Both as a former member of the SOPC but also as a member of the ccNSO, I think it will make it very difficult for the SOPC to stick to the timelines because probably that reaction time for consulting the rest of the ccNSO will be considerable. We have people, fellow members I think we should trust them with the job that we trusted them with. And if things happen that a large part of the ccNSO doesn't agree to, we can always intervene if that is necessary and change roles. But my impression is that everybody's very happy with the work of the SOPC. So I see no real reason to change this and it will be quite a cumbersome change. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Thank you, Roelof. As I mentioned, we had some discussions within the group and we also feel very comfortable to discuss that. But we want to discuss with the community. If we say

proactively seek out and foster participation, if this is the level you want, basically. And then we had a discussion about what does it mean proactively. So thank you for your feedback. There's another question?

BART BOSWINKEL: Yes, there's another hand up from Mary. Mary, go ahead.

MARY UDUMA: Thank you very much for giving me the floor again. I would have voted "Not sure" because my understanding is that the SOPC is not stand-alone on its own because I believe that even if we submit comments, it has to pass through the Council. Please correct me if I'm wrong, because I think that would have been the interface between us and the community. So if the ccNSO Council feels that they need to—from that point that the Council can now consult the community. I would have put "Not sure" so I needed clarification on that. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: I didn't get the question. Can you rephrase your question again?

MARY UDUMA: Okay. Sorry. I said I would have voted “Not sure” because from my own understanding, I think SOPC will not submit direct to ICANN or to Finance. It will pass through all comments through the Council of ccNSO. And if the Council approves it and it goes— I think the consultation with ccTLDs will not be necessary again, considering the timelines and the rest of them. So if I’m wrong that the submission will not pass through the Council, please, you can correct me. So there are two things I’m saying why I was not sure that would I pass this through the Council and/or is the SOPC leadership now submit directly to ICANN Org?

BART BOSWINKEL: Mary, may I rephrase? If I understand you correctly, you asked whether the SOPC has to pass through the Council, etc. Is that correct?

MARY UDUMA: Yes.

BART BOSWINKEL: Okay. Thank you. Maybe as an observation to everybody, and that’s probably why it’s so important for the SOPC to have the support, this is the only working group within the ccNSO that is mandated to submit comments directly. Other groups aren’t. So that’s one.

If you look at the one at the starting slide, you also saw that this is the only group that is mandated to submit a rejection action petition, if necessary. So they have in that sense in all the ultimate power. Again, this is the only group of the ccNSO that is mandated to do so. Therefore, this question is very relevant for the SOPC itself. Thanks.

MARY UDUMA:

Okay. With that explanation, then I support the second bullet point. Thank you.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Basically, we are independent in the things we are doing, Mary. This is the answer. Thank you.

Any more questions, Bart? Okay. Then next slide, please. Okay. What we can see in our discussions when we go through the budget process that we would like to increase the participation with other groups within the ccNSO but also outside. But this is the focus here to share more information. I think that would help to understand the one or the other initiative.

So the question is—next slide, please. The SOPC should collaborate with other ccNSO working groups and committees. Question?

IRINA DANELIA:

So when speaking about feasibility to cover all the documents we see and we're looking where we can get help. One of the ideas that comes to our mind is probably we can reach out to other groups in the ccNSO and ask for their input in their specific area of interest and area of focus. We are not sure this is realistic or not. That's why we are trying again to engage with you and ask what do you think on that?

Maybe we'll have a poll. Please keep it a little bit longer than the previous one. For example, when I read, let's say, the operational plan. Okay. I more or less understand figures but I do not understand much about root zone operations and the technical details of DNS functioning. So I would definitely be happy to have an input from somebody who has more thorough technical background. Just tell me what they think about it. And if they believe it's okay or whether they believe there is something wrong and should we at least select.

BART BOSWINKEL:

One minute has passed. We'll close the poll. Let me read it for the record again. I agree, 77% of the respondents. Not sure is 9%. As you can see, there is one "No, I do not agree" and no opinion is 9%.

IRINA DANIELIA: Thank you very much, Bart. Is that one who said “No, I don’t agree” willing to speak and explain why he believes so? If not, maybe somebody who was in favor of this idea would like to share his exhibit his or her observations? No hands up. No comments in the chat. Then why don’t we move further?

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Roelof, go ahead.

ROELOF MEIJER: Thank you, guys. Well, from the perspective of being previously a member of the SOPC, I think the collaboration with other working groups is essential. For instance, to understand the priorities of other constituencies, to exchange viewpoints on strategic plan, comments on the budget, etc. So it’s not a good idea to work in isolation, I think. The SOPC has been working together with working groups of other constituencies and also with other ccNSO working groups and committees. And I think that should continue. It’s useful. It enriches the results of the work of the SOPC.

IRINA DANIELIA: Thank you very much, Roelof.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Okay. Then, next slide. If there are any—

IRINA DANELIA:

So our next polling question is about external collaboration. The previous was about collaboration and coordination within working group within ccNSO community, but there are also working groups in other SOs and ACs. For example, GNSO and Registry Stakeholder Groups communities have a working group dealing with budget issues. ALAC, I think, pays a lot of attention recently to the ICANN operational plans and budget. And those are the parts of the whole community, which we potentially might engage with. We actually did have a couple of meetings with the committee of GNSO which has more or less the same task as we. So we are looking for your opinion on whether this is a good idea or not, whether we should keep doing that or be focused on ourselves. Please, can I have the next poll?

