YESIM NAZLAR:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening to everyone. Welcome to the Operations Finance and Budget Working Group call taking place on Wednesday 27th of May 2020 at 19:00 UTC.

On our call today on the English channel we have Ricardo Holmquist, Maureen Hilyard, Dave Kissoondoyal, Justine Chew, Bastiaan Goslings, Javier Rua-Jovet, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Holly Raiche, Sonigitu Ekpe, Sarah Kiden, Ron data accuracy Silva, Joanna Kulesza, Harold Arcos, Marita Moll, Nadira Al-Araj and Sébastien Bachollet as well as Alberto Soto present.

We currently don't have anyone listed on the Spanish channel. Excuse me, Alberto Soto has just joined the Spanish channel. And on the French channel, we have Abduldjalil Bachar Bong.

We have received apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Satish Babu, Alan Greenberg, and from Clément Genty.

From staff's side, we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Becky Nash, Shani Quidwai, Mary Wong, Victoria Yang, and myself, Yesim Nazlar present on today's call, and I'll also be doing call management for this call.

As you know, we have Spanish and French interpretation, and ours Spanish interpreters are Paula and David, and French interpreters are Claire and Isabelle.

Before we start, just a kind reminder to please state your names before speaking not only for the transcription but also for the interpretation

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Justine.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yesim, I think you missed me out.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I hear something there. I guess it's in the Adigo channel. For today's call, we have very good conversation. First we have the discussion on the ICANN finance, the approved fiscal year 21 to 25 operating and financial plan. Thank you, Becky Nash and her group for attending the call and being able to receive questions.

Then we have Mary Wong with the additional budget request. We have requested several ABRs and we have the results of this. And then we have Holly Raiche that is going to present the draft in the way for the PTI strategic plan that we have to deliver for next week.

[So with much anything else,] I would like to introduce Becky Nash and the finance team. So go ahead, please.

BECKY NASH: Thank you very much, Ricardo, and we have a short presentation for you today. Thank you for inviting us. The speakers today are the ICANN

Org planning team, including myself, Becky Nash. We have Shani Quidwai and Victora Yang.

I will quickly go over the agenda. Next page. We have an overview of the operating and financial plan process. We have an overview of the adopted five-year operating plan and financial plan. We have several slides on the FY20 operating plan and budget and some slides on the overall timeline and planning process.

If we could go to the next section. Just as an overall introduction, on December 20th 2019, ICANN Org published the draft five-year operating plan and financial plan and the fiscal year 21 operating plan and budget for public comment. These draft plans were developed based on the approved five-year strategic plan that took place earlier in 2019.

Subsequent to the public comment period, the COVID-19 pandemic appeared and has had significant impact on the world's economy. Based on that, ICANN Org expects that its planned activities and financial position both for the remainder of FY20 which is the fiscal year ending 30th June 2020, and fiscal year 21 will be impacted.

As a result, an updated forecast, new plans were projected, a new financial plan, and we held several webinars in early May with the community prior to submitting those plans to the board. These plans were adopted by the ICANN board on May 7th 2020.

Today, we just have a quick overview of the adopted plans which are set to go into effect at the beginning of the fiscal year pending the empowered community process. And we welcome your feedback and participation today.

If we go to the next slide, I'd like to ask Victoria to present the planning process.

VICTORIA YANG: Thank you very much, Becky. Can you all hear me?

BECKY NASH: Yes.

VICTORIA YANG: Perfect. Thank you. [It's always good] to recap the planning process here. ICANN's planning process involves basically fourfold, and this slide basically shows you the outcome of the first three fold. It starts with the strategic plan, the strategic plan helps to answer basically two very important questions: where are we now and where we want to go.

As a result, the strategic plan reflects the mission and the vision [then sets out a] long-term strategic objective and [both] for the organization reflect the mission and vision.

Following the strategic plan, we move to the operating plan and the financial plan. So the operating plan basically acts as a long-term management tool that helps tactically explain what, who, when and how to execute the strategic plan.

And the last fold is the annual operating plan and budget. The annual operating plan and budget focus on the organization's commitment for

the upcoming fiscal year whereas the five-year, the second one, shows a long-term plan.

The last fold of this planning process is actually progress reporting, which is not here on these slides but is always good to mention that the circle basically ends with the progress reporting. Currently, ICANN has multiple mechanisms for progress reporting such as the CEO report, our quarterly financial reports, and the accountability indicators.

As we head into this new five-year period, the planning team has started working on improving the mechanisms for reporting progress towards the new five-year and one-year plan. We will be applying what we have learned over the last few years, so more details will come on that part.

If we can move to the next slide. As Becky mentioned in her introduction, a lot has changed since the conclusion of the public comment process due to the COVID-19 pandemic, so as a result, ICANN expect its planned activity and financial position for the remainder of the fiscal year 20 and fiscal year 21 will be significantly impacted. As a result, in March and April, we did a very quick turnaround by assessing the current situation.

By the end of April, we published two sets of documents, as you can see here. The first set is the draft which reflects improvement resulting from the public comment proceeding that closed at the end of March, and the second set is the set for proposed for board adoption version which reflects the latest financial projection and activity for fiscal year 21 to 25 and in particular for fiscal year 21 due to COVID-19 impact.

When the board adopts the proposed for adoption version of this planning document early May, we also updated our website and provided the link there. So in total, there are three sets of documents. You can have access to all of them on the public comment page, which we have a URL link here. You have any questions, welcome to either ask here or e-mail us later. We'll have the chance to access those documents.

So I will stop here, see if there's any questions before we go to the next section. Thank you. Okay, with that, I don't see any questions regarding what has been present so far, so perhaps we can move to the next session. Thank you.

BECKY NASH:

Thank you, Victoria. I'm going to present an update on the adopted FY21 through 25 operating plan and financial plan. As we indicated, the draft plans published in December 2019 were based on all of the plan and budget development prior to that point. So those are the plans that were published for public comment. And those plans still are a very useful reference point. It outlines all of the details related to the plan and all of the work that ICANN Org is set to do.

We published both the draft plans and the revised plans back out on the public comment page just so that everyone could use those drafts that were subject to public comment as a reference point.

The revised plans did have a reduction in funding. So this is the five-year plan where we expected over the five years that there would be a 5% reduction during that five years in funding. This was due to a reduction

in the forecast for domain name registrations and contracted parties, mostly in FY21 which is the first year of the five-year plan. The remaining years, FY22 through FY25, we have modest growth in funding. But there is much uncertainty as of today still what the next few months lay ahead for us.

So these plans include recent developments as well in funding on initiatives related to the security, stability and resiliency of the DNS over the next five years, and we will be doing forecasting and updates to the five-year funding during FY21.

If we could go to the next page. This is a continuation of the summary of changes where ICANN Org balances its expenses with its projected reduced funding, and that resulted in a reduction in travel expense primarily due to travel restrictions where ICANN expects no face-to-face meetings to occur before September 2020 in the plan, and then there is an assumption that face-to-face travel would resume slowly throughout FY21 just based on the new travel restrictions.

The new plan also has proposed operation changes, functions supporting the work of the community through capacity building, education, training and communication. These were initiatives that were inserted into the plans as pat of an overall engagement plan.

The five-year plan has a reduction in personnel cost. We anticipated slower hiring of new positions, and with an average headcount of 395 versus 410 which was previously submitted in the draft plans.

The operating initiatives which require incremental resources, so those would be only operating initiatives that are not absorbed or performed

with the resources on hand at ICANN Org, they were delayed from FY21 and rebalanced throughout the period from FY22 on. The full amount is still to be incurred over the five years. And one other item as the revised plan had a recommendation to delay the decision to contribute to the reserve fund until after FY22.

If we go to the next slide, I would just highlight quickly what we just discussed but now it's just an accumulative five-year change of the five-year plan. So we can see that the draft plan, which was subject to public comment, compared to the adopted plan, had total funding over the five-year period of a reduction of 5%. As a result of that total expenses, excluding the operating initiatives, were also reduced by 5%, and then the operating initiatives which again are the incremental resources required to achieve these plans that support the strategic plan, there was no change over the five-year, we just delayed the spend from FY21 throughout the remainder of the five-year plan.