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Before we start the poll, the point here is that we can see that other groups like the SCBO is doing the same work in parallel, which means also probably by doing and coordinate our initiatives, we probably can be more focused. So that was also one aspect we could see from discussing with other groups.

BART BOSWINKEL: One minute gone. I'll read the results. Yes, I agree, 83%. Not sure, 13%. No opinion, 4%. Everybody in the room at least has no objection.

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you very much, Bart. Is anybody willing to speak up and to comment on their choice? Or if you have no opinion or not sure, maybe explain what will help you to have your opinion.

BART BOSWINKEL: Pierre has his hand up.

IRINA DANELIA: What could we do better to explain the idea?

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you, Irina.

IRINA DANELIA: Thanks, Pierre. Please.

PIERRE BONIS: I'm not sure so I'll leave it to you. Because when I read "should collaborate," it's something like we are asking SOPC members to systematically coordinate or collaborate with other SO/AC. I think it's very heavy. But at the same time, if it's useful for you to

have an exchange of ideas with other SO or ACs group, do it. That's why I said "Not sure" because I don't want to send the message that you have to do something like that. If you need it, of course, do it.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK:

Thank you, Pierre. I think it's exactly the point. We will not include in the charter something like we have to collaborate. But we want to see the feedback from the community, if it's something we should more focus on it. And always be reminded, we have limited time when we start the process. Then we say how we should share with the group to be transparent, how we should collaborate with groups within the ccNSO, how we should collaborate with other groups outside the ccNSO. So that's all about it. Thank you, Pierre. It was good comment.

Any more questions, comments? Do you want to ask something more? Then next slide.

BART BOSWINKLE:

At the moment, there is a comment from Xavier. Like the SOPC, the SCBO has a specific focus on policy work. And I assume that's a bit of a misunderstanding, Xavier. The SOPC has a broader focus than just policy work.

IRINA DANIELIA: Exactly. I agree, Xavier. This probably gives us opportunity to pay a little bit less attention to GNSO specific policy work because it is taken care about already very well, I believe.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Okay. Any general questions about the approach?

BART BOSWINKEL: Xavier has his hand up.

XAVIER CALVEZ: Sorry. I just wanted to clarify my point. I didn't mean to say the SOPC has limited work on the policy work but that the SCBO does. Therefore, the collaboration could be either on those topics or on other topics around the scope. But the SCBO limit itself very specifically and very clearly on policy work, which leads them not to comment at all by design on plenty other aspects that the SOPC does comment on. And there's also other groups in the community, which you may know of, including in At-Large, that have very similar approach and scope as the SOPC does. There's also individuals in other parts of the GNSO who work on the plans as an individual, not necessarily as a committee or as a group.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Thank you for the clarification. But what we can see, we had several meetings with the SCBO and we could really see that they were also keen to understand some financial figures and others and we have really things in common. Thank you very much. Okay. Any general questions? Then next slide.

So basically, Irina was very keen to collect your input because this was an exercise to understand how the future approach of SOPC should look like. So even if we have to pause, on the one hand, we need to understand if somebody's not sure to see what other points in between.

So the next steps for the SOPC will be to collect and make a clear guidance for the community out of that. This is bullet point one. Bullet point two is to update its charter, which means your inputs you give will be somehow we will review if the charter needs to be changed somehow. We will inform about that. So we will have meetings in the next month. And hopefully, to the next ICANN meeting, we can prepare proposition. Our goal is really to build on our strengths and opportunities, aspirations and results. So we will still work on our sole analysis to develop an action plan. That's the next plans and to-dos for the SOPC group.

So then Danko asked me to have a general comment for one to two minutes. The floor is yours.

DANKO JEVTIĆ:

Thank you, Andreas. Just very briefly, I would like to say thank you and I'm happy to be here. To expand a bit on that, I'm coming from the cc community and sitting on the ICANN Board and chairing the BFC. So I'm working with Xavier and lots of input that is coming to us is coming to this Strategic and Operational Planning Committee. And I'd like to take this opportunity to really thank you. I believe the strength of the input we're receiving in all the planning and financial processes, it's showing the strength of the cc managers and the business competence we have here that sometimes is much needed in the wider ICANN environment. So cc and g sites, we are, as Göran would say, joined the hip in IANA, but also in the root service system. But it is not the only thing because the stability of effectiveness of the whole ICANN ecosystem is something that is critical for all the TLD managers. So we are in this together. Importance, breadth, details and scope of the comments that are coming from your group is something that we really, really highly value. So I also follow this session and of course, I didn't vote on the polls even though I'm in a way back to the community being now on the Board of .RS. So again, I'm here. But I think this evolution of the role of the SOPC is in line with the precision of scope for the multistakeholder model. So I think we are in a very good place. I'd like to thank you and ask you to continue your good work.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Danko, thank you very much for the kind words. Okay. Any final hands or remarks? No? Then I would thank you very much for the valuable inputs from the community. Thank you to secretariat for preparing the presentation and the polls. We come to the end. Irina, do you have any final remarks?

IRINA DANELIA: Thank you, Andreas. You have just seen references how you can reach us in case you have any idea or suggestions or requests or demands or whatever. Thank you very much to everyone who joined, who provided comments and opinions. That's very helpful. We will try to keep doing our work to the best interests of the ccTLD community. Thank you very much.

ANDREAS MUSIELAK: Thank you. Bye-bye.

BART BOSWINKEL: You may stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]