Over the five years, the reserve fund contribution was reduced. That expected contribution still achieves the overall target for the reserve fund replenishment strategy.

And then the last set of numbers here is actually the average headcount, so not in dollars, this is headcount where we show that over the five-year plan, we do have a 4% reduction just based on the slower hiring of any new or open positions.

With that, I would like to go to the next slide and just touch very briefly on the financials that were presented as part of the adopted financial plan for the five years.

I would just like to highlight that on this slide, this has the funding and expenses, by year, and you can see based on the subtotals, we have the total five-year column over to the right, and then I'd just like to highlight underneath, we have several—at the bottom of the slide, we have the allocation to the reserve fund in the projections of $6 million. The operating initiatives total $24.5 million, and then that leaves a balanced budget with a net excess in total being funding, less expenses, less the allocation to the reserve fund and less the operating initiatives amount, is a balanced budget with a net excess of zero.

The $24.5 million of operating initiatives, if we go to the next slide, I would just like to highlight that that total is listed on this schedule which is part of the adopted five-year plan where you can see in gray the five-year financial estimate of the operating initiatives is listed there. and again, all of this is still included in the five-year plan.

I realize that we're going a little bit quickly, but we don't have a lot of time and now I would like to turn it over to Shani who will cover the next section, which is the FY21 operating plan and budget.

SHANI QUIDWAI: Thank you, Becky, and thanks, everyone, for having us on the call. I do realize we're running up against the end of the 15 minutes that we had allotted, so Ricardo, if you would like us to move to Q&A, we can. Otherwise, I have a few slides that I would like to go over first. I'll start with the slides and just wait for any feedback.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: We will still have eight minutes, so go ahead, please.

SHANI QUIDWAI: Okay. Thank you. Here I'm just going to give a brief overview of the FY21 budget. A lot of the themes and principles are very same to what Becky had alluded to in the five-year plan and some of the operational initiatives in the operating plan that Victoria had mentioned. The FY21 draft operating plan and budget that was published in December for public comment was revised due to the impact of the economic crisis. All of the comments that we received during the public comment period were incorporated into the materials that were published and as part of the adoption, and there were no material changes to any of those documents.

The draft documents are still considered very valuable resources, and for the most part are generally true. we did highlight where there were specific changes, but overall, they have not materially changed the plans from what was published for draft.

If we move to the next slide, we can see an overview of the financials specifically. Here you can see that when we posted for draft, our funding projections were $140 million and our revised projections were $129 million, or $11 million lower.

The lower funding is our projections and in order to understand the financial impact of this crisis, we modeled a few different scenarios, and ultimately, with the highest probability or most likely scenario. However, there is a lot of assumptions in here and we don't exactly know how things will play out. But ultimately, due to fewer domain

registrations and a reduction in the number of contracted parties, we have projected funding to be $11 million lower. Personnel expenses are $2.3 million lower than the draft budget, and this is due to the fact that our average headcount is declining from 410 to 395.

A key point here is that we're projecting to end the current fiscal year, FY20, at a lower point than what we had initially thought, which would spill into the next year, meaning we would start FY21 lower and this results in lower expenses.

Travel and meetings are $3.5 million or 20% lower than the draft budget, and this reflects the fact that there are several travel restrictions throughout the world in place today, and we've modeled those to continue into the start of the fiscal year and slowly start to progress and return to similar historical spend throughout the year.

That also does have an impact on professional services as some of the costs relating to the meetings and some projects and face-to-face meetings would be impacted due to travel restrictions.

Another item to call out here is that the contingency budget remains $5.2 million within each version of the budget. The contingency is a line item that we budget for to account for unidentified work, realizing that when the budgets are approved and when they are reviewed, there are other work that can come our way and we want to ensure that we have funds available for those. So we did want to keep the same amount available.

The last item to call attention to here is the reserve fund contribution. In the draft projections, we had $3 million and we have removed that

here and this does balance the budget where you can see that there's no excess or deficit. This is purely a planned contribution. The reserve fund contributions are evaluated on an annual basis, and to the extent that we get a better visibility into our financial picture or there is excess, that would still be evaluated. However, we didn't want to specifically plan for that given the reductions and a lot of the uncertainty that we see. Next slide, please.

This is just a brief overview on the additional budget request process. I think several of you on the call are familiar with this, but it's a separate budget process that allows SOs and ACs to express funding requests customized to their specific needs for things that are not within the budget.

And if you recall the past year, the deadline to submit those was in January, and when the budget was recommended for adoption, we published the report highlighting all of the requests that we received, which ones were approved, which ones were not, and the corresponding amounts associated with each of those.

So if you'd like to see specific information about that, you can view the budget documents that we posted online and we also have a full report of the additional budget requests on our finance Wiki page.

In total, we received 35 different requests from 14 different organizations. 16 of those 35 requests were approved and they totaled $326,000.

If we move to the next slide, we can see the breakout on how this varies by SO and AC. And you can see here that ALAC, there was a submission

of four. Two of those were approved, two of them were not. that totaled $38,000. And then there were some specific RALO requests below. Two of those were approved and five of them were not. There's very specific information in the report as to the criteria for the process and why they were approved or not. I'm looking in the chat right now and Mary has linked to that, so thank you, Mary.

If we move to the next slide, here is just an overview of the types of requests that we've received. You can see that a large portion of them related to travel and outreach. That consisted of 11 of the 16 that were approved. And a large sum of the amount, $182,000 and $91,000 of the total $325,000.

If we could move to the last area, just a few items that we wanted to highlight before we open it up for Q&A. In the next slide, we have a tentative calendar for the FY22 budget and the FY22 to FY26 operating and five-year financial plan. These dates will look very similar to the past fiscal year. Just wanted to highlight this is the best way for everybody to get involved and we appreciate all of the engagement and feedback that we got this year. I won't go through each and every one of these, but we planned to kick off the process this September and start to go through the structure and a timeline, reviewing that. We'll follow that up with sessions at ICANN 69, a public session as well as specific sessions with working groups such as yours.

We intend to publish the draft documents in December similar to this past year, and that would end the public comment period in February. Shortly after the posting in January, we'd host another webinar, going through the documents, just clarifying any questions that people have

and making sure that people have all of the necessary information to submit public comments.

And then lastly, you can see some of the other steps that are required and that go through before the budget is ultimately adopted. We would publish the staff report of public comments in April and also host another webinar in April highlighting that these are the documents that we are proposing for adoption that the board would be reviewing similar to something that we did earlier this year.

And with that, if there were any more specifics that anybody who didn't attend our webinar from a month or so ago, I do encourage you to go back to our Wiki. We have the recording and the slides if you're looking for more detailed information on the changes to the operating plan and budget. I think that was my last slide.

Here's just a high-level overview. We really do value all of the feedback that we get from your group and others within the community, and we're looking to get as much information and input as we can to develop the best plans.

So with that, we wanted to open it up for Q&A. I don't know there were any specific things in the chat that we didn't address or if we wanted to utilize the hand raising.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Shani. We have Judith Hellerstein with her hand up. Go ahead, Judith.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi Shani. I have a couple of questions. One is you showed that travel was only 20% lower, but if we haven't really traveled, we only traveled for one of the quarters, I would have thought that would be a lot lower.

Also, since we're not doing the contribution to the reserve fund, I seem to recall that you were given five years and you were doing it in less than that. So, are we now going back to the five years? And what impact is that going to have on what you had originally scheduled for the paying back of the reserve fund?

And then lastly, I don't know if I saw it there, but they were going to give—maybe in this one you didn't, but I know you were going to provide more information on the budget whereas some consultants, like the people who set up the meetings and others are more like a permanent one and there was going to be some more clarification on that level that these are not necessarily external consultants that are hired for only one time but they're pretty much a steady one. But [inaudible] the consultant process. And I don't know if that's clear, but thanks so much.

SHANI QUIDWAI: Thanks for the questions, Judith. So there were a few questions there. The first one was on the travel and meetings. The assumptions that we have in there—and you have to understand that when we made these assumptions, this was about six weeks ago, so a lot is changing within the world on a daily basis and over the last six weeks.

We assumed that there would be little to no travel in the month of July and August and that we would start to progress in September

throughout the rest of the year. So that's how we get to the 20% lower travel number. Part of that is due to the fact that in general, ICANN doesn't have as much travel in the July through September timeframe given that there's no ICANN meeting. So we have assumed in the budget that there would be three ICANN meetings and that's why the reduction is only 20%. If for some reason the travel restrictions would go out longer, the reductions would be even greater than what we showed.

Regarding the reserve fund, the board approved strategy called for an eight-year plan to replenish the reserve fund and we currently are tracking ahead of that. So even if we were to delay a contribution next year, we still believe that we are aligned to replenish the reserve fund within the required time that was given by the board. But I do also want to stress, as I mentioned, we will still evaluate. And to the extent that there is an excess generated from the next fiscal year, it will be evaluated and potentially we still could make a contribution. We just didn't want to commit to that until we know a little more as to how things would play out.

And then the last question about contractors as it relates to ICANN meetings, the costs associated with hosting and conducting an ICANN meeting, some of those are internal staff that are involved with facilitating and setting up a meeting and all of the logistical, and then some of it is done through contractors because it is more temporary work that's only needed for a week or two at a time.

So we're constantly evaluating those costs and we do use a blend of some staff as well as some contractors depending on the nature of the work. So hopefully, I got all the questions.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Thanks so much. My only thing, I posted it in the chat, is we didn't have a June meeting so I thought it would be a lot less than the 20%.

SHANI QUIDWAI: I see. And just to clarify, our fiscal year starts in July 2020 and runs through June 2021. So you are correct in that we are not having a face-to-face meeting this June and we didn't also have the past March one. All of the costs associated with that are reflected in our FY20 financials, and you are correct, there were significant savings due to that. However, that doesn't impact the next fiscal year, which is what we were focusing on in this presentation.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Not seeing any other hands, thank you very much to Becky, Shani and Victoria for the presentation. We may invite you to have any update you might have in this postponed pandemic or quarantine we are all having and see if the numbers are changing over the time. Thank you very much.

                        Now we have Mary Wong for the ABR. So if you're ready, please go ahead. Thank you very much.

MARY WONG: Thank you very much, Ricardo. Hi everybody. There's a lot of familiar faces on this call or familiar names and voices, I should say. I don't have a presentation today. Hi Cheryl, I see you in the chat.

I don't have a presentation today because the process I think is very familiar to members of this group and my colleague Shani has just gone through the slides that he presented, an overview of the process, and I pasted the result of the FY21 ABR process into the chat and Heidi has just put that in there again.

So Ricardo and everybody, I thought a better use of our time together today might be for me to take questions from members of this group about either the processes here or any specific questions about particular requests and perhaps looking ahead to next year if you don't mind. So I'm just going to pause and see how you would like to do that, Ricardo.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: I didn't expect that so early in your presentation, to have the questions. I don't know if anyone has questions right now. I have the feeling that most of our ABRs were [cut] from ALAC. Only half were approved, and only 25% or something like that was approved from the RALOs. So I don't know the criteria for that. We understand from the very beginning that travel was not allowed to be incldued, then we see a lot of travel approved now. So we want to understand how this works so in the next year, we are better prepared for this ABR. Thank you very much.

MARY WONG: Understood, and apologies if I caught you off guard. I know Judith has her hand up. Before we go to you, Judith, maybe I can start addressing some of Ricardo's comments. And maybe I can do that by recalling for everybody—and thank you, Yesim and colleagues for putting the results

up here. And you actually see the three bullet points here at the bottom of the page. I was actually going to recap those. And these are basic fundamental principles that the internal team has started to apply to all ABRs for the past two to three years in part because of lessons learned from previous ABR cycles and seeing patterns emerging there, in part also because with the recent flattening budget across ICANN Org for the last few years, as you all know, the envelope for a number of activities has had to be changed and reduced in some cases, including for ABRs.

So a confluence of events meant that we needed to be upfront and very clear about the kind of principles that would apply, and the most important one is the first, which is looking at all the ABRs to see whether on their face—meaning as written—they are directly and demonstrably related to current policy or technical work.

And that was really the driving force behind all the ABR decisions, not just for FY21 but for this current FY20 and last year as well.

And when we say on their face, it basically means the requests that you submit. So to your last point, Ricardo, about looking ahead, one of the things that the internal team encouraged by the responsible executives—and for ABRs that would obviously be Xavier, David Olive and Sally Casterton—we have gone back and looked at the templates and the forms that have bene used for ABRs for a while now. and while they've been tweaked over time, we think that it may be possible to have forms and templates that are more specific and that would include more information and cost estimates up front because that will help us estimate the amounts that a particular request might entail and see exactly how the community plans to spend the money if it's allocated.

I think one of the things that we saw through looking at requests over the past few years, less so for the At-Large but perhaps for some other groups, is that a number of requests would seem meritorious in terms of what the activity that is proposed is, but because the form is very short on detail—and I'll just give a hypothetical example. It may be attendance at a particular event and the event is named, the dates are given, but the proposed activity could simply be something like outreach or running a booth or something like that. Which is fine, it's legitimate, there's nothing wrong with it, but it doesn't go to show how providing funding for that activity will go towards these bullet points, particularly the ones that I mentioned.

So because the ABR principles require us to look at the request on its face and because we have these guiding principles, one of the improvements that we really want to do for next year is to have probably a more clear and improved form. And thank you for your comment in the chat, Judith. I hope it will be helpful.

And Nadira, to your question, is there a guideline of the type of requests for ABR? The short answer is that there isn't in the sense of a type of request. The reason for that is because it is not for ICANN Org or any of us to dictate or direct the community in terms of what sorts of activities you might prioritize. So the only guideline that we have or guidelines that we have, you see for example in this document, and in the ABR assessment principles which are also linked to from this document.

So in combination, they provide some guidelines for the sort of requests that the community might want to consider, but we definitely do not go into specifics of "You should be looking at outreach versus travel" or

"you should be looking at training versus something else. We just don't feel that it's our role.

But obviously, if in the course of preparing an annual request, any group has specific questions about perhaps whether things would change for next year, staff is always happy to respond to those requests. Heidi and her team have always been very active and responsive. Becky, Shani and their team on the finance side as well.

So in terms of the At-Large requests, Shani showed some of the numbers and Ricardo, you mentioned that as well. What I will say is I wouldn't look at percentage of requests that were granted versus those that were not or the number of requests that were granted to a group versus the numbers that were not or versus the amounts that were granted to other groups.

The reason I say that is because that is exactly not how the team does it and is not how the executives look at it. And I don't believe that is how the board finance committee or the board looks at it.

So it is not about giving two requests to this group means we can't give two requests to another group. That is not the guideline, that is not the decision basis.

There is a general sense that we want to be equitable across the community, but what that means is that within the limited budget envelope, we try to make sure that all the community requests are looked at on a similar basis, that the same principles are applied to each regardless of who is asking or what they're asking for. And again, I come back to these general principles.

So one of the comments I think that we often get and one of the questions that we often get relate to travel. And as the slides previously showed, what we've seen is just because of the nature of travel, the amounts requested—and if granted, allocated—do tend to be relatively larger an amount for maybe a one-off activity like a webinar.

Again, that is, I think, not necessarily the way to look at it, but if you look at the type of requests that involved travel that were approved, they were not only very specific but they related, again, to a direct connection with current policy or current technical work, at least in the view of not just the staff evaluation team and the responsible executives but as the proposals and the suggested approvals were put up to the board finance committee and the board.

So Judith, you've been very patient. I think I should stop talking now and take your question and comment.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Thank you so much, Mary. Thank you so much for elaborating that. And a good [form] would be helpful. I have two questions. One is also it would be helpful, one of our requests was, as you know, was not approved because of a policy decision on technology and what technologies would be prioritized. So it'd be always helpful for those kinds of things in advance to have a better idea before we go down the road to say, "Oh, yes, you're not going to get approved for that," and discuss early on what we need to figure out, how to answer those questions.

And the other thing that was confusing is when, at least for my proposal on the RTT, the title had English and Spanish but what was only approved was partial funding for English. So it is a bit confusing when you read the title and you see "approved," and then you read later on the information saying, no, half the proposal wasn't approved. So that was confusing and maybe that could be cleared up next time.

MARY WONG:	Thank you, Judith. Let me take the second question or comment first. What we've tried to do in this document, as we've done in previous reports, is that for the title, we refer to the full and overall request, and as you said, for that specific one for RTT, the request was for English and Spanish, and then what we do in the approval line is we'll put the word "partial" if it's a partial approval, as was the case here.

So I apologize if that was confusing. We can look into a different way of reporting. We do however want to still capture the sense that there was a request that was broader than what was actually granted. So if there's a way that we can do both and avoid the confusion, we will certainly try to do that.

To your first question about knowing ahead of time, that's a really good point and it's something that the internal team has been thinking about for some time. So if this group has any particular suggestions on how we can improve two thing, how we can improve, first of all, the communications between the Org and the community as you prepare for the annual submission process, what kind of information you find

helpful. I think that will be helpful to us to know so that if it's possible, we can prepare that information ahead of time for you.

I think the second thing that we were looking at is whether there is a way for us to engage with the community at the start of the submission process. Sort of the conversation we're having now. And again, it may be that we can't be too specific for a number of reasons. For example, it's a bit of a chicken and egg, right? If we don't know that people are thinking about certain requests, we can't proactively guess that this may be something that we can say, oh, internally, Org is already working on this so don't make that kind of request.

So there might be a need for some kind of flexibility, but definitely a need for perhaps earlier and more engagement in the first part of the submission process rather than having the request come in, and then as they come in or after they come in, or worse, after the closing date looking at them going, "Huh, we don't quite think that this request meets the standard."

So in other words, what I'm saying is that I think anything that the team can do to facilitate the types of requests that meet the goals within the limited budget envelope, that's something that we've been thinking about and we would very much welcome any specific suggestions that this group might have on how we can do that. And yes, Nadira, exactly. If there's some suggestions for improvement, we will really be very happy to receive them. And as Heidi says, the ABR decisions text is the definitive response for all ABRs. Thank you, Heidi. That's indeed the case.

This is written up and it is what is sent up to the board for their approval, and as you can see, is what is published. So we try to be as clear as possible and as precise while keeping the document concise so it can be a single reference point for the whole of the community and not just the community group that submitted the request.

So Ricardo, I don't see any more hands up, but I am happy to take more questions if there's time. If not, you all know how to get a hold of me.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Mary. We don't have more time. We're five minutes late. So thank you very much, and please go ahead with the agenda. We have Holly Raiche next for the PTI strategic plan.

HOLLY RAICHE: Okay. This is a follow-on from last week, and—

YESIM NAZLAR: Holly, is it possible for you to speak up, please? We can't hear you.

HOLLY RAICHE: Is that okay now?

YESIM NAZLAR: Yeah, much better. Thank you.

HOLLY RAICHE:	Okay. Thank you. This is really a follow-on from last week when I actually talked about the points that I had identified as things that should be said in response to the PTI draft strategic plan. And what I've done is turned that into script. So I'll just briefly go through the three points that I am making that came out of what I said, but also what the feedback was on the call.

The first point was knowledge and understanding of what the PTI is and does. In the plan itself, there was an acknowledgement that it's not necessarily clear what PTI is and does. What was suggested on the call last week—and one of the things I'd picked up—was the development of and implementation of an awareness and education campaign. This is not only in ICANN but one of the objectives of the plan was also to better liaise or liaise more often with other relevant international bodies, ICANN, IETF, so forth. So the recommendation that I developed was simply an awareness and education campaign that includes not only ICANN but includes the organizations that PTI should be working with in carrying out its naming function.

Alignment of the strategic and financial plans. Under the contract that PTI has with ICANN, it is supposed to have a four-year planning cycle. However, because of obviously the fact that PTI operates under contract with ICANN and is funded by ICANN, there needs to be fairly close liaison between the two in terms of both their strategic plans and their budgets.

I don't know the extent to which it's possible to actually change the timing of PTI's budget and strategic plan, but there needs to be closer alignment of the two because in fact, what essentially PTI is doing is

implementing in part ICANN's strategic plan and using money from ICANN to do it.

So however it's achieved, there needs to be some better alignment between the two, both in terms of strategic planning and in terms of budget planning.

The final recommendation, one of the things that was said in the PTI strategic plan was one of the things it could impact was any community policies that could possibly impact on the way the PTI does its work. To me, one of the obvious areas was—it was mentioned specifically in the strategic plan of PTI—the impact that privacy regulation may have on the transparency for IANA registries. And although in a discussion last week, Alan pointed out there isn't much impact, there may be some impact. And certainly, there may be impact on any of the other policy development processes that impact on PTI.

So even though when I was actually attending the seminar the PTI gave on its plan, I was made aware that there is some coordination—it would make sense to have specific opportunities for PTI to participate in or at least have input into policies as they are developed so that if there's any impact that the policies that are developed through a PDP process have on PTI, PTI would have an opportunity to indicate the level of impact that changing policy might have on the operation of PTI.

So those are three areas that I've highlighted as areas that ALAC should comment on in PTI. Now, I've asked that this draft document be put into a Wiki so that if anybody has any further comment, it can be made in

the next little while. Otherwise, this would be the text that would go into PTI as representing ALAC comment.

So I'll leave it there for any further questions or comments. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Holly, for the presentation. I understand it is due for June 1st, and prior to that, I understand also ALAC has to vote for this. So we don't have much time. We're due Wednesday, so maybe tomorrow it has to go to ALAC for voting in order to be ready for next Monday. I don't know the timing there for the ALAC vote. So it's not much comments we have time to do.

HOLLY RAICHE: Thank you, Ricardo. That's absolutely right. And that's why this draft does reflect the discussion that we had last week. But I think there's probably a 24-hour period. Remember we've got Thursday, Friday. I think we've probably got 24 hours and I've asked that this be put up on the Wiki and everybody let know so if there's any final comments even now, or in the next 24 hours, then that's fine. I can't imagine that PTI will not accept comments that are one or two days late.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Well, Heidi put [inaudible] in the chat. Sorry, Maureen, go ahead.

MAUREEN HILYARD: Sorry, I thought that Heidi was going to [take the floor.] But really, what we can do is if it's endorsed by this group, then we can actually move it on for when it's due, and once we've done that, of course, we will initiate the ALAC endorsement at the same time. That's not a problem.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you very much, Maureen. I don't know if we [inaudible] for 24 hours more to any other comment on the Wiki page, and after that, go ahead with the voting process. I saw a comment from Marita [inaudible] but that's maybe something that could be remediated in these 24 hours. Cheryl, please go ahead.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Heidi picked up my first point, but I was moved to respond to your last statement. I think you can probably give a little longer than 24 hours for feedback. I think little tweaks like Marita's just suggested are well worthwhile putting in, providing it is closed off from our and other people's comments within 12 to 24 hours prior to the drop dead date and time, which of course is, I'm assuming, 23:59 UTC on June 1st. We could actually allow comments up until and including a time to be determined on the 30th and still get it, because it is in such good shape, put into the public comment system pending ratification.

I don't think you need to be as tight as the 24 is where I was coming from. Thank you.

RICARDO HOLMQUIST: Thank you, Cheryl. 48 hours looks good. So Maureen agreeing with the 24, so until 29th, and then have the submission for the June 1st [I guess is the middle point in there.] I don't see any other hand or any other comment about the PTI strategic plan, so if everybody agrees, we are late for four minutes, so we can go ahead with the next point.

Well, next point is next call. We should have the next call for the second week of June if nothing else arises other than that. Since there is a change from a subcommittee to a working group, I think I will change some things, and one of those is the [inaudible] to schedule the meeting. So we'll have to figure out how to schedule a meeting in the way the CPWG is working. [They have a fixed day a week] every week. We plan this to be once a month and we have to figure out the week we want to be. I am suggesting the second week of the month, but let's see. And in any case, it should be in two or three weeks' time from now.

And I don't have any other points. If someone has Any Other Business, please talk now or this conversation is [very soon.] Not seeing any hands up, thank you very much to the finance team for attending the call, to Mary Wong, to Becky Nash, Victoria Yang and Shani Quidwai, and everyone for their participation. This is going up, so very good. We see more people in each call.

Thank you very much to everyone, and enjoy the rest of the day.

YESIM NAZLAR: Thank you all. This meeting is now adjourned. Have a great rest of the day. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]